

Doctrine and Defense.

Theological and ecclesiastical contemporary history

Monthly Bulletin.

Published

from the

German Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, et al. St.

Edited by

Teachers' College of St. Louis Seminary.

Luther: "A preacher must not only feed, so that he instructs the sheep how they should be true Christians, but also ward off the wolves, so that they do not attack the sheep and lead them astray with false teaching and introduce error, as the devil does not rest. Now many people can be found who are willing that the gospel should be preached, if only one does not cry out against the wolves and preach against the prelates. But though I preach rightly, and feed and teach the sheep well, yet it is not enough to keep the sheep, and to keep them, lest the wolves come and lead them away again. For what is it built, if I cast up stones, and I see another cast them in again? The wolf may well suffer the sheep to have good pasture; he likes them the better to find them hostile; but he cannot suffer the dogs to bark in hostility."

Forty-second volume.

St. Louis, Mo.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1896.

Content.

January.

	Page
Preface	1
The meaning of the resurrection of Jesus Christ	6
The Position of Lutheran Symbols on Scripture - Evidence that Our Confession Holds Literal Inspiration	22
Literature	28
Ecclesiastical contemporary history	2S

February.

The Position of Lutheran Symbols on Scripture - Evidence that Our Confession Holds Literal Inspiration	33
On the doctrine of conscience	43
The Meaning of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ	51
Literature	60
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	61

March.

Frank's Theology	65
The Modern Theologians' Attacks on God's Word	76
The Meaning of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ	82
Miscellaneous	89
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	93

April.

Frank's Theology	97
The position of Lutheran symbols in relation to Scripture - proof that our confession represents the literal inspiration	107
The Modern Theologians' Attacks on God's Word	120
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	126

May.

Frank's theology	129
The main service of the Evangelical Lutheran Church	139
News about the progress of the work on our St. Louis Luther Edition 144	
Miscellaneous	149
Literature	152
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	152

June.

Frank's theology	161
The Modern Theologians' Attacks on God's Word	170
Miscellaneous	182
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	183

July and August.

Page

Are political pastors an aberration?	193
Frank's theology	201
The Position of Lutheran Symbols on Scripture - Evidence that Our Confession Holds Literal Inspiration	212
The Modern Theologians' Attacks on God's Word	226
Miscellaneous	239
Literature	242
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	245

September.

Are political pastors an aberration?	257
Frank's theology	262
The Position of Lutheran Symbols on Scripture - Evidence that Our Confession Holds Literal Inspiration	272
Miscellaneous	278
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	281

October.

The wrong attitude of today's evangelical Christianity towards Rome	289
The Modern Theologians' Attacks on God's Word	297
Miscellaneous	307
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	311

November.

A word of warning against overestimating the antiquity research	321
The Modern Theologians' Attacks on God's Word	329
Miscellaneous	340
Literature	344
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	345

December.

Lourdes. A Contribution to the Characteristics of Today's Pabst Church	353
On Luther's Position on Scripture	360
Modern Theologians' Attacks on God's Word	365
Twenty-three theological aphorisms	376
Miscellaneous	377
Literature	378
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history	379

Doctrine and Defense .

Volume 42.

January 1896.

No. 1.

Preface.

The highest and last purpose of theology is the glory of God. In view of this, the blessedness of men, which, according to Ephesians 1:5, 6, 11, 12, 14, is to be the praise of His glory, and especially the glory of His grace, is to be regarded as the *finis intermedius*. To the extent that theology serves God's glory, it fulfills its final and highest purpose.

But honour is the recognition of what one is. A poet is not honored as such by being made a *Doctor juris utriusque*, and a jurist or historian who has never succeeded in writing a verse might take it as a mockery if he were crowned a *poeta laureatus*. To acknowledge God in his nature, his will, his works, his word, to let him be accepted by us and others for what he is, to acknowledge and accept his will as set by him, his work as wrought by him, his word as spoken by him, is to honor him. Not to honor God is to let him be what we make him to be. He who makes God right for himself, even in supposedly high thoughts and deep speculations, does not honor him, but sets him down by his part, pushes him, as much as there is in him, from his throne of honor, makes for himself an idol in God's place, as really and truly as the wild heathen who hews his own out of wood and stone, and puts out of sight the word of the Lord: "I will not give my honor to another, nor my glory to idols." A theologian who, in his theology, in his doctrine of God, of the three persons in the divine essence, in his doctrine of God's counsels and their divine execution, of God's word according to content and form, and in general of divine things, holds and says and sets something different, misses the purpose, if he does so. If he does so, he misses the purpose of theology, does not honor God, but practices idolatry, - and even if he built temples up to the clouds, wrote libraries full of his speculations, would be a tenfold doctor of such theology - as certainly the highest end of theology is the honor of God.

This final purpose is not unique to theology. As from God, so also "all things were created for Him, Col. 1, 16. and everything that exists, whether great or small, has for its purpose the honor of its Creator. So then all his works are called upon to praise the Lord, Ps. 103:22, Ps. 148:1-10, just as the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament proclaims the work of his hands, and God's eternal power and divinity is known from the works of creation, Ps. 19:2 and Rom. 1:20. But God not only wants the heavens and the earth to proclaim his praise, but he himself has also determined how he wants to be honored by every creature. The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds of the air, the lilies of the field, each in its own way, as ordained by God, praise him, in that they are what they ought to be according to God's will and work, and serve the nearer purposes which God has ordered and set for them as intermediate purposes, and the unreasonable creature corresponds to their purpose, notwithstanding that it too is subject to vanity without its will, with such reliability that God Himself instructs men of all ages and in all lands to the ants in their busyness, to the birds under the sky, and to the lilies of the field, and knows that they will not fail to serve Him. But to us the same God saith, "Are ye not much more than they?" And to whom much is given, with him much will be sought. As much as the rational creature is of a higher nature than the unreasonable, in so much higher degree and measure is it destined to exalt God's glory. So then the Gloria in Excelsis of the heavenly hosts is a praise of God many thousand times more glorious than the praise of the firmament and all the glory of lilies. And yet, if a Solomon wanted to fulfill his highest purpose of existence with adornment and splendor, instead of with Solomon's wisdom, the flowers of the field would do it before him. Yes, we human beings also correspond to our highest purpose in the measure in which we are just what we are supposed to be according to God's will, and do or refrain from doing what we are supposed to do or refrain from doing according to God's will. This is true of men and women, of children and aged, of masters and servants, of teachers and pupils; it is also true of theologians. Let none of them seek to increase the glory of God in ways of his own choosing, by means of his own devising, where God has shown him the ways and given him the means; And if any one thinks that he must come to the aid of new measures or do the best he can because God's means and ways do not lead to the end in the desired way or to the proper degree, he is so far from fulfilling his purpose in a higher degree that he deserves rather, having become unfaithful to it, to be put out of office, like the unjust steward in the Gospel, apart from the fact that resorting to means and measures of one's own choice commonly already finds its expression in this.

The reason is that one also wants to be something and is intent on one's own honor. It is no longer unheard of that, where people, anxious for their own honor and to make a name for themselves, build theological towers to dizzy heights, the builders, in their own interest, also get into trouble, and things soon become Babylonian, until they shout at each other in an uncanny confusion of language, and no one understands the other, and some hardly understand their own jargon.

In the history of the Reformation we have an example of how, in the building of the church, God's glory is enhanced according to God's will only where and to the extent that one builds according to God's plan and measure and guideline, whereas where and to the extent that one constructs according to one's own thoughts, one only destroys, disrupts God's glory and harms oneself. "Fear God and give him glory!" was to be the keynote of the voice of the promised angel with the eternal gospel; the work that was to be done by him was to be to God's glory. But to the end it had to be directed as God had provided it, not by army and armour, as Hutten and Sickingen thought and wished; not by swarm-spirituality and iconoclasm, as Carlstadt and the heavenly prophets wanted; not by humanistic beaurocracy of a fine and coarse kind, as in Erasmus's praise of stupidity and the letters of the dark men; not by a theology in which Frau Hulda, the clever reason, was enthroned beside and above the Scriptural Word, as with Zwingli and his: but by the word which "our Lord and Master Christ speaketh," by the simple, plain doctrine of the Gospel of the "glory and grace of God," the word which Luther preached in speech and writing, and by which alone he willed to work, and let God work, what was to be worked. And while Erasmus and Carlstadt and Münzer and Zwingli and Hütten and Sickingen and the scorching and burning peasants, in so far as they went to the field as self-made reformers with means and measures of their own devising and not according to God's mind and counsel, not only came to disgrace and harm themselves, but also did harm to the glory of God, Luther, the reformer after God's own heart, the repugnant who deliberately robs God of His glory, has inflicted the incurable wound and, on the other hand, has re-established a theology and church that carries the *Soli Deo Gloria* on all its war and victory spars through the lands and times.

That the theologian as such is eminently called to live and work for God's glory, no one of understanding will deny. But it is equally true of the theologian in an eminent sense that as a theologian he will fulfill his highest purpose only in the measure in which he is in truth a theologian and does the work of a theologian, and what a theologian and a theologian's work is to God's honor, the theologian has no more than the sparrow on the roof has its sparrow nature.

The theologian who wants to construct a theology out of the depths of his consciousness has rather been determined by God Himself, Whose glory he is to seek. Whoever wants to be a theologian and do theology in any other way misses his prescribed purpose as surely and much more thoroughly than the bird in the sky when it sows and reaps, or the lily in the field when it wants to spin. He who substitutes for theology a scientific system, a doctrinal edifice developed from a principle of completeness and uniformity of content, a science that elevates itself to an end, misses his purpose as a theologian. Theology is not a product or result of systematic development from a principle, but rather, in concrete terms, the ability of God to recognize, teach, and defend divine truth, or, in abstract terms, the totality of divine truths that have been fully and completely laid down in the Word of Scripture, and that have been drawn from Scripture in all their parts and compiled, and that do not need or are not capable of being developed and educated by men. Only he who, by virtue of such a theology, is a theologian, gives to God the glory which he desires to have in regard to theology, that he, and he alone, is the teacher who guides into all truth. Only the theologian who fully acknowledges that no one knows what is in God except the Spirit of God, and who knows and speaks of the hidden and secret wisdom of God only as much as God has revealed, and who is content to know piecemeal and to prophesy piecemeal because God has enabled him to know and prophesy only piecemeal, gives to God as a theologian the glory that is his due. Yes, just as the right theologian gives glory to God alone with what he says and sets forth, and says: "The Lord has said it," so he also inscribes a *Soli Deo Gloria* in the God-ordained gaps of fine theology with the confession that he knows nothing here because God has told him nothing. A theology, on the other hand, which swings itself in self-conceit beside and above God, and fills the gaps out of its own, usurps the honor of God, which is due to God alone, and does a deep fall, as Eve fell, because she wanted to be like God, and ate of the tree of knowledge, since God had said, "Ye shall not eat of it."

That such a theology, with its speculations, does not fulfill the purpose of sound theology, but is detrimental to the glory of God, is also evident from the material with which it seeks to fill the depths of the divine mysteries, even in obvious contradiction to what God has spoken. A subordination theology constructs into the mystery of the Holy Trinity a Logos who is not true, because he is not God in the highest sense; a kenotic theology constructs into the mystery of the person of Christ a divinity of Jesus that is no longer of divine essence, because it no longer has divine attributes; a Calvinistic theology constructs into the mystery of the Holy Trinity a divinity that is no longer of divine essence, because it no longer has divine attributes.

Election an election that is no longer an election of grace and only an election of grace, not an election in Christ; a synergistic theology into the mystery of conversion a conversion that is no longer a pure miraculous work of God, a resurrection from spiritual death; a hylozoistic or pantheistic or materialistic theology into the mystery of the world, a divinity which is not God, because it is not personal; a critical theology into the mystery of revelation, a word of God which is not God's word and truth; a speculative theodicy into the mystery of providence, a divinity without divine power, incompatible with divine justice. Thus the ultra Scripturam sapere, on its self-chosen paths, also strikes out as contra Scripturam sapere to God's dishonor, fulfills the theology that, as a servant according to the instruction given to it by God, should work what God wants to have worked through it, where it sets for itself new directives and rules contrary to the divine instruction and thus makes itself a mistress on its own authority, Not only does the glorious task set before it not resound where it becomes audible, not only does it not sound as a Gloria in Excelsis Deo from a sanctuary consecrated to God, but its speech turns into the opposite and sets up temples, since, according to a new gospel, God is degraded and the creature is elevated to a usurped throne. Verily, if such a theology, which speaks where God wills that it should be silent, which masters God's word and punishes lies, makes the Son of God an idol, deprives the world of its Saviour, snatches God's scepter of grace out of his hand, puts man's blessedness into his own hand, if a theology, in so far as it bears such fruit, corresponds to the highest purpose of theology, then the devil is the greatest theologian since he said in Paradise, "Yea, should God have said?" and in the wilderness to the Son of God, "These things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Should we, considering what we live and are for, well lust after a theology worthy of the devil in hell? No, it remains what the Psalmist says Ps. 48:11: "Lord, as thy name, so is thy glory unto the end of the earth." God's name, however, is the manifestation of what God is, especially what he wants to be to us men, especially to his believers, and as what we are to know and acknowledge him. As God has revealed Himself to us, so He also desires to be glorified by us; he who so honors Him, honors Him worthily. He that honoureth him not is vain, as the Lord saith: xxxxx xxxxxxxx xx, in vain do they revere me, because they teach such doctrines as are the commandments of men. Matth. 15, 9. Marc. 7, 7. All theological scholarship, which in theory or practice leads away from the Scriptures as the book of divine revelation, is vain to the same degree and bears the name of theology unjustly, and its labor and work is in vain, even there and just there, where it is so very zealous.

seems to preserve and save God's glory, as is well known to be peculiar to subordinationism and kenosis, to Calvinism and synergism and modern criticism, and to the whole *ψευδώνυμος γνώσις* which poses as theology. That such a theology is also vain in another sense, pleasing itself in its pomp and finery, especially in the peacock's breach of so-called scientificity, and looking down genteelly on a plain simple-minded theology of Scripture with wrinkled noses and downturned corners of the mouth, is easily intelligible. She must honor someone, and since she does not honor God, how will she honor his handmaiden, the theology after his own heart? So she will honor herself and those who build her temple. God only grant that we may never allow ourselves to be impressed by such vanity, but remain simple and simple-minded, as by God's grace hitherto, persevering in his truth, and let this be our theology; Then also in the future, as far as God gives us grace, we shall contribute to the accomplishment of that for which God has given theology, the praise of his glory, especially of his glorious grace, by which he has made us acceptable in the Beloved, by which also we have come to inheritance, who were ordained beforehand according to the purpose of him who works all things according to the counsel of his will, that we may be something to the praise of his glory. A. G.

(Submitted.)

The meaning of the resurrection of JEsu Christ.

"As it was said before concerning the passion and death and other articles of Christ, that there are two ways of looking at them, so also concerning the resurrection of the Lord there are two ways of knowing and fasting. First, the history, which shows how the events of history took place, with all manner of circumstances, and how he manifested himself alive by various manifestations; that we may have a certain record and testimony of the same, for the ground and strengthening of our faith. . . The other part, which is the most important and necessary, and for the sake of which the history is also done and preached, is about the power and benefit and comfort of the joyful resurrection of the Lord, and how one should use it by faith," Luther once wrote in an Easter sermon. 1 The "history" of the resurrection, how "one has certain documents and testimony of it," was spoken of in the last volume of this periodical (p. 33 ff.); it therefore remains for us now to speak "of the power and benefit and consolation of the joyful resurrection of the Lord," or of the meaning of it for our faith.

1) St. L. vol. XI, col. 632.

and our lives. And the article about the resurrection of Christ is a very important article. The resurrection of Christ has a very eminent meaning for our whole Christianity. The whole of Christianity stands and falls with this fact, that Jesus Christ has risen, and risen bodily.

Of course, on the side of the opponents, one likes to deny this great importance of the resurrection of Christ. Especially in recent times liberal theology has denied the importance of this fact for our faith in the controversy over the Apostolicum. It is not a question of whether Jesus has risen bodily or not, but only that he lives, lives on spiritually, and works with his spirit, lives in his work, in his church. "For the disciples of Jesus, who did not recognize the role played by Jesus of Nazareth to the extent that we do, it may have taken outward signs to convince them of the conquest of death and the reconciliation between God and man through Christ; For us, who readily infer and take for granted the survival of Christ's personal spirit from his human perfection, those signs have lost all value and meaning; for us it is most indifferent whether the resurrection and ascension of Christ, as reported by the apostles, are based on real events, or on imaginary fancies of the disciples of Jesus, or even on deliberate deception. All this must not touch us today, for that Jesus Christ lives is certain for us, not because the disciples tell us of His resurrection, but because, according to the conception we have of the person of Jesus Christ and of His mission, it cannot be otherwise." 1) - If, like the Ritschlians, Jesus is regarded as a mere man, to whom the church gives the predicate of deity, because he is for us the image of the invisible God, but who is by no means essentially and naturally God, then it makes no difference whether Christ has risen or not, but then it is also quite indifferent whether Jesus lived at all or not, for then the whole of biblical Christianity falls away. Our whole Christian faith rests on Jesus Christ, who is "truly God, born of the Father in eternity, and truly man, born of the Virgin Mary. The Christian religion is really the religion of facts, of the great saving deeds of God, done in Christ Jesus for the lost world of sin. The sad fact of sin, the loss of all men to death and damnation, and the blessed fact of the perfect redemption of the whole world, wrought by his grace, are the two pivotal points around which everything revolves. And our redemption stands entirely on

2) "The New Church," i. 1. p. 13.

the person and work of the God-Man. His person and his work, what he did and suffered for us, are at the center of all Christianity. He is the precious stone chosen by God, which the builders once rejected, but which, through God's grace, has become the cornerstone on which the whole church stands, on which the whole congregation builds itself into a holy temple in the Lord. If one takes away the person and the work of this God-man, then nothing remains of Christianity. And just as Christ's person and work stand at the center of all Christianity, so again for Christ's person and work His resurrection is of decisive importance. It is precisely in his resurrection that it must be decided in the last analysis whether Christ is really the Son of God and our Saviour and Redeemer. Thus our whole faith and hope stands and falls with Christ's resurrection. For this reason, more profound opponents have recognized and expressed the importance of Christ's resurrection and the importance of the struggle for it. Thus, for example, the well-known Strauss says: "The resurrection of Jesus forms the central point, the very heart of Christianity hitherto, and therefore from time immemorial the sharpest bullets of the opponents have been aimed at it above all." 1) "Here we stand at the decisive point where we must either retract all that has gone before and abandon our whole enterprise, or make an effort to bring the origin of faith in the resurrection of Jesus to understanding without a corresponding miraculous fact." 2)

Also the holy scripture points out the great importance of the resurrection of Christ for our faith. Let us only think of that well-known passage 1 Cor. 15, 14-19. This is how things stand. If Christ is not risen, we must give up the reality of His bodily resurrection, then our preaching is in vain and our faith is vain, without real content, without power, then the apostles are false witnesses, at best blind enthusiasts who have deceived themselves, on whose word we can never build our faith and our salvation, then there is no redemption from our sins, no hope after death, and it would be better for us to abandon faith and Christianity and live according to the principles: "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall be dead," and with death all is over. With the resurrection of Christ all falls away. Again and again, therefore, the apostles, in their sermons and epistles, return to painting before the eyes of Christians Jesus Christ crucified and risen. And it is on His resurrection that they lay the chief emphasis when they exhort and comfort the Christians. "Who will ver-

- 1) "Die Halben und die Ganzen" p. 125, citirt Steinmeyer Auferstehungsgesch. S. 1.
- 2) Life of Jesus p. 288. Citirt ibid. p. 2.

dim," says the apostle, Rom. 8, 34. "Christ is here, who died, yea rather, who also is risen." When the apostle exhorts his spiritual son Timothy, 2 Tim. 2, 8. "Hold in remembrance Jesus Christ," he adds, "Who is risen from the dead." Thus everywhere in Scripture the resurrection of Christ comes to the fore. Among the teachers of the Church it is especially Luther who drives this article over and over again. He cannot, as it were, find words enough to emphasize this article, to show how important it is that Christians also hear, believe, and take to heart this very article of Christ's resurrection. Only two brief sayings of Luther's may be quoted here: "Because this article of the resurrection is the noblest, on which at last stands our salvation and blessedness, without which the others would all be vain and without all fruit." 1) "The words, Christ risen from the dead, are well to be remembered and written with large letters, that one letter may be as great as the tower, yea, as heaven and earth, that we may see, hear, think, nor know any thing else, but this article." 2)

It is certain, then, that the resurrection of Christ is of the greatest importance for our faith. The question now arises as to what this great significance consists of, and what significance does Scripture ascribe to this salvation of God?

When we speak here of the significance of the resurrection of Christ, we mean it, of course, in relation to us human beings. The Lord did not rise from the dead for his own sake. The Lord, eternal life itself, could not remain in death, "since it was impossible that he should be held by it (death)," so Peter says in his Pentecost sermon. But if the Lord had risen from the dead chiefly for his own sake, he could have taken up his life again, and returned to his heavenly Father in glory, without any one suspecting or knowing it; no, it was for us, for our sake, for our good chiefly, that he came forth from his grave, and showed himself alive to his disciples; it is for us that this saving act of God has such decisive meaning. Thus the apostle says that Christ died and rose again for them, for men, 2 Cor. 5:15. This is the question: What is the significance of Christ's resurrection for us, for our faith, for our life, for our hope?

In that well-known classic passage of Christ's resurrection, 1 Cor. 15:17, the apostle indicates, if we may so speak, the meaning of Christ's resurrection negatively. He describes in brief outlines how miserable we Christians would be if Christ had not risen. And in this lies at the same time also the positive, how happy, how blessed we would be

- 1) St. L. vol. XI, col. 632. § 2.
- 2) W. Vol. XIII, Col. 1089.

Christians have become through Christ's resurrection. Three things are the case, says the apostle, if Christ were not risen, then our faith would be vain, then we would still be in our sins, then those who have fallen asleep in Christ would be lost. From this follows this: Since Christ is certainly and truly risen, our faith is not vain, but has the right substance; we are no longer in our sins, but are redeemed from our sins; our dead are not lost, but have hope beyond death and the grave. Christ's resurrection therefore has a threefold meaning for us. 001 It makes us sure of our faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour and Redeemer. 002 It makes us sure of our redemption from sin, and gives us power to come out of sin. 3. it makes us sure of our future resurrection and eternal life, and thus gives us a living hope.

The resurrection of Christ makes us sure that our faith in Jesus Christ is not vain. "But if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain" (*ματαιά ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν*), says the apostle 1 Cor. 15:17. and a few verses before, "If Christ be not risen, your faith is vain" *ἡ -ίσης ὑμῶν*). *Κσν*[^] and *ματαιά*, according to the apostle's statement, would be our faith in Christ, if the HErr had not risen. means: empty, without right real content, *μάτ*_α, *ως* means: vain, without inner truth, and therefore: vain, without fruit, without power and effect. Faith has for its object Christ alone, the crucified and risen; if Christ is not risen, then faith becomes without object, it is without right content, and therefore also vain, without truth, a self-deception, a faith which brings no salvation and no justification. It would be foolish to hold on to such faith. For how would things stand if Christ had not risen? Then we would believe in a mere man who had died and remained in death, and our faith would have no power to overcome sin, the world, and death. The resurrection of Christ gives our faith in Christ the right content and the right power, for it gives us the certainty that this Jesus of Nazareth, in whom we believe, is both the true Son of God and the true, prophesied Messiah.

That Christ's resurrection makes us sure that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the true God Himself, is what the apostle Paul says Rom. 1, 4. The whole passage reads in connection thus, "Paul, a servant of JESUS Christ, called an apostle, set apart unto the gospel of GOD, which he preached before in the holy scriptures, of his Son, born of the seed of David according to the flesh, declared to be the Son of GOD in power according to the Spirit of holiness from the resurrection of the dead, of JESUS CHRIST our LORD," etc.

"Ὁ ὁρυσ^ς υἱός >θεοῦ, so the apostle calls the HErrn in this place. means: to limit, to determine, but then also: to declare, to prove. He is declared, proved, certified by God to be the Son of God, and indeed δυνάμει this is now done: in power, with might, powerfully before of all the world, Κατὰ -νεύμα ἀγιωσύνης, the apostle goes on to say, "according to the. Spirit of holiness". Some commentators understand by this expression the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead. But already the preceding *κατὰ σάρκα*, which denotes the human nature of Christ, does not well admit of this. *Πνεῦμα* is here omen essentiae. The whole expression denotes the sacred, divine nature of Christ. The Apostle means to say, Christ is the Son of God according to His holy divine nature, and as such He is powerfully proved, before the whole world, and that "from the resurrection from the dead." Hereby the apostle says, whereby Christ was proved and declared to be the Son of God, from and by his resurrection from the dead. In this *ἵχ* is not only the time from which, but in it is also the means by which Christ is declared and proved to be the Son of God. Bengel rightly says in his Gnomon: *ἵχ non modo tempus, sed nexum rerum denotat.*"

Since His resurrection, and through it, Jesus Christ has been powerfully proved to be the Son of God.

But we must pay special attention to the fact that the apostle says that Christ was proven and declared to be the Son of God through his resurrection, and that strongly. This is by no means the apostle's opinion, as if one could not have come to the conclusion that Jesus was the Son of God before his resurrection, or even that Christ only came to sonship with God, to full unity with God, through his resurrection. Christ is the Son of God, true God, in the fullest and most real sense, even at his conception and birth; he did not lay aside his divinity when he became man, and he remained God in the whole state of his humiliation, even in the state of death. "I and the Father are one," says the Lord of himself, in his very lowliness. But as long as the Lord lived here in the flesh, he did not show his divinity so clearly; he did not always and fully use his divine majesty. At His resurrection, and through the same, it is now powerfully, mightily revealed and proved before all the world, that JEsus is the Son of the living God, and still more shall it be made manifest in that great day of judgment, when all tongues must confess that JEsus Christ is the Lord, to the glory of God the Father. "According to the flesh he began, but according to the Spirit he was for ever, though it was not clearly discerned before (for it was not of necessity that we should make him a God, but only that we should declare and understand that he was the Son of God...). In the Old Testament Christ

Likewise, at the time when he was here on earth in the flesh, it was known to few people; it was kept secret until his resurrection and ascension, when it was to be revealed and transfigured," Luther says. 1)

This is what the Scripture says, that the Lord Jesus is proved to be the Son of God, the true God, by his resurrection. But how does the resurrection prove that Christ is the Son of God? In two ways.

When we look at the passages of Scripture that testify to Christ's resurrection and explain its importance and significance for our faith and our lives, we see that Scripture speaks of Christ's resurrection in two ways. On the one hand it tells us that Christ was raised from the dead by God, and on the other hand it tells us that He was raised by Himself. Both expressions are found: Christ is raised, and he is risen. And we must also hold both. Christ is raised "by the glory of the Father," as the apostle says, and yet again, Christ is raised by his own power, in the power of his Godhead. "I have power to lay it (my life) down, and have power to take it again," says Christ himself Joh. 10, 18. And to the Jews he cries, "Break this temple, and the third day I will raise it up again." Joh. 2, 19. And this is by no means a contradiction, when on the one hand it is said that Christ is raised by the glory of the Father, and on the other hand it is said again that He Himself is raised by His own power and authority. The Lord Christ once said to the Jews, John 5:19: "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he beholdeth the Father do. For what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son." And v. 21: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; so also the Son quickeneth whom he will." In the Father raising up His Son, the Son rises in His own divine power. The Father and the Son have one and the same divine essence in number, they have one and the same divine power through which they work.

But it is by no means idle and futile that the Scriptures speak of Christ's resurrection in one way and in another. Both statements of Scripture need to be considered carefully when it comes to the meaning of the resurrection. Each of these two statements has its own special purpose, and shows us the importance of the Lord's resurrection from a different point of view.

God the Father raised Jesus of Nazareth from death. He has lifted up the deeply humbled one and with that he has confessed this JEsu, with that he has justified him before all the world, with that God has, as it were, raised his

1) Citirt Eberle Letter to the Romans, p. 11.

Divine seal pressed upon all that Christ said and did. But before his death Jesus had said of himself that he was the Son of God, in the true sense of the word, that he was like the Father, that whoever saw him saw the Father, that he did the same works as the Father, that he had been from eternity, and the like. Yes, just because he had testified of himself these things, which the Jews declared to be blasphemy, he was accused by the high council and condemned to death. As an alleged blasphemer who had falsely made himself the Son of God and claimed to be so, he had suffered the death of one who had been banished and cursed by God on the trunk of the cross. Now if Christ had remained in death and the grave, if God had not confessed Himself to Him and had not raised Him up again, then we should certainly be mistaken about Christ's person, then we should have to suppose that all those statements of Christ about His person were false, that the Jews had been right to put Him to death according to their law. But now God has raised up this JEsu, he has confessed him and his cause, so it follows with incontrovertible certainty that all that Christ has said of himself is true, that he is the Son of God, the true, eternal God himself. Or is it not altogether inconceivable that, if the enemies of the Lord were right, if Jesus was justly condemned and executed as a blasphemer who falsely claimed to be the Son of God, that God should have raised up this Jesus and declared His cause? The very raising up of Christ by the glory of the Father, by a glorious direct intervention of God, proves to us that the accusation of the Jews was false, that this JEsu of Nazareth swore to the truth, since, in answer to the question of the high priest: "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God," He answered, "Thou sayest it, but I say unto you, From henceforth it shall come to pass, that ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Matth. 26, 63. 64. - Again and again, therefore, in their first sermons after Christ's resurrection, the apostles also point out how God justified this JEsu by raising him from the dead, and thereby publicly confessed his person and cause. Again and again in their sermons before the high council and the people of the Jews this contrast is found: You killed him and hanged him on a tree, but God raised him up again. Ye rejected him, but God exalted him: ye treated him as a malefactor; God made him a Lord and a Christian. Cf. Apost. 2, 23. 24. 3, 15. 4, 10. 5, 30. 31. 10, 39. 40. 13, 29. 30.

But the Scripture not only says that God the Father raised Jesus from the dead, but it also testifies just as clearly that the Lord rose from the dead by his own power. But if Christ rose from the dead by his own power, then

through this very act he proved himself to be the Son of God, the true God. To conquer death, which came into the world through sin and therefore reached all men, because they all sinned, to conquer death, which rules over all flesh, to conquer and overcome this death, to voluntarily give oneself into its power and voluntarily throw off its bonds, is something no creature can do; it requires more than created power. He who overcomes death by his own power, who himself opens the gates of the grave, must be the true God and eternal life. This Jesus of Nazareth is the true God, and so it was impossible for death to hold him. Apost. 2, 24. "He who is eternal life itself, the resurrection and the life, the fountain of life to all those who believe in him, the bread of life that comes down from heaven and gives life to the world, who gives living water that quenches all thirst and springs up into eternal life, cannot remain in death. He must burst the gates of the grave, and pass through into that life which henceforth can sink no more into death." 1) By his resurrection Christ is powerfully proved to be a Son of God.

The resurrection of Christ makes us certain that Jesus is the Son of God, but it also makes us certain that Jesus is the Messiah and Christ prophesied by the prophets and sent by God. The apostle Peter closes his glorious Pentecostal sermon with these words, "Know ye therefore all the house of Israel assuredly, that God hath made this JEsu, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ." Apost. 2, 26. The whole house of Israel, according to the request of the apostle, should know and be sure that God has made this Jesus of Nazareth a Lord and a Christian. The whole nation of Israel should acknowledge and accept this JEsu as their Saviour and Messiah. And whereupon does the apostle make this demand? Whereupon Peter demands of the Jews that they overturn their judgment, that they should now acknowledge him, whom they had crucified a few weeks ago as an abuser and blasphemer, as the Lord, the Christ, as their prophesied and God-sent Messiah? By the little word "now" (xxuv, therefore, thus) the apostle connects these words with what precedes. Previously Peter had spoken of the resurrection and ascension of JEsu, had proved that the resurrection and ascension of the Messiah was already prophesied in the Old Testament, and then he continues, "Know therefore, therefore," etc. Because God has raised up this Jesus of Nazareth, as was prophesied of the Messiah in the Old Testament, therefore let the whole house of Israel change their judgment, therefore let the whole house of Israel acknowledge this Jesus as their true Messiah.

1) Greiner Auferstehung JEsu Christi, p. 284.

His resurrection therefore makes us certain that Jesus is the true, prophesied Messiah and Christ.

If Jesus of Nazareth is the true Messiah sent by God, then all the prophecies of the Old Testament must have been fulfilled in him. If only one prophecy had not been fulfilled, then this Jesus could not be the prophesied Messiah. But if all the prophecies of the prophets concerning the Messiah have been fulfilled in his person, then we have proof that Jesus is the Christ, the prophesied Messiah. Now in the Old Testament it is prophesied of the Messiah not only that he would humble himself and suffer and die, but also that after his humiliation he would be exalted again, and after his death he would rise again and enter into a new and eternal life. The apostle Paul says 1 Cor. 15: "I gave it to you first of all, which also I received, . . . that Christ should rise again the third day according to the scriptures." According to the Scriptures, that is, according to the Old Testament Scriptures, as promised in the Old Testament, Christ rose again. When, after His resurrection, the Lord, as an unknown wayfarer, joined those two mourning disciples on the road to Emmaus, He laid before them all the scriptures of Moses and all the prophets which were spoken of Him, and showed them from these scriptures that the Messiah must suffer and enter into His glory. Nebe very aptly remarks on this passage: "The exegesis of the Old Testament, which recognizes in it no direct prophecies concerning Christ, certainly no definite proclamations of His innocent suffering and death, and thereby mediated entrance into glory, has lost all right in the Christian Church to this proceeding of Christ, who is the right hermeneutist." The apostle Peter, at last, in his first epistle (1:11.), says, that "the Spirit of Christ, which was in them (the prophets), testified beforehand of the sufferings which are in Christ, and of the glory that follows."

What are the prophecies that mainly deal with the resurrection of Christ? The main passage is undoubtedly Ps. 16, vv. 9-11: "Therefore my heart will rejoice, and my honor (that is, my tongue) will be glad, and my flesh will be safe. Thou wilt not abandon my soul to Sheol, nor wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou makest known unto me the way of life; Fullness of joy is before thy face, Lovely things at thy right hand for ever." He who speaks in this Psalm says that he rejoices that his tongue is glad and ready to praise God, to spread God's glory, for, though he must go to death, yet God will not abandon his soul to Sheol, to the state of death.

1) Resurrection History, p. 165.

God will not allow him, his saint, to see decay. God would rather make known to him a way of life, a way to new life, God would raise him to new life, and then he would ascend to the right hand of God and there have joy in abundance and a sweet life forever. That he who here with such clear words expresses the certainty that he will indeed die, but will not remain in death, will not see decay, but that God will raise him up again, is none other than the Messiah, that there is here a Messianic prophecy, and that this prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, is told us by inspiration of the Holy Spirit by Peter in the well-known passage of his glorious Pentecost sermon, Acts 2:25 ff. 2, 25. ff. Peter clearly proves to the Jews that David could not be the one speaking in this Psalm, for he had died and remained in the grave, and his grave was with them to this day; with him this hope of the resurrection had not become truth. David rather spoke these words as a prophet of the Messiah, and according to this prophecy God raised up Jesus of Nazareth and proved him to be the true Messiah. Likewise Paul interprets these words of the 16th Psalm in his speech to the Jews at Antioch in Pisidia, Apost. 13, 35-37.

Another well-known prophecy of Christ's suffering and resurrection is found in the wonderful 53rd chapter of the prophet Isaiah. Already the heading of this prophecy, Cap. 52, 13, indicates the content of the whole prophecy: "Behold, my servant shall do wisely, and shall be exalted, and lifted up on high. My servant, the Messiah, will act wisely, he will be completely obedient to the will of his heavenly Father until death, he will humble himself in obedience to God until death on the cross for the sins of the people. Therefore God also will exalt him. "He shall be exalted; high and very exalted shall he be." Our ancients find expressed in these three expressions the whole state of Christ's exaltation, XXXX being the resurrectio, XXX the exaltatio, XXX XXX the sessio ad dextram Patris. The eighth verse of the prophecy points to the death of Christ. Verse 9. then deals with his burial. "He was appointed his grave with the wicked, but with a rich man he was in his death, although (or because) he had done no wrong, and there was no deceit in his mouth." The meaning is this, as given by Hengstenberg 1): "Not satisfied with his suffering and with his death, they thought to insult him, the innocent and just, still in death, by burying his body with criminals. It is then casually remarked that this intention was not accomplished. Christ was buried by Joseph

1) op. cit., p. 345.

Of Arimathia buried, who as here XXXX, so Match. 27, 57. αν^ρωπος πλούσιος is called." In the tenth verse the proclamation takes up of the glory of the servant of God. According to Hengstenberg's translation, it reads: "But it pleased Jehovah to crush him; he made him sick. When he hath offered a trespass offering, he shall see offspring, shall live long, and God's purpose shall pass away by him." After his death, when he has offered his life for a trespass offering, the Messiah shall see seed, that is, descendants, a great multitude of those who cling to him in faith, he shall live long, shall not abide in death or the grave, but shall rise again and live long, that is, forever. Death has no more power over him. The Lord's purpose and will and work shall continue by his hand. He is who, as king, rules his church, and leads it, according to God's will, towards perfection. In verses 11 and 12 it is said that the Messiah will see the fruits of his labor and take pleasure in them, that he will make many righteous through his knowledge, that is, through their recognizing him in faith as their Savior, that even the strong and mighty will fall prey to him as the reward of his atoning death, that he will intercede for the wicked and plead for them before God's throne. Everywhere, then, the thought that the Messiah will rise again and live and work as king of his kingdom of grace.

But that this whole prophecy, this whole 53rd chapter of the prophet Isaiah is about the Messiah, is a Messianic one, we can see not only from the whole content, but also from the numerous citations of this passage in the New Testament (cf. especially Apost. 8, 37. ff.); therefore this cannot be doubtful to him who still holds on to the divine inspiration of the New Testament. Luther therefore remarks on this passage: "And, of course, in all the Scriptures of the Old Testament there is no clearer text or prophecy of the passion and resurrection of Jesus Christ than in this chapter. Therefore it ought to be well known to all Christians, and they ought to know it by heart, in order to strengthen and defend our faith, especially against the stiff-necked Jews, who deny their one promised Messiah, solely for the sake of the astonishment of his cross."

Another prophecy is found in Ps. 22, 23: "I will preach thy name unto my brethren," says the Messiah, after his suffering and death had been spoken of before. Luther remarks on this passage, "Quid hoc? mortuus vult narrare? Ergo includit ille versus resurrectionem." And so many more prophecies could be cited. Almost everywhere in the Old Testament where the suffering and death of the

1) Enarrationes in Psalmos XXV priores et sequentes aliquot. Opp. lat. Vol. XVII, p. 193.

Messiah is prophesied, it is also pointed to the following exaltation, to his resurrection and glory.

But the apostle says in the above mentioned passage of his first Epistle to the Corinthians not only that Jesus Christ is risen, but also that he is risen on the third day according to the scriptures. This too is prophesied in the Old Testament. The Lord Christ himself points us to such a prophecy. When once the scribes and Pharisees desired of the Lord a sign from heaven, that he was the Messiah, the Lord answered, "The wicked and adulterous kind seeketh a sign: and there shall no sign be given unto them, but the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the midst of the earth." Matth. 12, 39. 40. This circumstance, that the prophet Jonas was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, is a prophecy that Christ would be three days and three nights in the midst of the earth, that he would rest in the grave until the third day, and then rise again. The fulfillment of this prophecy was to be, as Jesus Himself said, the great sign by which men should know that He, Jesus of Nazareth, was the prophesied Messiah.

So we see that it is clearly prophesied in the Old Testament that the Messiah would suffer and die, but rise again and enter into His glory on the third day. Therefore, if Jesus had not risen on the third day, he could not be the true Messiah. But now the Lord has truly risen, and this prophecy has also been fulfilled in him, and so we are certain that Jesus is the Messiah and Saviour sent by God.

But even more. Through His resurrection the Lord proved Himself to be the true Messiah. It was also prophesied in the Old Testament that the Messiah would be the true prophet, the only high priest and the eternal king, and it was precisely as such that Jesus proved Himself through His resurrection, as prophet, high priest and king. - Christ is prophesied to be our right prophet. We need only recall the well-known prophecy of Moses, Deut. 18:15, that a prophet like Moses should be the Messiah, the founder and mediator of a new covenant of grace with God, a prophet who would proclaim God's word and will to us, and whom everyone should hear. And it was precisely through His resurrection that Christ proved that He was this prophet who was to come. During His earthly life the Lord proclaimed to His disciples as well as to His enemies, the people of the Jews, the chief priests, the scribes and the Pharisees, with clear and distinct words that He would suffer and die, but that He would also rise again on the third day. Yes, He had pointed to His future resurrection as the sign by which He would be known as the Son of God and the

Messiah would be revealed before all eyes. The opponents of the resurrection of Christ have not left these proclamations of the Lord unchallenged. They simply want to do away with them by declaring them to be *vaticinia post eventum*, prophecies which were only later put into the mouth of the Lord through legend and tradition. "So only after the success, is such foreknowledge as prediction attached to the resurrection of Jesus," says, e. g., Strauss in his "Life of Jesus" (Vol. II, p. 361.). As a reason and proof for his assertion he gives this, that if Jesus had foretold His resurrection in such clear words, the behavior of the disciples after His death, their deep dejection, would be quite inexplicable. Surely the disciples should have remembered these words of Jesus and taken comfort in them. But this does not follow at all. The disciples had not understood JESu's words about his suffering, death and resurrection. Marcus mentions explicitly, after JESus had proclaimed His death and resurrection to them in Galilee: "But they did not hear the word and were afraid to ask Him", 9, 32. All this was so different from the Jewish conceptions they had of the Messiah, that they could not grasp and understand it at all. And exactly what the Lord told them about His resurrection was incomprehensible to them. When the Lord, after His transfiguration, commanded the three disciples that they should say nothing of this event until He had risen from the dead, the disciples asked one another in amazement, "What is the rising from the dead?" Marc. 9, 10. So we cannot be at all surprised that when what was thought to be impossible really came to pass, when their Saviour suffered and died on the cross, the disciples in their deep sorrow, in their great consternation, no longer thought at all of Jesus' word, that even if a fleeting thought of this misunderstood word came to them, it could give them no comfort, no hope in the anguish of their souls. But though the disciples in those days had forgotten the prophecy of their Saviour, yet the enemies of the Lord remembered this prophecy of his very well. Their evil conscience reminded them of it. After the death of the Lord they came to Pilate and said: "Lord, we thought that this deceiver spoke while he was still alive: I will rise again after three days," Matt. 27:63. So they knew and considered the prophecy of Christ very well.

The Lord foretold his resurrection. But not only that, but the Lord also made such statements about his person and his work that he could not possibly remain in death and the grave if these statements were based on truth. He says that he is life, that he has life in himself, that he gives life, eternal life, to his own. "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He

given to the Son, to have life in Himself." Joh. 5, 26. "I am the resurrection and the life," Joh. 11, 25. "I live, and ye also shall live," Joh. 14, 19. "I am the way, the truth, and the life," Joh. 14, 6. and many such sayings more.

What would the situation have been if Jesus had not risen from the dead, but had remained in death and the grave? Then JESU's proclamations would not have been fulfilled, then the Lord would have spoken falsehoods about his person. Then the Lord could not be that great prophet of whom Moses speaks; he would be a false prophet, at best a man who had deceived himself about his person and his divine mission. Then the chief priests would have been right when they called him a "deceiver" before Pilato. Yes, then JESU's whole teaching would fall. For if we knew that the Lord had deceived and erred in this one, and moreover in so important a matter, which of his teachings could we then still believe, how could we then still hear him?

But now the Lord has certainly and truly risen. He spoke the truth when he said that he would rise again on the third day, and his prophecies came true. He spoke the truth when he testified of himself that he is the eternal, essential life. Thus the resurrection makes us certain that Jesus is the true prophet who proclaims God's word and will for us to hear.

It is also prophesied in the Old Testament that the true Messiah would be a priest. To cite just one passage, we read Ps. 110:4: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever after the manner of Melchisedec. An everlasting priest he was to be not after the manner of Aaron, not after the manner of the Jewish priesthood, but after the manner of Melchizedek, who was higher than Abraham, Levi, and Aaron. A greater priest was to be the Messiah than all the priests of the old covenant. As a priest he was to offer the right sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, to reconcile God and mankind. He was to give his life as a guilt offering, to bear and take away the sin of all men.

And that Jesus of Nazareth is this eternal priest, that through his suffering and death he offered the right sacrifice of guilt for all mankind, that all mankind is now reconciled to God, is just revealed through the resurrection of the Lord. We shall see in detail later that Christ's resurrection is the glorious proof of the validity of His sacrifice for the sins of the world. Without His resurrection Christ could not be the eternal High Priest, His suffering and death could not help us.

And finally it is prophesied in the Old Testament that the Messiah will be a king. There are a lot of such prophecies in the

Old Testament; one of the most glorious is probably the one David received, 2 Sam. 7, 12. ff. There the Messiah is portrayed as a great glorious king, whose kingdom and dominion shall remain forever, whose kingdom and power shall not only extend over one or more, but over all peoples and nations to the ends of the earth.

And just his resurrection gives us the proof that Jesus of Nazareth is this eternal king who rules over the whole world. If the Lord had not risen, then this prophecy would not have been fulfilled in his person, for in the state of his humiliation we do not yet see anything of his rule over the whole world; then he would not be an eternal king, but one who had died and remained in the grave, and whose rule and power would have ceased, as is the case with earthly kings. It is precisely through His resurrection that the Lord has taken up His royal rule, His dominion over His kingdom, over His church, which is now spreading under His leadership and guidance through all countries and peoples to the ends of the earth. Now the Lord shows himself as the eternal king, whose life and reign has no end.

So Christ's resurrection proves to us that Jesus of Nazareth is the great prophet, the only high priest, the eternal king, that he is the Messiah sent and prophesied by God; it proves to us that God has made this Jesus a Lord and a Christian.

"Now we need no more to cry with the Jews: Oh that Christ would come to gladden the people of God, For Messiah is already here, and salvation is near to all."

The resurrection of Christ proves both of these things, that Jesus is the true Son of God, born of the Father in eternity, and that he is the prophesied Messiah and Saviour of all men, and so our faith in him is not vain and empty, but has the right content and the right power. Now we believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God, the true God Himself, in Jesus Christ the Saviour, who bore and atoned for the sins of all men. Now our faith is the victory that overcame the world, and even sin, hell, the devil, and death, and continues to overcome them.

G. M. . . .r.

(To be continued.)

The position of Lutheran symbols in relation to Scripture - proof that our confession represents literal inspiration.

Modern theology, which acknowledges reason as its mother, not the Holy Scriptures, and knows of no higher honor, and has no greater desire than to be recognized as the equal of the sciences of reason, is similar to its sisters in the flesh, as in its nature, its characteristics, and in its whole manner, so also in its addiction to doubt and hypothesis. In her work of destruction, she is positively dripping with bold assumptions and assertions plucked out of thin air, which she gives off as just as many axioms and offers for sale as established truths on the theological market. In these, of course, history and logic only too often come off better than Scripture itself; and it also strikes the newer "scientific" theologians when Melancthon in the Apology writes of the Scholastics not only: "The Scholastici have mixed philosophy with Christian doctrine, teach contrary to Scripture, have followed the philosophers, are Aristotelian and not Christian," 80, 85, 88, 89, 151, but also when he says, "The Scholastics have mixed philosophy with Christian doctrine, teach contrary to Scripture, have followed the philosophers, are Aristotelian and not Christian. 89. 151, but also when, indignant at their perversion of Scripture, he exclaims: "Then everyone sees that our adversaries have not invested their money badly, since they have studied Dialecticam, for they may introduce the sayings of Scripture rhymed, unrhymed, finally, inconclusively, as they wish, and as they please," 222, or in another place: "Who has taught the gross impudent asses such dialectics? But it is not dialectica nor sophistica, but it is knavery, to play thus with God's word, and to exercise such despicable will," 189, and therefore pleads against such enemies of the Scriptures, "O Lord JESUS CHRIST! how long wilt thou suffer and endure such public reproach of thy holy gospel, when our enemies blaspheme thy word and truth?" 273.

The five articles which Dr. Luthardt published in numbers 28 to 32 of his "Allgemeine Evangelisch- Lutherische Kirchenzeitung" of last year with the heading: "Zur Frage von der heiligen Schrift" ("On the Question of Holy Scripture") also serve as examples of what has been said. In them, Scripture, the Lutheran Confession, and Luther, as well as logic, come off equally badly. What Luthardt puts forward, especially in the second of his articles, concerning Luther's "free" position in the doctrine of inspiration, has already been duly denounced in the "Evangelical Lutheran Free Church," 22. 24, as an untruth and gross distortion of Luther's statements. *) We would only like to remark that the passage to which Luthardt, who does not quote literally, also does not give volume and page number in Luther

*) See also in "Lehre und Wehre" the December number of the previous year, pages 358-363.

when he writes of Luther: "He judged just as impartially and freely about the writings of the Old Testament. The prophets studied in Moses and the later ones in the earlier ones and made whole sermons out of one word. Even if his word of 'wood, hay, and stubble', which was sometimes lost, is not to be understood, as is often thought, and as I also erroneously thought in the past, of the writings of the prophets themselves, but - only with somewhat imprecise linguistic expression - of their interpreters, they are not without fault in all details: "When they prophesied of Christ, they were not missing; but when they proclaimed of kings and worldly races, they were often missing," E. A. 8, 23, and 24. A. 8, 23. and 24. and thus reads: "Notice, however, that St. Paul here does not greatly esteem the prophecy which speaks of things to come, as in these last times there were of Lichtenberger, of Abbot Joachim, and the like. For such prophecies, though they are pleasing to the imagination, because they show how kings, princes, and other states of the world will fare, are unnecessary prophecies in the New Testament, for they neither teach nor improve the Christian faith. Therefore it is almost one of the least of God's gifts, and sometimes comes from the devil. But to interpret the Scriptures is the noblest, highest, and greatest gift of prophecy; for even all the prophets of the Old Testament are called prophets, because they prophesied of Christ, as St. Peter says, Act 3:18, and 1 Peter 3:18. 3:18, and 1 Pet. 1:10, and that they led the people in their time in the faith by the interpretation and understanding of the divine word, much more than that they sometimes preached from kings and worldly rulers, which they themselves also seldom prophesied, and oftentimes also filed. But that they prayed daily, and did not make a file of it, because faith feileth not, to which their prophesying was like." If Luthardt had considered this passage according to its wording, and had not allowed himself to be led by the blind desire to gain a testimony from Luther at all costs for his sad position on the sacred Scriptures, Luther and the Lutheran Church would have been spared this repeated slander, and Luthardt himself at least the repeated humiliation of a public retraction of his assertion; for that Luther does not speak of the canonical Scriptures in this passage is obvious.

Now what Luthardt says about Luther's "free" position on Scripture he introduces with four sentences in which he dismisses the whole question of what position the Lutheran symbols take on the inspiration of Scripture. His sayings are as follows: "Our ecclesiastical confession contains nothing on the question of inspiration. Scripture is to it the Word of God, the purest source and only norm and rule of beatific truth, as the Concordia formula says-that is all. About the

It contains nothing about the way in which inspiration is to be conceived, about the number and origin of the individual books of Scripture, or about their different values. This is the essential and necessary, this is left to theological investigation." This is as calm and apodictic as it is inconsistent and wrongly judged. The second proposition denies the first, the third does not coincide, as it should, with the first, which includes not only the how but also the that, while excluding other parts of the third proposition, the fourth thus remains indefinite and incomprehensible, and the whole is a nest of falsehoods and contradictions.

But what Luthardt actually wants to say with the above sentences, especially with his axiom: "Our ecclesiastical confession contains nothing about the question of inspiration", can easily be determined from the third of his articles. Briefly summarized, it is something like this: The symbols do not decide the question whether Scripture is really inspired, God-breathed, or not; do not decide whether the actual author of Scripture is God the Holy Spirit, or the holy writers; do not decide the question whether Scripture is infallible in all things, or merely in the exposition of the doctrine of salvation; Finally, they do not decide whether or not the Scriptures contain errors, especially in historical, chronological, and topographical matters, and in the mention of names, as a result of ignorance, carelessness, forgetfulness, and lapses of memory on the part of the writers.

May these omissions of Luthardt, who unfortunately speaks in the name of many, be an inducement to us to consider the position of our symbols in relation to Holy Scripture on the basis of the decisive statements of the same, and especially to consider what results from the same for the doctrine of inspiration.

As far as the Augsburg Confession was concerned, according to its preface, it was handed over to Charles V in order to give public testimony of "what and in what way they - the Lutheran preachers and teachers - preach, teach, hold and teach in our - Lutheran - lands, principalities, dominions, cities and territories on the basis of divine holy Scripture, *ex scripturis sanctis et puro verbo Dei*. (36) In accordance with the imperial decree, the confessors in Augsburg declared themselves ready to do everything to settle the discord, but "*omnia ad veritatem Dei*, according to divine truth. 36 When un

As a necessary precondition for ecclesiastical unity, Art. VII of the Confession requires no more, but also no less, than "that the gospel be preached with one accord according to a pure understanding, and that the sacraments be administered according to the divine word. (40) The Lutheran Witnesses do not wish to pass on to their children and descendants any other doctrine "than that which is according to the pure divine word and Christian truth. 40. Our church knows that

"This confession of ours - the Augustana - is divine and Christian," because it is "clearly founded in holy Scripture," and in the main Articles there is "no lack or deficiency" of decisive Scriptural statements. 47. (47) The Twenty-One Articles of Doctrine have proved this, "that the Articles of Faith are not taught in our churches contrary to holy Scripture. 48. article 28 wants that one should not follow the bishops "where they err, or teach or order something contrary to the holy divine Scripture. 64, 65: The purpose of the whole Augustana is "that it may be the more truly understood that nothing is accepted among us, either by doctrine or by ceremonies, which is contrary either to the holy Scriptures or to the common Christian churches. 69] "And if any man be found - with these words the confession concludes - wanting in these things, he is further required to report it on the ground of divine holy scripture. (70) The Romans, on the other hand, though they seek to cite sayings from Scripture as proofs of their doctrine, actually set tradition far above God's commandment, even "accepting no one until he has first taken an oath that he will not preach this doctrine, which is undoubtedly in accordance with the holy Gospel. 65, 55, 68. Finally, with the often quoted words on page 66: "If then the Holy Spirit has warned all this in vain, *num frustra haec praemonuit Spiritus Sanctus*," the Augustana confesses for the second time to the statement of the Nicene of the Holy Spirit: "Who has spoken through the prophets," and thus clearly indicates what it holds the Holy Scriptures and all the individual sayings of them to be, and why it recognizes them as the only, but also as the reliable source and standard of doctrine.

It is true that the Augustana appeals to the testimony of the church, of the old symbols, of the fathers, of its own experience, yes, of the opponents themselves, for its doctrine against the Romans; but the proof, which it accepts in all its articles as the last and finally only as binding on conscience, is for it the proof of Scripture. As in all the confessional writings of our church, so also in the Augustana it echoes again and again through all the articles: As Christ speaks, 40; as St. Paul says, 39; as then Christ himself indicates, 40; as John speaks, 41; the gospel teaches, 42; thus the Scripture speaks of faith, 46; for thus it is taught by faith, as Heb, 11.46; which also is the highest worship according to the Scriptures, 47; so then the same is clearly founded in the Scriptures, 47; for the cause that this is a clear commandment and commandment of Christ, 48; which the Scriptures clearly declare, 49; founded on the divine word, 50; which the Scriptures show in many places, 52; so Paul teaches, 52; for thus it is written to the Hebrews, 52; as may be proved from St. Paul, 53; the gospel compels, 56;

testimonia ex scriptura adsunt, 56; according to this saying of Christ, 64; but one has bright sayings of the divine Scripture, 66; why then does the divine Scripture bebeit, 66; for the holy Scripture hath taken away the Sabbath, 67.

Thus, it is the sayings of Scripture, according to their meaning in context, that our first particular confession cites as evidence for its doctrine. And as with the proofs of truth, so the Augustana also holds with the refutation of the opposing heresies. Here, too, our Confession spurns not only nothing that it can produce as worthy proof from history or experience, but also no argument from logic when it is necessary to lead the opponent to absurdity (which, of course, is more often the case in the Apology), but here, too, Scripture, Scripture alone, is decisive. Monastic vows are contrary to the gospel. (42) Scripture is not to be used to prove that one calls upon the saints. (47) Calling on saints is done without some consistent ground of divine commandment or Scripture. 47. one form is contrary to the institution of Christ. 49) The commandments of men are contrary to the gospel. 57. Why then doth the divine Scripture so often bend to make human essays? 66.

We will refrain for the time being from discussing the implications of these statements of the Augustana for the doctrine of inspiration. It should only be pointed out here that it emerges irrefutably from the statements cited that the Augsburg Confession sees in the holy Scriptures the pure, infallible source from which alone it can, will, and should draw what Christian doctrine of faith is; that Scripture alone is for it the infallible touchstone by which it must judge all doctrines and teachers; that the Confession recognizes only the testimony of Scripture as the final, only compelling proof of the truth of its doctrine; that all contradiction must fall silent before the verdict of Scripture; and finally, that the Lutheran confessors were divinely certain of their doctrine and their salvation, and that, in the final analysis, this was solely because they had the clear word of Scripture for themselves.

It is therefore also wrong and basically means nothing less than to label our fathers as enthusiasts when Luthardt, in the second and third of his articles, says of Luther: "No one has ever been more certain of the Scriptures, more joyful and more confident than he. But from JEsu Christo. That was first and foremost to him. Christ was to him dominus ac rex scriptura. And according as it drove Christ, that was to him the standard of judgment of the individual scriptures and their different value and meaning. Because Christ was certain to him, the Scriptures were also certain to him as the testimony of Christ. ... He stood by it (the Scriptures) as a free son of the house, not as a servant.

He had his fixed end in Christ: from this, that is, from the central content of Scripture, it was certain to him, not the other way around. ... He was not a servant of the letter, he did not know fearful bondage (to whom the whole world became too narrow with every saying of the Bible! Red.); as a free son he shifted in his father's house. . . . For Luther, Christ and salvation in him were first of all certain, the Scriptures as a testimony of him and in the measure that they were. In this he had a standard for judging the Scriptures themselves. Gerhard, of course, meant it in the same way; but he formulated it quite differently. For Luther, Christ is 'the Lord and King of Scripture' in its individual wording; here (among the theologians of the seventeenth century) the latter is the Lord over Christ and faith in him."

Such tearing apart and, in the interest of his false doctrine, Luthardt's artificial opposition of Scripture and the content of Scripture, Scripture and the Gospel, Scripture and divine truth, Scripture and the doctrine of salvation, Scripture and Christ with His salvation, is just as foreign to our confession as the Reformed separation of Word and Spirit. The Augustana knows of no divine truth, of no doctrine of salvation, of no Christ, and of no certainty of salvation in Christ apart from Scripture; that is, it knows of no doctrine of salvation and of no certainty of salvation that cannot be traced back to Scripture as its ultimate source and its only ground. For the Augustana, certainty of salvation, certainty of faith, is essentially certainty of Scripture, that is, certainty from Scripture and on the basis of Scripture. Luther's certainty of salvation and faith was also rooted solely and exclusively in Scripture and its individual statements. It also corresponds to this that our confession, as well as Luther, does not refer to the so-called whole of Scripture, but only to the written Scriptures and the individual testimonies of the same. The Augustana operates with certain sayings whose passages are precisely indicated, interpreted according to the context, and cited as *dicta probantia*. Every passage of Scripture is to her as such, as a scriptural passage, a word of God, a saying of the Holy Spirit, and therefore conclusive. And this is not merely the case because the passage introduced as proof demonstrably contains a moment of testimony to salvation in Christ, but rather because it is demonstrably a part of Scripture and thus of the Word of God. From the first to the last letter, the Augustana gives no room to any other thought than that the entire canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testaments is to it as such certain divine infallible truth. And this is also true of the other Lutheran symbols.

F. B.

(To be continued.)

Literature.

Christ's Testimony on the Old Testament. A simple contribution to the fight for God's Word by Th. Beyer, Professor at the Royal Princess Hedwig High School in Neustrelitz. Motto: "Esstehet geschrieben." Brunswick and Leipzig. Published by Hellmuth and Wollermann. 1896. (99 pages, price not stated.)

In 1893, Prof. Beyer wrote a little book on the origin and the falsity of the Holy Scriptures, which won the prize offered for it by the Press Association in Silesia. He now offers us a defense of the Old Testament. The raging of God's enemies and of his word offers enough reason for this! A schoolman, Heidrich, has published a book intended to be a guide for religious instruction in seminaries for schoolteachers, in which all the miracles in the books of Moses are hushed up; for to these people they are only a mixture of legends and perhaps - some truth. That is what the future teachers of the people are to be taught! - The author now proceeds as follows: First, he introduces the testimonies of Christ for the Scriptures, beginning with the first word of Christ, that he might begin his controversy against the kingdom of Satan: "It is written," Matt. 4. 36 passages are discussed in this first chapter. In the second chapter, the divinity of the Old Testament is confirmed from the miracles, events, and historical occurrences that Christ cites from the Old Testament (15 passages). For whatever miracles and facts the Son of God, that is, God Himself, cites as having happened and being true from the Old Testament, through these same miracles the truth of the Old Testament is also acknowledged by Him. The third chapter treats (in 21 passages) of words of the Lord, which are based on words of the Old Testament, partly in complete literal agreement. "The Lord speaks the same language as the Old Testament; it is the same God who speaks here and there" (p. 87). - Christ also confirms individual books, even parts of books of the Old Testament. Thus Prof. B. sees - rightly we think - in the word Satan, Matt. 4:10, by which Christ names the tempter called the devil by Matthew and Lucas, a testimony of Christ to the name Satan bears in the book of Job, and thus to the divinity of that book itself. So also Christ testifies that there is only one book of the prophet Isaiah, not also a spurious second part. For it is to this second part, called spurious by a human, earthly, diabolical wisdom, that he refers at the beginning of his teaching ministry, as near the end of it, Luc. 4:17 ff. Cap. 22, 37. In the same way he testifies to the miracles of the Old Testament, as often as he remembers them, as true according to the miraculous deed and according to the report of the Old Testament; for he is the omniscient God, and it is true of him, "We testify what we have seen." The Omniscient also knows of these miracles even more than is written of them in the Old Testament. What man, asks Prof. B., could know that no leper was cleansed in Naaman's time in Israel, nor sent to any widow but that at Sarepta of the Sidonian Elisha? But whether Christ's miracles of the Old Testament are true, - a modern theologian does not believe it. Prof. B. points to Prof. Christlieb, who is silent about a miracle of Jonah in the fish. But he also wants to have a sign of the prophet Jonah, it is supposed to be his sermon of repentance. Christ alone is the sign that Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the Welshman. If another theologian does not believe another miracle, we only see that where a union broke through the fence: It is written, all manner of unclean beast creepeth through. But the prophet calls to us, "If thou teach the pious to be different from the wicked, then thou shalt be my teacher," Jer. 15:19. On this side the Scripture warns Christians, not directly, but indirectly. For we do think that "Christ's testimony" about the Old Testament will be of great comfort and strength to a devout reader, and will also serve as a serious warning against false prophets.

However, some things about this testimony must be criticized as misleading. When the author of Matth. 4, 4. says: "Man does not live on bread alone, and so that Christ testifies in accordance with Moses that the right

If we say that "the food for the (eternal) life of men is (every) word of God," then we must say with Calov: It is not eternal but bodily life that is spoken of here. The author's reasons for his assertion are not drawn from the text, but pious reflections. If, furthermore, the Lord is supposed to change things in vv. 4 and 7, the linguistically learned author completely overlooks the fact that Matthew quotes the words of Christ according to the LXX; yes, our Lord Christ Himself does this, and that for the benefit of the Greek-speaking peoples entering the church. And now when the LORD says with the LXX (v. 7.), "Thou shalt not tempt," Deut. 6, 16. but in the Hebrew text it is written: You shall not tempt, but Prof. B. ascribes a high impression to this (pretended) change, then - because without support - all this is mistaken. But Prof. B. is right, that Matth. 4, 10. the Lord as Lord also changes the Scriptures in fact, yes, creates a new Scripture. He substitutes for the word fear - worship. Calov now thinks that the HErr renders the Hebrew (fear), Deut. 6, 13. by προσκυνέω (worship). Now it is true that adore also stands for the whole worship of God, as Jer. 32, 39. 40.; in our place alone adore is connected with the revelation of the Messiah. But it seems to the Evangelisten by the προσκυνέω (adore) rather to indicate that Christ has put the Hebrew XXX for the Hebrew XXX. Since Christ says, "Lift thyself up," He reveals Himself as Supreme Lord, as God, as Son, as Messiah, of whom such worship is prophesied (Ps. 45:12, 72:11, XXX, the LXX προσκυνέω). He soon receives it, Matt. 2, 11. 8, 3. John 9, 39.; it shall continue, to the end of the world, Luc. 24, 52 (everywhere προσκυνέω). D.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

s. America.

General Synod and General Council. The "Kirchenblatt" of Philadelphia appropriates the following statements of other papers about the General Synod, respectively the unification of the Council with the General Synod: "In the 'Lutheran Observer' of December 20, the General Synod of the Lutheran name seriously objects to being equated with the General Council. It wants to be distinguished from the General Council especially by its broad-mindedness, in which it cultivates pulpit fellowship with pastors of other sects and grants communion to members of any Protestant denomination, even inviting them to its altar. ... But there is no need at all for fraternization with the sects in order to deny the General Synod the right to be called a Lutheran synod: it has in its midst elements that make a mockery of all true Lutheranism, and tolerates doctrines that have never stood in the confession of our church, and are on the contrary rejected by it. In general, it has never professed all the confessions of the Lutheran Church, but only the Augsburg Confession, whose binding force is again limited to a few fundamental articles. It represents the most unevangelical union under the Lutheran name. A regrettable fact is the re-establishment of fellowship with this Synod on the part of the General Council, and it is neither to the honor nor to the blessed furtherance of good causes that the Luther League, through its connections in the General Synod, is exposed to un-Lutheran influences from there. . . . [It is said that] one need not and should not indulge in any apprehension concerning the splendid youth connections, in which one simply ignores synodal boundaries as if they meant nothing. It is groundless concern, there is no danger here, we are told, and is full of enthusiasm since the Pittsburg meeting. It is, after all, the manner of English-Americans to rave sometimes for this, sometimes for that cause, and to expect great things from it; sober

Contemplation and treatment is their weak side. At the same time, however, one reads, for example, in the 'Lutheran Evangelist' sentences like these: Especially is the prospect of Lutheran unity and interdenominational fellowship hopeful when one looks at the various organizations of our young people into Christian Endeavor Clubs and Luther Leagues and Alliances. Our young people care nothing for the hair-splitting of theologians, and the hope of unification rests largely upon the youth. - This is plain enough to those who wish to see. One must not overlook the fact that the leadership of the united youth associations is in the hands of people of the General Synod, whose Lutheranism, as we know, is not yet that of our Lutheran confessions, even though Luther and the Lutheran Church are almost always the third word in their papers and speeches. What separates us from the General Synod and its followers are not theological hairsplitting, but articles of faith, such as those concerning baptism and Holy Communion, which may be publicly attacked and rejected in the General Synod, as no knowledgeable person can deny, and in addition principles of ecclesiastical action, which are absolutely demanded by the confession of our church; we recall altar and pulpit fellowship with unbelievers, which obviously quarrels with the confession. And it would be sad enough if it could be said with truth that the young members of our congregations care nothing for such things, as for hair-splitting."

II. foreign countries.

From Prussia. The introduction of the new liturgy in Prussia has given rise to new protests on the part of the liberals, but they are trying to come to terms with the established fact in their own way; the "Germania" calls this way "Jesuitical. Thus the parish organs of St. Mary's parish in Frankfurt a. d. Oder have declared in the minutes that they consider "full truthfulness" indispensable. For this reason they regret that the forms presented in the new Agende can give the appearance of requiring literal confession of every word of the Apostles' Creed! On the other hand, it can only "accept the saving faith in the grace of God in Christ expressed in the confessions". Only in this sense is her use of the Apostolicum to be understood. The "Germania" finds in this declaration the infamous "secret reservation" of the Jesuits and says: "The Apostolicum will therefore be read out publicly in the church by the preacher and heard by the congregation, although preacher and congregation do not believe in it. The advice given by the "Neue Evangelische Gemeindebote" is also noteworthy. With unmistakable reference to the unfortunate decree of the church authorities to the preacher Lisso, the paper congratulates the clergy because "by virtue of their theological education" they are able to understand "what the Apostolicum actually means with its oriental imagery. And since they are bound to it only for the liturgy, not also for preaching and pastoral care and teaching, where each one has to proclaim the same according to his conception of the Gospel, the scruples which individual clergymen have with regard to the reading of the Apostolicum in the liturgy appear to be unjustified." "Liturgy and preaching are two quite different things." The only ones to be pitied are the laity, who lack knowledge of dogma history, and "are thus simply dependent on the wording of the same (the confessional formulas)." Since this liturgy imposed by the majority "does violence to the moral feeling and simple understanding of the minority," the latter must issue a decisive protest.

"that by this could somehow be meant an assent to the literal sense of the Apostolic."
(A. E. L. K.)

The School Bible. The following is written from Koburg: "The first state in which the school Bible is to be introduced as a compulsory textbook in place of the Bible is likely to be the Duchy of Koburg. The use of the school Bible, and of the 'Völkerschen biblisches Lesebuch', has been permitted for a long time, but no compulsion has yet been exercised to introduce it. At the General Conference of all Coburg city and country teachers held last Saturday, it was agreed that the school Bible should be made compulsory. In the General Conference, the necessity was emphasized that with the introduction of the school Bible into the school curriculum, the removal of the full Bible from the confirmation classes must also go hand in hand. A request to this effect was addressed to the highest church authority and will undoubtedly be approved in view of the benevolent position that the new General Superintendent Bahnsen is taking on the matter. By Easter 1896 at the latest, the compulsory introduction of a Bible reading book will be carried out throughout the Duchy." - Pay attention to this: the full Bible is also to be removed from confirmation classes. Those are nice prospects. One person, of course, will hear this clever decision of the entire Coburg city and country teachers and its official approval with undisguised joy. This one, however, has his seat not at Koburg on the fortress, but in Nom. (P. a. S.)

Marriage of a monk. The "D. E. K." reports: An interesting case, unprecedented in Vienna, occurred on September 29 in the Old Catholic parish church there, in that a former Franciscan monk announced his own marriage to the widow Frau Anna Stark from the pulpit. The wedding of the now Cooperator Julius Wolf took place on October 8 in the afternoon at five o'clock in the Salvatorkirche, Wipplingerstraße No. 8. The function was performed by the diocesan administrator M. Ezech. The marriages of Roman Catholic former priests - there are eight at present in Vienna - were not recognized for some time, until the court declared them perfectly valid. Thus, about two months ago, in response to a complaint to the Vienna District Court that a priest who had left the diocese of Leitmeritz was living in "concubinage" in Vienna, it was decided once again that his marriage was to be recognized as perfectly legal.

Holland. The "Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" reports: To a Protestant population of 2,810,000 souls there are in the Netherlands 2, 250,000 Reformierte in 1347 parishes, served by 1600 pastors. At present no less than 347 Reformed parishes are vacant. The blame for this lack of pastors is not the social position of the clergy, which is not an unfavorable one, but the rationalism that has devastated the church, and which must now reap the fruits of its own sowing, since most liberal pastors preach before empty pews. The Dutch Bible Society, since its foundation in 1814, has distributed about 2½ million Bibles and New Testaments; in the past year 96,000 were printed, of which over 4000 were in Indian languages. A large number of sacred writings have been given or sold at reduced prices to the soldiers in the colonies. A number of translations are in progress.

Cameroon Mission. In the "D. E. K." we find the following details about the Cameroon Mission of the Basel Mission Society: The center of this field of work is formed by the two stations Bethel (Bonaku)-

on the left bank and Bonaberi on the right bank in the estuary of the Cameroon River. The insufficient space of Bethel's previous secondary school made it necessary to erect a new building, and in order to avoid bad neighbors, mau chose Bonaberi. However, due to a not entirely unjustified dislike of this place, after the vacation almost all of the students, especially the most promising ones, left; they could not be replaced in any other way than by less pleasant elements. Notwithstanding all this, an experienced missionary entertains fine hopes for Bonaberi. A particularly pleasing event to be reported from a sub-station of Bonabera is the inauguration of a chapel. It is made of clay, twelve meters long and six meters wide. Next to it stands a beautiful teacher's house with tin walls and a mat roof. Young and old were looking forward to the day of the inauguration; one of them thought he would die of joy. And really everything was joyful. The chapel could not hold all those who came from Bonabera and the outlying stations. At this celebration eight new members were received into the congregation through baptism; the total number since then has been 64. West of the centre, at the foot of the Cameroon mountain, lies the station of Victoria; there some land matters are now united, which have hitherto made the relationship with the Baptists difficult; thanks to the intervention of the government, more peaceful conditions have been created among the Bakwari, so that one may hope for future success. The Catholics, of course, have other things to look forward to than seeking recreation in the beautiful mountains. On the southern wing, on the Sanaga or Lom River, near the Bukoko town of Ndogominyi, lies the station of Lobethal. The pagans there show a surprising zeal for church attendance and Sunday sanctification, which is probably due in large part to the energetic intervention of the government against pagan abuses. But the peaceful fishing people of the Mulimba show a powerful eagerness to learn where the Sanaga branches off. By founding a boarding school in Lobethal, they are to be offered more extensive instruction than was previously possible. The best news comes from the most advanced post, namely Mangamba in Aboland, north of Bethel. In 1893, when attacked by the heathen, the Christians prevailed by acquiescence. Independently of the missionary, the Aboland congregation of 200 to 300 souls passed a resolution that no young Christian who knew how to write should become a court clerk for a heathen chief, because of the danger of either becoming involved in heathenism or succumbing to evil desires with the abundant income. (? L. u. W.) In August 1894, however, the congregation of Mangamba even joined with three others for independent planned missionary work, at first for the foundation of two outstations. In the areas of Wuri and Bodiman, east and northeast of Mangamba, the work is more difficult. In Bodiman the truth seekers had to suffer much from the members of the pagan secret society; in Wuri the people are often absent on trading trips and seem to be based less on religious need than on an appreciation of Christian culture. The need for new work opportunities for the Christians in Mangamba has led to an attempt to plant coffee, but this has failed, probably due to the condition of the soil. The missionaries recommend the introduction of handicrafts. The total income of the General Kasfe amounted to 1,058,416 M. 44 Pf., apart from 3932 M. 25 Pf., which were contributed in Cameroon itself; from the German Empire 33,987 M. 67 Pf. were donated for Cameroon. In total, the Cameroon Mission required 130,345 M. 80 Pf. in grants from outside.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42.

February 1896.

No. 2.

The position of Lutheran symbols in relation to Scripture - proof that

our confession represents literal inspiration.

(Continued.)

As from the Augustana, so also from the Apology it is clear that the position of our confession to the holy Scriptures is as healthy as it is clearly determined. It is true that the Apology has not included a special article dealing *ex professo* with its position on Scripture. The reason for this, however, is not that the Lutheran confessors at Augsburg were still in unsettled territory in this matter, had not yet given sufficient thought to this question, and, still uncertain of the matter, had not been able to formulate their own view precisely. That a doctrine is only ready for decision and symbolically fixable to the extent that it has been through ecclesiastical struggles, in which it is thought out and processed, is in general an unscriptural, thoroughly modern, and therefore false thought. Nor does the way in which the Apology speaks of Scripture and its position in relation to it betray any uncertainty, indeterminacy, vacillation, or disharmony. Vague, undefinable views, especially concerning the doctrine of Scripture, are found in abundance in modern theology, but not in our confessional writings. On almost every page of the Apology we are confronted with one and the same precisely defined position on Scripture, which we have already come to know from the Augustana. From the first to the last letter, the Apology drives only the Scriptures, and it knows and wants to know of no other than Scriptural theology.

The reason why the confessors at Augsburg did not speak out about their position on Scripture in a special article in the Apology is that they had no particular reason to do so. The Lutherans considered their own doctrine of Scripture to be undisputed throughout Christendom. They also presupposed of their opponents that they shared with the church the Scriptures as an infallible source and guide.

The Bible was the only thing that they recognized as the cord of faith and life. To them it was still a matter of course that whoever claimed to be a Christian should not question the divinity of Scripture. Moreover, the mutual recognition of the authority of Scripture was for them the only ground on which a fruitful discussion of the disputed doctrines of faith was conceivable. That the confessors at Augsburg really proceeded from this view is clear from the Apology itself, which deals with the opponents as with those who want to be theologians of Scripture, and is repeatedly astonished that the opponents pretend to stand on the ground of Scripture, but in reality are in contradiction with all the syllables of Scripture. 97, 60. Even the Romans did not dare to openly deny this basic assumption of the Lutherans and to take a direct stand against the authority of Scripture. In so doing, they would have torn the mask off their own faces before all Christendom, and would have revealed themselves to be blind heathens, which they were. The Papists therefore assured that they also wanted to proceed from the Scriptures. They hoped that under the cloak of Scripture they could all the more easily turn the content of Scripture into its opposite for the simple-minded. For it had long been clear to the Lutherans at Augsburg that the papacy was only anxious "to misrepresent, pervert, and interpret the Scriptures according to its own pleasure, contrary to all divine law. 157, 23. "They put on many sayings of Scripture - says the Apology of the Romans - that they make a pretense to the inexperienced, as if their doctrine were ... is founded in the Scriptures." 189, 25. In another place it is said, "But they speak thus, that they make a pretence to the inexperienced, and put on sayings of the holy Scriptures, which speak of right Christian works, which we owe; yet they base their satisfaction on works, which we do not owe, and which they call opera non debita." 200, 76. The more therefore the Papists perceived that they could most easily bring their false doctrines to the attention of Christendom by wrapping them up in passages of Scripture, the louder they cried out, "It is written," and adduced sayings, many sayings of Scripture, and boldly and impudently asserted that the evangelicals taught "against the clear gospel." 200, 76. 109, 1. 103, 87. 124, 102. 137, 165. And when the Confutation was read, they blasted out in all Christendom that the Confutators had "mislaide" the confession of the Lutherans "from the holy Scriptures. 74, 8.

Thus the Romans, in order to be able to deceive the people, who pricked up their ears for proofs of Scripture, all the more easily, appealed with their mouths to the Bible, which they inwardly cursed. From Satan they had also learned ways and means how they could apparently destroy the Scriptures in the name of the Scriptures, drink out the contents, and make the shell appear to be unharmed.

that our confession represents literal inspiration.

35

could leave. What an honest, conscientious interpretation of Scripture was not able to accomplish, a "sophistical gloss," a "cunning little find," did. 107, 109. 107, 109. If the Confutators could not cope with a Scripture word, they patched "addition" to it, 124, 102. 134, 143, citirte "mangled," 260, 53, and thus put "new skirts" on the sayings, 192, 40. The Apology says of the Adversaries, "They may introduce the sayings of Scripture rhymed, unrhymed, finally, non-exclusively, as they will, and as they please." 222, 89. "The adversaries make of the Scripture black and white, if and as they please, contrary to all the natural manner of the clear word in the place: *cognosce vultum pecoris*, etc. There *cognoscere* must mean to hear confession. Cattle or sheep must be called people. *Stabulum* we respect, is called also a school, there such *Doctores* and *Oratores* be in." 186, 9. "Abjecto Christo, deleto evangelio male detorquent scripturas ad humanas opiniones." 132, 139. „In verbis maxime planis et perspicuis repererunt rimam." 145, 222. "The most comforting sayings they thus point to their lies." 199, 69. 262, 61. Such twisting is also possible to an unscrupulous man, for so simple-minded, so certain and pure, so plainly nothing can be spoken or written, one can make him another nose with words. 182:84 But the Romans are just such evil-doers, for their explanation of the Scriptures is nothing but a gross, public abuse of the divine word, a knavery, a playing with God's word, a wickedness, an impudent lying, and a falsification of the holy Scriptures. 190, 26. 27. Therefore, pious Christian consciences should not err even in such abominable perversion of the Scriptures by the adversaries, but rather pray: "May God desecrate and punish such desperate sophists, who so treacherously and wickedly interpret the holy Gospel to their dreams. For what pious, respectable man should not be pained in heart by such great public abuse of divine word?" 189, 26. 145, 218.

The Apology therefore makes it its business to show that the Romans lie with their pretense of Scripture. "Thus we have also clearly shown here - it says accordingly 74, 9 - how they have condemned some articles against the public Bright Scripture and clear word of the Holy Spirit, and must never again say with truth that they have answered for a title from the Holy Scripture against us." It intends to give the solutio of all the sayings which the adversaries had attracted against the Augustana. 120, 67. It is to the invalidation of the opposing Scriptural evidence that she takes special care. 123, 97. She shows how the Romans are always concerned to evade the compulsion of the Scriptural word - *ad eludendas scripturas*, 141, 200, - and that the sayings cited by them are more against them than for them. 155, 19. Of the Roman tricks and handles to pervert Scripture, Melanchthon says, 137, 165. 166: "Speramus nos piis conn-

scientiis satis ostendisse, quod hi loci non adversentur nostrae sententiae, quod adversarii male detorqueant scripturas ad suas opiniones, quod plerosque locos citent truncatos, quod omissis locis clarissimis de fide tantum excerpant ex scripturis locos de operibus eosque depravent, quod ubique affingant humanas quasdam opiniones praeter id, quod verba scripturae dicunt, quod legem ita doceant, ut evangelium de Christo obruant. Tota enim doctrina adversariorum partim est a ratione humana sumta, partim est doctrina legis, non evangelii. "

Thus the Apology proceeds from the basic premise that Scripture is the principle of truth recognized even by the opponents and the common basis for the discussion of the doctrines at issue. This circumstance does not detract from the statements of Scripture which our confession makes here and there, often apparently by chance, but rather lends them double weight. For it is not a matter of indifferent, uncertain, or indefinite truths, but of truths that are self-evident, acknowledged by all Christianity, and openly admitted even by its opponents, according to our confession.

The first thing he said was that he was not a man, but that he was a man, and that he was a man, and that he was a man, and that he was a man, and that he was a man. Even the doctrines which it itself contains are, according to it, only pieces, the most necessary pieces of Scripture. 76:18 To this end is the endeavor of apology, to bring the holy gospel, the word of God, to the recognition of all. 291: The teaching in the church is to be done through God's word. 163, 52: What we teach, we are to say and conclude according to the holy Scriptures. 158: We are to pay attention to what Paul's opinion is, what the Scriptures clearly teach. 160:35 In the church it is what Christ, the prophets, and the apostles write and say that counts, and not what the pope says. 157, 26: In the church one should not teach, judge, and speak otherwise than the apostles themselves and their writings have taught. 161, 39: And what the apostles taught, and held to be good and right, must be sought from their clear writings, and not shown by examples alone. 161, 40: In matters of faith, everything must be clearly stated in the Scriptures, and nothing must be invented. 219, 76: What is not taken from the Scriptures cannot be used to build the church. 151, 268; The church must take heed how the Scriptures speak of the law and the promise. 120, 67. How we relate to God and what works please God can only be determined from God's word. 208, 13. 14. Also in every question concerning the Christian life we must be able to say: On this we have God's word and commandment. (225:18) For no man can know or know the will of God otherwise than by his word alone.

208, 17. Without God's word no theological statement can be made. 208, 17 The theologian can and should do nothing more and nothing else than write and preach the clear words and teachings of the apostles. 157, 26. He must equip and strengthen himself with God's word. 211, 29.

Therefore, our confession does not want to know anything about truly new doctrines that are not found in Scripture. A doctrine which is really new, that is, which is not contained in Scripture, is *eo ipso* also false. Only he who strictly adheres to Scripture teaches nothing new, and conversely, he who imposes nothing new in the church also adheres to Scripture. "We teach - so it is said in the Article of Original Sin 83, 32 - nothing new, nothing different, from the holy Scriptures, the common holy Christian Church, but such necessary, brave, clear sayings of the holy Scriptures and of the Fathers, which had been suppressed by unskilful bickering of the Sophists, we bring to light again, and would gladly have the Christian doctrine pure." And in the article of justification, the Apology 86, 50, says: "Therefore our preachers have taught of the necessary article with all the highest diligence, and have taught nothing new, but vain clear words of the holy Scriptures, and certain sayings of the Fathers, Augustini, and others." Dr. Luther also did not teach anything of his own, but wanted to "teach and explain from the Scriptures" the confession of Christ and the gospel, which was entirely suppressed in the papacy. 85, 45. What, therefore, does not consist of Scripture passages, cannot be derived from Scripture passages and traced back to Scripture passages, in short, what is not Scriptural, is, according to the Apology, not Christian, not Lutheran, and also not theological.

The source of all doctrines, therefore, is Scripture, and Scripture alone. The *doctrina rationis* and the *humana sapientia* can only blind and deceive in the spiritual. 137, 167, 126, 108: The reason why the scholastics fell into all kinds of terrible errors and knew nothing of Christ is that they did not pay attention to the clear words of Scripture, but mixed much philosophy with Christian doctrine and followed the light of reason. 80, 13. 85, 43. 151, 269. 169, 68. 69. Reason, especially concerning works and faith, always teaches wrongly and contrary to the gospel. 123, 91. 115, 38. And he who will accept from the Scriptures only that which is according to reason, and consider everything else to be fables, is a heathen, for the true Christian church is the multitude of those now and then in the world who truly believe the gospel of Christ and have the Holy Spirit. 159:28 Theology is Christian only in so far as it draws from Scripture, and in so far as it draws from reason it is heathen. He who wants to teach from Scripture and reason, throws philosophy and the Gospel, Aristotle and Christ, theology and philosophy, through each other. But the words of Christ and the sayings of Socrates and Zenoni harmonize badly. 89, 16. This should be clear to everyone who has even a-

38 The position of Lutheran symbols in relation to Scripture - a proof of this, has ever looked at or read the books of the gospel. 115, 38. "Preach Christianly" is equal to "preach according to the Scriptures." 271, 1. "Christian" and "according to Scripture" are equivalent expressions. "Scripture, only Scripture, let reason say what it will." This has been the watchword of the Lutheran Church from the beginning. "Scholastici doctores - speaks Melancthon 126, 109 - magni et ingeniosi homines . . . , sed decepti humana sapientia non viderunt faciem Moisi resectam, sed velatam, sicut pharisaei, philosophi, Mahometistae. Verum *nos* stultitiam evangelii praedicamus, in quo alia justitia revelata est Nec ignoramus, quantum haec doctrina abhorreat a judicio rationis ac legis. Nec ignoramus multo speciosiore esse doctrinam legis de dilectione. Est enim sapientia. Sed non pudet nos stultitiae evangelii. Id propter gloriam Christi defendimus et rogamus Christum, ut Spiritu Sancto suo adjuvet nos, ut id illustrare ac patefacere possimus." In the Apology, too, our Church has thus closed every door to rationalism.

But if only what is biblical is theological, then every doctrine must also be proven with sayings from Scripture. Of every exposition the preacher must be able to say: Haec plana et evangelio consentanea sunt." 138, 172. In every doctrine he must have certa et firma testimonia Scripturae, quae labefactari non queunt, for himself. 77, 2. sayings of Scripture found doctrine. 222, 88. From Scripture, from God's Word, one must take evidence. 166, 64. 177, 61. If we wish to prove something, we must relate sayings of Scripture, which clearly report what we teach. 103, 86. If the adversary wants to prove something to us, it must also be done from Scripture. 179:42 We cry out to him, "Let him bring a word, a single example from the Scriptures." 226, 24. Thither must our endeavor go, to have a thing well founded in Scripture. 260, 53. We must be able to boast: "This doctrine of ours is ever clear; it can also be well seen in the light and held against the holy Scriptures, and is also here clearly and rightly advocated; whoever will let it be said, and not knowingly deny the truth." 119, 64. 75, 16. For the church and the teacher in the church, therefore, the one recurring question remains: How does the Scripture deal with this, what does Christ, Paul, Job, the Psalm say? What do the sayings in Scripture indicate? 80. 175, 52. 53. 116, 40. And the whole work of the theologian consists in quoting sayings from Scripture, 94, 39, letting the Scriptures of the apostles and prophets speak. 212, 37. 160, 37. 174, 49. 182, 83. he should be able to say: Hoc docet Paulus, 118, so all the holy Scriptures of the prophets and apostles testify, 194, 45. 85, 44. 45. 197, 60. 99, 70. Especially towards the enemies he should cite a clear word of Scripture and always repeat it. 140, 192. 140, 192. Then it is good for a doctrine, if it is plurima.

et clarissima testimonia in scriptura. 142:202 Accordingly, the Lutheran Church sees to it that even the young learn and pray the sayings of Scripture, and that the pastors and church ministers instruct the children and youth in God's Word both publicly and at home. 213, 43. For the very reason that the theologian is to bring only the Scriptures to bear, he must also see to it that the Scriptures are cited "uncluttered, unbroken, whole. 260, 53; 136, 161; the clear, correct understanding of the whole Scripture, the sense of Paul, he is to show; 87, 4; 182, 54; the simple understanding, which also agrees with other sayings of Scripture. 136, 159. Scripture must be interpreted according to clear Scripture. 284:60. If the matter were to be settled by allegory, every man would find allegory useful: but all men of understanding know that in such matters of great importance to God one must have God's word certain and clear, and not draw in dark and strange sayings by force. Such uncertain interpretations do not hold the sting for God's judgment. 256, 35.

But that which is contrary to the plain words of God is neither Christian nor theological. This is false, which Proverbs, and even many of the sayings of Scripture, deny. 84, 42: That which is contrary to the plain words of Christ, contrary to all the scriptures of the apostles, contrary to all the holy scriptures, is publicly false and unjust. 170, 16. He brings up dreams of his own, who puts forward something in theology that disputes with Scripture. 90, 18. 104, 90. 224, 9. 85, 44. 85, 46. What therefore is contrary to Scripture, we say no to, 164, 55. that we declare to be unholy godless sophistry, 220, 80. that is pravae opiniones, 151, 279, ungodly doctrines, great errors, blasphemies. 86, 50. But against Scripture is to the Apology every doctrine which is not found in Scripture. That which lies outside Scripture can never become a part of theology. Therefore no one can demand faith for his doctrine until it is proved from Scripture. The *onus probandi* is on him who claims faith for his doctrine. We do not want to know anything about his own dreams outside of Scripture. 124, 101. He who has for his doctrine no command of God, no word of God, no example of Old or New Testament, must be silent in the church. 228, 31: Human opiniones praeter id, quod verba scripturae dicunt, we reject. 137, 166. 223, 3: All theological questions can and should be judged and evaluated according to Scripture alone. 80, 13. 291. As therefore right doctrine must be answered from the Scriptures, so also false doctrine must be answered from the Scriptures. 74, 8. 9. And it is enough to cry out to the adversary with apologia: Such dreams and lies are nowhere to be found in Scripture, 193, 41, such are nowhere to be found in Scripture, 42, this is not founded in Scripture or the Gospel, 200, 75, nowhere does Holy Scripture say of, 201, 78, this has no testimony in

of Scripture, 324, 9, in God's word, it is not found in Scripture, 224, 12, they say this without all Scripture, 225, 15. 17, it is nowhere found in Scripture, 197, 60.

Thus our confession intends that the theologian should only repeat what the Scriptures say to him. Without any human addition on his part, he should present to the church what he has taken from Scripture. 124, 101. Nor is this impossible, for the Scriptures speak clearly. It is the public Bright Scripture. 74, 9. This is especially true of the *sedes doctrinae*. Concerning the *loci classici* in the doctrine of justification, the Apology says: "These are such clear, bright sayings of Scripture, that they do not require such a sharp understanding, but only that one read them and see the clear words, as Augustine also says in the matter. 92, 34. One cannot speak more clearly than Peter, than the Scriptures speak. 102, 83. 104, 89. To speak quite unmistakably, Scripture also repeats the same thing so often in clear words. 107, 108. *scriptura idem saepe inculcat*. 142, 205. He who takes the Bible in his hand and reads it with earnestness soon notices, for example, that the doctrine of justification is everywhere founded in Scripture. 221:87 And it is a wonder that the adversaries can be so blind, and not consider so many clear sayings, which clearly declare that we are justified by faith, and not by works. (107:107) If any man misinterpret the *loci classici*, and be not clear from the Scriptures, it is only a proof of the darkness and corruption of man, but not that the Scriptures are dark, and need the light of human reason.

Now if all the spiritual knowledge of Christians is scriptural knowledge, which the wisdom of reason in the world can destroy but not increase by a candle, then all certainty in spiritual, divine things is also scriptural certainty, that is, certainty from Scripture and on the basis of Scripture. What otherwise presents itself as certainty is a deception, a dream. Only the Word of God is able to produce divine certainty in the heart. This is true of the certainty of our state of grace and of the hope of eternal life, *Fides parit certam spem, quia nititur verbo et mandato Dei*. 146, 225. *Non est enim hominis, praesertim in terroribus peccati, sine certo verbo Dei statuere de voluntate Dei, quod irasci desinat*. 133:141 Therefore let Christian consciences know that this is the word and commandment of God, that we may be forgiven of sins through Christ without merit, not because of our works, and that such a word and commandment of God is a right, strong, certain, everlasting consolation against all the terrors of sin and death, against all temptation and despair, anguish and anguish of conscience. 179:72 Good consciences, to whom death is not so bitter as it is bitter to them, where they doubt in one piece, cry out therefore for truth and right instruction from God's word. 191, 33. To speak of a certainty of faith, through

The Apology says that the effect of Scripture, which is only made certain to us by Scripture itself, is nothing other than to let the effect precede the cause, both factually and temporally. From Scripture alone one can become divinely certain of his doctrine. The confessors at Augsburg declare 221:85: "But since we, by the word of God, are assured in our hearts and consciences, without any doubt, that the adversaries condemn the public divine truth, and the right, Christian, blessed, holy doctrine, without which no Christian church can be, which every Christian, so far as his life and limb go, is bound to confess, save, and protect for the glory of God, we are not deterred from such wholesome doctrine. 208, 17. Yea, precisely because they are sure of the Scriptures, they may say, as with an oath, "If this be not the pure and unadulterated gospel, as preached by the apostles; if this be not the voice of the gospel of the eternal Father, which thou, O Lord, who sittest in the bosom of the Father, hast revealed unto the world, we shall be justly punished. Scimus enim ea, quae diximus, consentanea esse scripturis prophetiis et apostolicis." 273, 13. 151, 268. From this, that they were sure of the Scriptures, flowed at last to our confessors also the undaunted courage and holy defiance against the adversaries. If they had only a clear word of Scripture under their feet, they were not impressed by the multitude, learning, and worldly reputation and fame of their opponents. To the Confutators, who insisted on Scotum, Gabrielem, and the sayings of the Fathers, the Lutherans cried out: "We are not mistaken, but truly know that we may cheerfully hold the word of the holy apostle Peter as a great doctor against all the Sententiaros in a heap, even if they were many thousands." 179, 68.69. 152, 279. 75, 16.

Thus the Christian's certainty has its sole ground in Scripture. And the Scriptures are also fit to be an unshakable rock of faith, for the Bible is the holy Scriptures, and not men's, but God's Word. One about the other time Scripture is called "God's Word," "Word of God," in Apology. 142, 205. 146, 225. 179, 72. See also the Hendiadyoin "the Scriptures and God's Word" for "the written Word of God," 249, 3. Now in the mouth of our confession these high names are not mere empty titles, in which one conceptually, in thought, excludes just what they actually say, and adds what they do not say. When our Confession repeatedly and deliberately calls the Scriptures God's Word, it is precisely to emphasize that, just as otherwise a certain book has a certain author, God Himself is the author of the holy Scriptures. The Bible, according to the Apology, is God's book in the most actual sense, for the Holy Spirit is the actual, final author of it. Holy Scripture is "Scriptura Spiritus Sancti." 74:8, 9; and that this designation, too, is to be taken according to the Apology in the most proper sense, is also evident from this,

42The Position of Lutheran Symbols to Scripture, etc. that in the same passage the words of Scripture are called "clear words of the Holy Spirit". The individual voices of Scripture, according to the Apology, were set by the Holy Spirit, and set with care. 107, 108. (107, 108) It is to the "syllables of the Scriptures," therefore, that the Apology frequently refers to its opponents. Now if all Scripture, in all its words and syllables, is the Word of God, then every single saying of Scripture is also a statement of the Holy Spirit. Thus, for example, John 16:23 is written in Scripture and is therefore the Word of God. 225, 17. He that therefore preacheth the Scriptures, preacheth not his own word, but soundeth the voice and word of Jesus Christ our Saviour. And he that condemneth the doctrine of the Scriptures, condemneth, as the masters of confutation do, the clear word of Christ. 167, 3. Paul therefore, because the Scripture is the Word of God, is also a much higher Doctor than the famous scholastics. 182, 86, And he who can boast of Paul has a strong patron, patron, constantem patronum for himself. 214, 51, And Peter is such a great Doctor that his word can be confidently held against all sententiariorum. 179, 69, What a glorious, great, excellent, strong decree, then, when all the holy prophets testify! 102, 83, For even a few prophets are great in the sight of God, and are a treasure of the world. 220, 80: The word of the prophets, who were full of faith and spirit, must therefore not be considered as pagan as Aristotle or any other pagan. 132, 140; thus the doctrine that is unscriptural is great error, yea, ungodly doctrine, blasphemy. 86, 50. And those who combat the Scriptures are not only "altogether blind as a bat," 117, 48, but "hopeless godless sophists," 220, 80, "desperate wicked men and hopeless knaves," 274, 19, for they publicly despise and condemn God's holy word and truth. 221, 83.

But if the Scriptures are the Word of God, they are also infallible and absolutely free from error. The words of Scripture are chosen and set by the Holy Spirit, and that with care. To the opponents who carelessly ignore the clearest passages of Scripture, the Apology cries out: "Where do these poor people think? Do they think that the Scriptures, without any cause, so often exalt with clear words? Do they think that the Holy Spirit does not set his word with certainty and deliberation, or that he does not know what he is saying? Num arbitrantur excidisse Spiritui Sancto non animadvertenti has voces?" 107, 108. Men, of course, often speak and write falsehood from ignorance, want of deliberation, weakness of memory, wickedness, etc. But the Holy Spirit does not suffer from all these infirmities of the spirit, and therefore neither does the Scripture suffer from the consequences of them. Nothing has escaped from the Holy Spirit in Scripture; so no inaccuracies, let alone manifest errors, can have crept into Scripture. In every instance the Scriptures have expressed exactly what the Holy Spirit intended to say. The expression is everywhere adequate to the thought, congruent. In the

There is not a word in Scripture that says more, or says less, or says something different than the Holy Spirit intended it to say. Errors are therefore impossible in Scripture. He who does not admit this, must deny that the Holy Spirit is certain and deliberate in his word, and maintain that he often does not know what he is saying, and, like limited men, makes mistakes in the choice of his words. But if nothing escaped the Holy Spirit, neither did Paul nor the other holy writers, who were but instruments of the Holy Spirit. 104, 88. In Scripture, therefore, no word or phrase may be deleted as inaccurate. 100, 73. clear Scripture is the clear expression of divine truth, of the holy gospel, of blessed doctrine, 183, 90. scriptural doctrine is identical with public divine truth, synonymous with right, Christian, blessed, holy doctrine. 221, 85. Certain clear sayings of Paul are certain divine truth. 274, 18. 220, 82. 75, 16. Scripture is holy divine truth, the blessed Word, wherein all comfort and blessedness consist. 167, 3. "These," says the article on original sin, 84, 40, 41, "are Paul's brightness, certain words, and clear sayings, against which no cunning mouth, no crafty little finger, can do anything; these sayings all devils, all men, will not be able to overthrow." The scripture, the gospel, is a sure word. 220:82 Therefore the promises in this book cannot be lacking. 143; And the church which adheres to the Scriptures does not err, but rather becomes itself a pillar of truth, for in the Scriptures it has the pure gospel, the right foundation. 156:22. In the Scriptures every sentence is a pure gold grain of truth, free from all dross. "Wherefore," says the closing words of Apology 290, "let all the world, all wisdom, all power, yield unto Christ and his holy word; but the devil is God's enemy, therefore he exalteth all his power against Christ, to restrain and subdue God's word." F. B.

(To be continued.)

On the doctrine of conscience.

(Sent in by resolution of the Buffalo Districts Conference by P. N. Sörgel.)

As often as the word "conscience" is used in the language of ordinary life and of devotional literature, it has this peculiarity that no dogmatic-ethical concept is more difficult to formulate than this one. We all know what is meant when we speak of conscience; but we encounter the most manifold difficulties when we consider the multitude of phenomena which we include under it, and the multitude of relations in which we use the word.

44 On the doctrine of conscience. need, want to bring into a uniform formula. If we look around for the word in antiquity, we meet the expression *συνείδησις* not first in philosophical literature, but in proverbs and in popular wisdom. Yes, long before one spoke of a *συνείδησις*, the expressions of it, as they appear in the self-accusations, the anguish and restlessness of the wicked, were personified in the Erynnyes (Furies), the daughters of the night, who avenge all wrongs and persecute the one who commits them with their serpent scourges. - The Old Testament has no special word for what we call conscience. Here XX = *καρδία* = heart is the intellectual-moral central organ to which the manifestations of conscience are ascribed. But at the very beginning of Genesis we hear how Adam and Eve, after the Fall, feared and hid themselves from God, how, therefore, the evil conscience awoke in them at the same time as the Fall. - In the New Testament the expression *συνείδησις* is found quite frequently, especially in the Epistles of Paul and in his discourses in the Acts. Here it occurs in the meaning "conscience," conscience in the strictest sense of the word.

Etymologically, the word *συνείδησις* first denotes consciousness, or self-consciousness; for *ἡνεκεδέναι* *τι* means: fellow-knowers.

To be someone's, used of witnesses or accomplices;
= to be one's own witness, one's own confidant, to be aware. We must think of this also in the German word *Gewissen*. It is a co-knowledge, passed over from the Latin *conscientia* into our language, and is said to be found first in Notker († 1022).

In order to get on the right track, it might be a good idea to start with a passage from the New Testament, which does not only describe what we want to know on one side, but rather gives us a broad overview. This passage is probably Rom. 2:14, 15, where it says: "For if the Gentiles, who have not the (written) law, do works of law by nature, they, though they have not the (written) law, are law to themselves." Now this peculiar expression, "they are law unto themselves," the apostle explains in the following verse: "As which (doing the works of the law) they prove that the work of the law is written in their hearts, whereby this process takes place, that their consciences bear witness agreeably (to what is written in their hearts), and the thoughts among themselves accuse or also excuse each other."

Here we first hear that the apostle ascribes a conscience also to the Gentiles. This conscience expresses itself in such a way that it gives its voice and testimony on the basis of what is engraved in their hearts, and that their thoughts accuse or excuse one another. The heathen,

Those who do not have the written law do works of law "by nature," by themselves, of their own accord. We hear, for example, that they consider it their duty to worship God, to be obedient to parents and authorities, and to practice truth. We also hear how they legislate against the sins of murder, theft, perjury, and the like. They speak of virtues and of vices; they urge us to practice the former, but to beware of the latter. In what they hold to be right or wrong, the "thou shalt" or the "thou shalt not" of the positive law is not infrequently reflected. Of course they do not, not even the best of them, reach with their knowledge to the demands of the law; nay, sometimes, as, e. g., in their cultus, they are virtually guilty of a distortion of the divine demand. But nevertheless, according to the apostle, it is "the work of the law" that is described in their hearts. It is as Gerhard says: "*Sic ergo in templis Atheniensium et reliquorum gentilium fuit iniquitas et veritas.*"

In the first place, we are not concerned with whether and to what extent changes have taken place in the hearts of the people, but rather we must say that the Scriptures are there and that the work of the law is written in the hearts of the Gentiles, the people, by nature. What was written in stones on Sinai, the law with its "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not," was imprinted by God on the hearts of men. Luther says: "What Moses gave is not new. For what God gave from heaven to the Jews through Moses, he also wrote in the hearts of all men, both Jews and Gentiles, only that he had it written and proclaimed to the Jews, as his own chosen people, with a bodily voice and scripture. Now therefore I keep the commandments which Moses gave, not because Moses commanded them, but because they are implanted in me by nature, and Moses here agrees with nature. But the other commandments in Moses, which are not by nature implanted in all men, the Gentiles (Gentile Christians) keep not, neither do they concern themselves, but of tithes and other things, which after all are also beautiful." (Instruction how Christians ought to send themselves in Moses, III, p. 11, conf. 1557.) And the Apology says the natural law written in all men's hearts agrees with the law of Moses, or the ten commandments. (87, 7.)

Even if this law scripture no longer expresses the will of God completely purely and perfectly, the knowledge of God's will could still not be completely blurred nor extinguished, but traces of it have been preserved. Even if man has fallen from his original condition, he has not lost all consciousness of right and wrong, but every one brings this consciousness with him into the world. This can only be explained as the apostle explains it,

46 On the doctrine of conscience.

It is a law that is engraved in the heart and still exists. And as this law is inscribed in the heart, that is, in the organ in which the most important spiritual forces have their seat, man must know about it and be conscious of that law. From this consciousness, from the knowledge of the law inscribed in the heart, arises the strange phenomenon which we call conscience. - Without asking man long, without taking the slightest notice of him, a power arises in man that gives its voice, that, on the basis of the law, imposes its judicial testimony upon him. This self-judgment, then, is not, as already indicated, left to our discretion, whether we will perform it or not, but we are inwardly compelled to it; we must be our own witnesses and judges; we must look at and judge ourselves in our relation to God and his law. "Conscience is the witness in our own house of our words and deeds, and our inseparable companion," says Gerhard. - And again, this judicial testimony of conscience does not come to nothing, but produces very distinct manifestations in us: "Thoughts accuse one another, or they also excuse themselves," says the apostle. This, no doubt, was felt by that heathen who cried out, "What doth it profit thee, O Thor, not to have a fellow-conscience?" The same is probably at the bottom of Seneca's saying, who calls conscience a sacred guardian resident within man, and says of it, "Just as he has been treated by us, he himself treats us."

"Among themselves," that is, without the need of a witness for the prosecution or exoneration, the thoughts excited by conscience go about their business of accusing or excusing. - But we must not overlook the fact that the apostle does not place accusing and excusing thoughts on the same line. He does not simply say: who accuse or excuse, but: or also, x xxx. Bengel says of this passage, "The particula concessiva 'etiam' indicates that the thoughts by far accuse more than excuse." It is in the form of accusation, then, that conscience most commonly expresses itself; and it was in this form that the heathen felt it most and most clearly; hence Juvenal writes, among other things, "Worse than the punishments one must suffer in Hades is the punishment of having to bear one's own witness in one's breast day and night." To this also belongs Gerhard's saying, "Conscientia est frenum ante peccatum et flagellum post peccatum."

Where conscience takes the form of accusation, or appears as an accuser, it appears as an evil conscience, Heb. 10:22, or as an impure, defiled conscience, Titus 1:15. Accusation puts the man in a bad mood.

The man is in fear and anxiety because he is aware that he has gone against God and His law. "An impious man who suffers in conscience endures more misery than he who suffers in body and is beaten with whips," says Pythagoras. And Plautus in *captivis* says, "If I have done wrong, I must torment myself; would that what I have done could be undone! There is no greater torment than an evil conscience!" An evil conscience is the consciousness of a man that things are not right between him and God, as may be seen from Heb. 10:22. The same is called Hebr. 10, 2. also a "conscience of sin," that is, a consciousness of having unatoned sin. Such an evil conscience is found among the heathen. The sacrifices which they offer to their gods in various forms prove that they do not trust in peace, and the purpose of their sacrifices is to make the deity incline toward them; all this would not be necessary if they did not fear that something was not right between them and the deity. The evil conscience comes out most clearly through the preaching of the divine law, especially when it strikes through and ignites in the heart. In this it may happen that the accuser asserts himself in such a way as to mock all human efforts to get rid of him, that, perhaps pushed back for years, he now suddenly appears with such irresistible force that he becomes an intolerable torture to him, so that we speak of remorse. A sad example of this from the New Testament is Judas Iscariot. Cicero speaks of "arrows of the gods" boring into the minds of the wicked; and the Greeks speak of "gnawing grief" and "consuming disease" which conscience causes them. To the question, "What sickness kills thee?" a matricide answers in the poet Euripides, "Conscience." Remembering the suicide of Tiberius, Tacitus says (*Annal.* VI, 6.): "Tiberius was not protected by his happiness, nor by solitude, confessing that the torments which tore his heart were his punishment."

But strangely enough, this mighty power, this incorruptible judge in man, can also be checkmated; the master can become the mastered, and the mastered can ascend the throne of the master, even if only relatively. Conscience, after all, is subject to influences on our part and obeys them to a certain extent. We can, in fact, beat it, dull it. By continually avoiding the admonitions of conscience, by not listening to them, conscience is dulled. It loses its fine sensorium. And the more, the more consistently this resistance is carried out, the more the stirrings of conscience cease. It is made calloused and insensible, as, for instance, the hands of a blacksmith are made calloused and insensible by the constant touching of the hot iron. From the-

The ancient pagans also knew of this condition. Thus Epictetus speaks of a *ἀπολῶσις*, a moral petrification, admittedly without the true Cause of it to know.

We have here a complete analogue between conscience and olfactory sense. He treats us as he is treated by us. If we do him justice, if we avoid such atmospheres as he resists, he will do what is his duty. But if we do violence to him, if we do not listen to his admonition, he is weakened, and in the end he is indifferent to every atmosphere.

In this way we can undoubtedly explain the great moral depravity among the pagans. Men outside of divine revelation stood, as it were, between two fires: on the one side the testimony of conscience, on the other the innate inclination to evil, which as a rule came out victorious. "They held up the truth by unrighteousness," that is, held it down, says the apostle Rom. 1:18. This constant "beating" of the conscience finally led to the point that evil could be thought good, and good evil, without the conscience yet reacting against it. Each people had its own individuality, its own predominant sinful tendency. The one was more inclined to fornication, the other more to death, the third more to theft. By indulging in these sins, the troublesome witness and accuser was more and more silenced, and at last he was got rid of in one way and then in other ways. Thus not only did a false moral tradition develop among the heathen, but their moral views also showed great diversity in detail, so that, for example, among the ancient Germans we find high regard for marriage and chastity, high regard for the property of others, high regard for the promise made, while other peoples considered fornication, theft, and disloyalty to be right. And again, while among other peoples, such as the Spartans, intemperance in drinking was contrary to their moral concepts, drinking was in perfect accord with the views of the ancient Germans.

Already from what has been said it is evident with evidence that conscience is more than mere human opinion, and that it is nothing with the flattening which some aim at in regard to conscience. According to some, *συνείδησις* is said to be only another expression for *σύνεσις* (sense, understanding).

Such alone forget that Tit. 1, 15. the apostle says of unbelievers, "Unclean is both their mind and conscience." How this is to be understood is shown by the next verse: "They say they know God; but with works they deny it." Denying with works indicates their unclean mind, and the result of denial is an unclean conscience.

This is quite consistent with the opinion of those who want to see nothing else in conscience than the product and result of

The first is that a man reproaches himself when he has done something that does not accord with the views he has been brought up with. "Of this supposedly empirical explanation of conscience . . . must simply be said, it flies in the face of all empiricism, of all real experience." (Martensen.) And so it is indeed.

We must not overlook the fact that the judgment which conscience pronounces is quite different from the judgments which are otherwise formed in our minds. When we examine and consider a matter, and in this way come to the conviction that we have acted wrongly, this is by no means the activity of our conscience. Conscience proceeds in quite a different way. Where it develops its activity, no deliberations and conclusions take place, but without these aids it impresses upon man the stamp of certainty; the moment he hears the accusation, in the same moment man is also convicted; to accuse him and to convict him are one and the same thing. The apostle does not say that the conscience justifies and disputes with the Gentiles, but rather that it testifies to them, gives its voice and testimony in them.

If we want further insight into the *ἀπολ& ωσις*, we hear, as the apostle Rom. 13, 5. admonishes the Christians to "not only be subject to the authorities out of necessity, but also for the sake of conscience". Higher than the first term, then, stands the second for the apostle. Conscience signifies more than mere human obligation and duty; it is a higher authority. It is also more than human opinion; it is a moral power in man which falls to right and truth. Only in this way can it be explained that the apostle Rom. 9, 1. appeals to his *ἀπολ& ωσις* in proof of the truthfulness of his pain, and that he declares 2 Cor. 1, 12. his fame. His conscience testifies that he has walked in simplicity and purity. And again, when he says, "We do not walk in malice, but prove ourselves well against all men's consciences," 2 Corinthians 4:2, he can only do this insofar as he knows that a witness lives in them whom he can call for the truth.

But it does not follow from this that conscience can be the absolute moral standard, but that it must be sought in divine revelation, which must also enlighten, purify, and form conscience. To appeal to one's conscience, and thereby spurn the discipline of the divine word, can only do mischief. The apostle knows nothing of such a calling. He does not refer to his conscience alone in Rom. 9, 1, but adds: "in the Holy Spirit"; he refers to his conscience, which was also under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The apostle 1 Cor. 8, 7. also speaks of

a "weak" conscience that feels unnecessarily bound in one piece and has not yet reached the level of knowledge that others have already reached. In Worms, Luther did not refer to his conscience as such, but to his conscience bound in God's Word.

The Scriptures also speak of a good, pure, undefiled, uninjured conscience. These four terms are so closely related to one another that we can include them all under the term good conscience without exposing ourselves to the suspicion of misinterpreting Scripture. This is the opposite of an evil or bad conscience. Man can be freed from his evil conscience, Hebr. 10, 22. Christ's merit and faith in it is the remedy, Hebr. 9, 14. For as soon as a man grasps Christ's merit in faith, his evil conscience is cleansed, Hebr. 9, 14, so that man is no longer conscious of any guilt in relation to God. In Christ he finds rest and peace. In this sense the expression "covenant of a good conscience" is used in 1 Pet. 3, 21. - Far more frequently, however, another sense is connected with it in Scripture, in that it is related to the life, the walk of man, that is, of the Christian. The condition of a "good" conscience in such cases is a godly, godly walk; and is therefore the "good" conscience the consciousness of the Christian that, so far as he has acted according to God's commandment, he has walked rightly. Hence we meet with the connection: faith and a good conscience. Thus Paul exhorts Timothy, I, 1, 19: "And have faith and a good conscience," where the good conscience is based on the consciousness that he is really "practicing good chivalry," which is spoken of in the previous verse. That the loss of faith is always connected with the loss of a good conscience, is evident from the following words: "which (good conscience) some have cast away, and have suffered shipwreck in the faith." 1 Tim. 3, 9. it is said, "Who have the mystery of faith in a pure conscience," by which is meant the true consciousness that their walk is according to the mystery of faith. The ἀπολ& ωσις

ἀγαβη, 1 Petr. 3, 16. is based, as the end of the verse shows, on the consciousness of a good walk in Christ. Heb. 13:18. is literally, "Our consolation is, that we may have a good conscience, being careful to walk well with all." Here, too, the good conscience consists in the consciousness that one is making an effort to walk in a godly manner.

(Submitted.)

The meaning of the resurrection of JEsu Christ.

(Continued.)

2 The apostle writes in 1 Cor. 15:17: "But if Christ be not risen, ye are yet in your sins." Without Christ's resurrection we would have no assurance of our salvation, Christ's suffering and death could give us no comfort. Thus we find in Scripture that the two are always closely connected with each other, when it is a question of our redemption and of our Christian comfort, His suffering and death and His consequent resurrection. Whenever the Lord predicts his suffering and death to his disciples, he also adds that he will rise again. His disciples should only think of his suffering and death in connection with his resurrection, as the suffering and death of the resurrected one. And it is the same in the sermons and letters of the apostles, e.g. Apost. 17, 3. 26, 23. Rom. 14, 9. 2 Cor. 5, 15. 1 Thess. 4, 14.

But in what way does Christ's resurrection have such significance for the work of redemption? Not, of course, as if Christ had acquired and brought about redemption through his resurrection. Scripture attributes this to the suffering and death of our Savior alone. We must not divide and separate here, and say, for instance, that by his suffering and death Christ delivered us from our sins, and by his resurrection redeemed us from death. No, by his substitutionary suffering and death Christ did everything and suffered everything that was necessary to redeem us from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil. On the trunk of the cross the Lord, as the true high priest, offered his great sacrifice of atonement for all men, his sacrifice which is now valid for all eternity. When the Lord cried out on the trunk of the cross, "It is finished," and then immediately bowed his head and passed away, the great work of reconciling all men to their offended Creator was truly accomplished, there was nothing left to be done, everything had been done and everything suffered that had to be done and suffered to redeem us men. Christ did not purchase anything for us through his resurrection, but he makes us certain of our redemption through it. Christ's resurrection gives us a guarantee, as it were, that Christ has really finished his work, that he has really redeemed us men, all men, from their sins and from death through his death. Therein lies the significance of Christ's resurrection for our redemption. It is the confirmation, and indeed the necessary confirmation, of this work. The resurrection of Christ gives us the certainty that we are redeemed in two ways.

The Scriptures tell us that the Lord rose from the dead, that by His own power He broke the bonds of death and the grave. Death could not hold him. By his resurrection Christ gives us the assurance that he is the Lord of death, that he has overcome death and the devil. When the Son of God came to this earth, he came to destroy the works of the devil, to free us men from the power of the devil, from the bonds of death, by atoning for our sins and blotting them out through his substitutionary suffering and death. The Lord took our sins upon Himself and, as our substitute, fought the battle against the devil and death. In this battle the Lord sank to his death, wounded by the heel of the old serpent. If the Lord had remained in the grave and in death, it would have been obvious that death and the devil had won the battle, that they had overcome the Lord, and that the sin of the human race had been too great and heavy even for this strong hero to atone for. If the Lord had not risen from the dead, we would have no hope of salvation. But now the Lord is risen. By his resurrection the Lord proves that death could not hold him, the prince of life, that Christ has conquered and overcome this strong enemy. And when death is conquered, when life, incorruptible life, is brought again out of death, it is evident that the other enemy is also conquered, that the power of him who had the power of death, the devil, is also taken away. And when the Lord has conquered death and the devil, when he has taken away their power, it is evident that he has also atoned for our sins and blotted them out, and redeemed us from our sins. For it is precisely through sin that the devil has right, power, and authority over men; it is precisely through sin that death entered the world; death is the wages of sin. Only by this Christ overcame these our enemies for us, in our stead, that he was sufficient for our sins, and did them out of the remedy. Therefore Christ himself cries out, Revelation 1:18: "Fear not: I am the first, and the last, and the living. I was dead, and, behold, I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and of death." As the one who died and rose again, who conquered death and lives for all eternity, Christ has the keys of hell and death, that is, he has broken the prison of hell and death and opened it so that we can go out freely from hell and death. Thus also the apostle Paul writes Romans 6:9, 10: "And knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth not henceforth, neither shall death have dominion over him. For that he died, he died to sin once: but that he liveth, he liveth to God." Christ did not rise from the dead, as Lazarus did, who returned to this earthly life and died again.

Death conquered, death can no longer rule over him, has no more power over him. Once he died to sin, died in relation to our sin, to blot it out and make atonement for it, and thereby sin and death are now overcome, and so Christ now lives for ever in divine glory as the Lord of death. Of this the resurrection of Christ makes us certain, that he has overcome sin, death, the devil, and hell for us, in our stead.

But still more. Christ rose from the dead by his own power and divinity, and thereby proved himself powerfully before all the world as the Son of God, the true God. Through the resurrection of Christ, then, we are certain that his suffering and death is not the suffering and death of a mere man, though sinless. One man's suffering and dying, one man's merit cannot help us, cannot save us from sins, nor from death and the devil. "We Christians must know this: Where God is not with us in the scales, giving the weights, we sink to the bottom with our bowl. This, then, is what I mean: where it should not be said that God died for us, but a man alone, we are lost." (Luther, W. XVI, 2728.) But now, by Christ's very resurrection, we are assured, this Person, who here suffers and dies for our sins, who has taken our place, atoning for sin and overcoming death, is not only a man, but the true God. This suffering and dying is not of a mere man, but of God. And "when I know that he who is truly God has suffered and died for me, and again, that same truly man has risen from the dead, ascended into heaven, etc., then I can certainly conclude that my sin and death have been paid for and overcome through him." (Luther, St. L. VIII, Col. 386.) Thus Christ's resurrection makes us certain of our salvation.

Not only did Christ rise from the dead by his own power, but the Scriptures also tell us that he was raised by the glory of his Father. And it is precisely the raising of Christ through the glory of the Father that makes us certain of our redemption from sin. In that prayer which the first Christian church at Jerusalem, when persecution broke out on the part of the high council, sent up to God, they said, "Verily yea, they are gathered together concerning thy holy child JEsu, whom thou hast anointed, Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, to do those things which thy hand and thy counsel purposed before to be done." Apost. 4, 27. 28. Behind the Jews and the Gentiles, behind all those men who joined together to kill and crucify the Lord, stood God's counsel and will, God's eternal decree concerning His holy child Jesus. God willed that his child Jesus should suffer and die. It was God who

gave his son Jesus Christ into suffering, into death. God's wrath and curse was upon this Jesus of Nazareth, not because of his own sins, for he had none, but because the sins of the whole world were upon him and imputed to him, because these sins had become his own. For these sins God gave his Son into the hands of the unrighteous. And now God did not leave his Son, whom he had condemned for our sins, in the grave and in death, but raised him again from death, which he suffered as punishment for our sins. And with this God justified this Jesus, our representative, declared him innocent and free, innocent not only of the crime which the high council had brought upon him, of blasphemy and sedition against the temporal authorities, but also free from the sins which lay upon him, from our sins imputed to him. If God had not raised him from the dead, if he had not confessed him and his work, it would have been evident that God was not satisfied by the sacrifice of his Son, that our sins had not yet been atoned for before God, and that we were still in our sins. But God raised Christ from the dead and justified him from all our sins, which were on this holy and righteous man. God has thereby solemnly declared before all the world that through Christ all our sins have been atoned for and expiated, that through Christ we have acquired true righteousness, which is valid before God, that Jesus Christ is the only true high priest, who through his suffering and death on the trunk of the cross offered the true sacrifice of atonement, which is now valid for eternity, who with this one sacrifice has perfected for eternity those who are sanctified. God has declared that He has accepted this sacrifice of His Son as a fully valid one. By Christ's raising from the dead, therefore, we men, and indeed all men for whose sins Christ went to death, are justified; our whole debt of sin is thereby declared paid. Christ's resurrection is the general objective justification of the whole lost world of sinners. As his suffering and death was not fine punishment, but actually the punishment of the world, so also Christ's raising from the dead was not a riddance of Christ for his person, but our riddance; not a justification of Christ for his person, but our justification. As Christ hung on the cross not laden with his sins but with our sins, so now with Christ's resurrection into glory not Christ's sins but our sins are gone. What then was . . . Christ's raising from the dead? It was nothing else than a great general absolution of all sinners; it was nothing else than a judicial act of God the Father, by which he absolved in Christ all sinners for whom Christ had suffered,

He set their sins at liberty, paid their debts, and declared them righteous in his sight; he granted them life, and put death and hell under their feet, and opened to them all blessedness. 1) Thus the resurrection of Christ is, as it were, the seal which God set upon the work of redemption, the seal of divine assurance. Through the resurrection of Christ, God the Father pronounces His eternally valid Amen to the word of the Lord on the cross: "It is finished!" and we Christians can boast with the apostle: "Who will condemn? Christ is here, who died; yea, rather, who also was raised from the dead." Rom. 8:34.

This meaning of the resurrection of Christ is clearly stated in the scriptures. The main passage is Rom. 4, 25. In the fourth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, the apostle used the example of Abraham, that Abraham was justified in the sight of God without the work of the law, through faith in Him who "quickeneth the dead, and calleth him that is not, that he might be. The apostle then continues, that these things were not written for his sake, but chiefly for ours, to whom they should be imputed, "if we believe on him that raised up our Lord Jesus from the dead." V. 24. And then the apostle goes on to say, v. 25: "Who" (namely, Christ) "was given for our transgressions, and was raised for our justification" (τὴν δίκαιωσιν ἡμῶν).

A double statement of the apostle is found here. Christ was given up for our sins, that is, for this reason Christ was given up by God in suffering and death, that he might bear and atone for our sins; and he was raised from the dead for our justification, that is, God raised him again from death, that our justification might be effected, that God might justify us. "Illa enim est iustitia nostra," therefore Chemnitz says in explaining this passage, 2) "I. Quod filius Dei mediator factus est pro nobis, obediens patri usque ad mortem. II. Quod pater illam satisfactionem et obedientiam filii acceptavit pro reconciliatione et propitiatione nostra, id quod resurrectione ostendit. Ideo Paulus in imputatione iustitiae conjungit mortem et resurrectionem Christi." By Christ's resurrection our justification came to pass, by it God justified us, declared us righteous in Christ. "Excitando Christum a mortuis Deus eum ipso facto absolvit a peccatis nostris ipsi imputatis; ac proinde etiam nos in eo absolvit." 3)

This truth, that Christ's resurrection and raising from the dead is the seal, the confirmation of our redemption, also rings through in all the prayers of the Lord.

1) Cf. I)r. Walther. "Hom. magazine, Vol. II, p. 105.

2) Examen Con. Trid., ed. Preuss, P. I, p. 170.

3) Gerhard in Steinmeyer: Resurrection of Christ, p. 49.

56The meaning of the resurrection of JEsu Christ. which the Lord held with His disciples after His resurrection. This is the first speech that we hear from the mouth of the risen Lord when He speaks to Mary Magdalene Joh. 20, 15: "Woman, why are you weeping? "The Risen One, speaking to Mary Magdalene, turns His face to the whole human race, and asks the same, τίζλαδί; Why weepest thou? You have no reason to weep now." 1) By Christ's resurrection all cause for weeping is taken away. Now blessed joy must fill our hearts, for now we are sure that our sin is blotted out and forgiven, that death is overcome. In the commission which the Lord Christ gives to the women on that resurrection morning, he calls his disciples "his brethren". Through his resurrection we have entered into a right brotherly relationship with Christ; through this it has become evident that God is our reconciled brother, that Christ is our brother. Especially Luther interpreted this word "brothers" very beautifully in an Easter sermon. See St. L. Vol. XI, Col. 634, §§ 7. 8. 9. 12. When the Lord appeared to his gathered disciples for the first time after his resurrection, this was the first greeting which he called out to them: "Peace be with you!" Probably this greeting: εἰρήνη ὁμῖν, XXX XXX was the ordinary greeting of the Jews. But this greeting is with JEsu not a mere empty figure of speech, not merely a pious wish; his words are truth and life; in the mouth of the Risen One this greeting acquires a new and deeper meaning. By wishing peace to his disciples, Jesus proclaims to them that peace has now been acquired through himself, true peace with God, that through his resurrection the factual proof has now been given that God is no longer angry with men, but is reconciled to them. In wishing peace to his disciples, the Lord offers and communicates to them this peace with God, which he brought out of the grave and death, forgiveness of sins, and justification.

Through the resurrection of his Son, God has indeed justified all men. But we men must now enter into this new relationship with God, which Christ has brought about. We must direct and draw from ourselves this gracious judgment which God in Christ has pronounced upon all men, this general objective justification. This is done by faith in Jesus Christ. By faith we take hold of Christ's merit, take hold of God's justification, and appropriate it to ourselves, and so we are justified before God for Christ's sake, by grace alone, through faith alone. Thus comes the subjective, individual justification of the sinner before God. And also for our faith in Christ the resurrection of Christ is of the greatest importance. Thus the holy scripture leads our

1) Nebe, Auferstehungsgeschichte, p. 77.

Faith in Christ also refers back to the resurrection of Christ and connects it with it. For example, 1 Peter 1:21 says, "Who through him believe in God, who raised him from the dead, and gave him glory, that ye might have faith and hope in God." Upon Christ's resurrection our faith is founded. Now that Christ is risen, faith can come to us in this Jesus Christ as the Messiah and Son of God, who bore all the punishment and guilt of sin for us. Furthermore, the apostle Paul writes in Eph. 1:19, 20: "And which is the exceeding greatness of his power toward us, who believe according to the working of his mighty strength, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his right hand in heaven." According to the same effect of fine mighty strength God giveth us faith, according to the same power which he hath wrought in raising Christ from the dead. Again, alfo our faith is associated with Christ's resurrection. Christ, the Risen One, the Living One, works true, beatific faith in the hearts of His own by His Spirit.

Through true faith in Christ man is born again, a new spiritual life is wrought in him, the new man is created. "If any man be in Christ," says the apostle, "he is a new creature." By faith a man gets power to hate sin, no longer to serve sin, but to put it away more and more, and on the other hand to love God and what is truly good, to walk in a new life, and to pursue sanctification. And all these things also, regeneration, conversion, renewal, and sanctification, the Scripture calls the fruit of the resurrection of Christ. Scripture calls regeneration virtually a "dying with Christ to sin," a "being made alive and raised with Christ," a "rising with Christ," but regeneration and sanctification a "walking with him in newness of life." As Christ was once raised for us, so by faith He is to be raised in us, and we with Him. The power of Christ's resurrection is to work in us a spiritual resurrection from our sins. His life is to bring about a new spiritual life in us. The resurrection of Christ is not only an example and model for the spiritual resurrection from sins, for a new spiritual life, but also a cause of it. When a man by faith grasps and appropriates the resurrection and its fruit, the certainty of the forgiveness of sins, then the spiritual resurrection has just happened, then he has died to sin, then he no longer wants to serve sin, but to pursue sanctification in the power of his risen Saviour. "If thou comfort my heart," says the Psalmist, Ps. 119:32, "I will run the way of thy commandments." When God comforts our hearts with the consolation of the forgiveness of sins,

makes us certain in faith of the forgiveness of our sins, then we walk in the way of his commandments, then we become joyful and glad to walk in newness of life. And the risen living Saviour is with his believers and gives them power and strength through his Spirit to resist the temptations and temptations of Satan and to dampen and overcome the lusts of the flesh more and more. Therefore Luther also writes: 1) "For, as St. Paul says here (Col. 3:1-7), the excellent work and high treasure of Christ's resurrection is not to be a useless, idle, and ineffective talk or thought, as a dead image carved in a stone or painted on paper; but such a power and might as works in us through faith also a resurrection; which he calls: That is, to die to sin, to be snatched out of the power of death and hell, and to have comfort and life in Christ; as he plainly said of this in the other chapter: 'Ye are buried with Christ through baptism, in whom also ye are risen with him through faith, whereby God worketh in you?' Col. 2:12." Gerhard also reckons among the fruits of Christ's resurrection *renovatio nostra*. "Ideo vero," he writes, 2) "*renovatio nostra inter fructus Dominicae resurrectionis refertur, quia renovationis nostrae non tantum figura et exemplum, sed etiam causa in ea nobis proponitur*. Eph. 2, 5."

This truth, that our rebirth and renewal is a fruit of Christ's resurrection, is spoken in many passages of Scripture, e.g. Eph. 2, 4-6. Col. 2, 10-13. 3, 1-7. 1 Petr. 3, 21. 2 Cor. 5, 15. All these passages say this: that we are born again, that we have passed from spiritual death to spiritual life through faith, which is the fruit and effect of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, which comes from Christ being alive, risen and glorified. Especially important are the passages Rom. 6, 1. ff. and Phil. 3, 8-10. Let us have a closer look at these two passages. First Rom. 6, 1. ff. In the first five chapters of his letter the apostle had explained his theme that the gospel of Christ is the power of God that saves all who believe in it. It was now necessary to reject the false conclusions that could be drawn from this teaching. The apostle himself interjects v. 1. "What then shall we say to this? shall we persevere in sin, that grace may be the more powerful?" With a most decided, "Let this be far off!" the apostle rejects this shameful conclusion from right doctrine. We Christians, after all, are dead to sin; how should we wish to live to sin? We are already dead to sin

1) S. L. XII, col. 513.

2) Baieri Comp. ed. Walther, Vol. III, p. 94.

in holy baptism. And now the apostle reminds the Christians of their baptism, how they were baptized into Christ's death and resurrection through it, and how they were made partakers of Christ's death and resurrection through it, so that they could no longer serve sin, could no longer persist in sin, but had to walk before God in a new life. Throughout the whole passage there runs like a red thread this twofold thought, that through Christ's death, by means of baptism into it, we are taken from the power, the ban, the dominion of sin, and through Christ's resurrection, by means of baptism, we are translated into a new, spiritual life. Hence the apostle v. 5. says, "If we be grown together in the likeness of his death, we shall be grown together in the likeness of his resurrection." By the power of Christ's resurrection through baptism, a man is spiritually resurrected, born again, and regenerated.

The apostle Phil. 3, 8-10 speaks in a similar way. The apostle says that he considers the Jewish-Pharisaic righteousness, which he used to profit from before his conversion, now as harm and dung, so that he might win Christ and His righteousness, the righteousness of faith. For, continues the apostle, v. 10, "To know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, that I might be made like unto his death, that I might come to meet the resurrection of the dead." When, therefore, a man hath by faith apprehended the righteousness of Christ, and is justified therefore by faith, it cometh to pass with him, that he knoweth or knoweth Christ, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, that he may be made like unto Christ's death. The same thought is expressed here as in Romans 6:1 ff. A believing Christian is conformed to the death of Christ; he has died like Christ, spiritually dead to sin, and experiences the power of Christ's resurrection. By the power of Christ's resurrection he is spiritually risen, become a new man, a new creature, and so, walking in a new life by the power of Christ's resurrection, a Christian comes toward the resurrection of the dead, toward eternal life. The apostle here speaks expressly of the power of Christ's resurrection. Christians experience this power in faith, rebirth and renewal.

So it is true, because Christ is risen, we are no longer in our sins. We are now certain that God, for Christ's sake, has forgiven us all our sins and no longer imputes them to us. In the power of Christ's resurrection we also come out of our sins and walk in a new spiritual life, which finally leads to eternal blessed life. This brings us to the third meaning of the resurrection of Christ.

(Conclusion follows.)

Literature.

The biblical history of the Old Testament. Brief interpretation of the Old Testament history books. By G. Stoeckhardt, professor at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, M. 1896. 410 ropes. Gr. 8° format. Price: Hlbr. ed. v1.75.

This short interpretation of the Old Testament history books has emerged from the morning lectures that the author held in the Concordia Seminar here. The interpretation is carried out in such a way that first the story in question is presented in its main features and what seemed necessary for the explanation of individual sentences and expressions is interwoven into the presentation; this is then followed by a brief application of the story to our time and circumstances. In the preface, the author, after pointing out the origin of this "Brief Interpretation of the Old Testament History", comments on its use: "(This) could also be of some help to Christians who are not theologians in their daily Bible reading. Perhaps also one who has to teach Christian children biblical history and Bible reading will find in it just those points emphasized which deserve special attention in teaching." What is presented here will serve this purpose in an excellent way. The exposition and application are only brief, but sufficient to point out to the reader how the whole history of the Old Testament, and every part of it, is useful for teaching, for punishment, for correction, for chastening in righteousness, and for consolation. As a sample, we place the section "Abraham's Calling. Gen. 12." here: "Now begins the history of Abraham, the progenitor of Israel, the father of all believers. Abraham, or, as he was then called, Abram, was commanded by God to go forth from his fatherland, from his friendship, and from his father's house, to a land which God would show him. By God's command Abraham had gone out before with all his family from Ur in Chaldea. Apost. 7, 3. But his father Tharah had settled in Haran in Mesopotamia. So Abraham was supposed to move on to the place of divine destiny, the land of Canaan. But at the same time God gave Abraham a great promise. He promised him that he would bless him and make him a great nation. Yes, through him, that is, through his seed, Gen. 22:18, that is, through the One Seed Christ, Gal. 3:16, all the families of the earth were to be blessed. Abraham believed the promise and proved his faith in obedience, left his home, his friendship and went with his wife Sarai and his nephew Lot to the land of Canaan. Hebr. 11, 8. he passed through the land from north to south, dwelling first in Shechem, then in Bethel, and finally in Noah. Where he lived he built an altar and preached the name of the Lord. He was a stranger in the land of promise, and looked on the city which God had prepared for him above. Hebr. 11, 9. 10. We have a similar command from God as Abraham. Christ commands His disciples to leave father, mother, wife, child, brother, sister, to loose their hearts from all earthly ties. We have the same promise as Abraham. In Christ, who has now appeared, we are promised blessing, grace, forgiveness, life, blessedness. All believers walk in the footsteps of Abraham's faith. They believe the gospel, rejoice in salvation in Christ, confess and glory also in the name of the Lord, deny for God's sake, for Christ's sake, the things that are on earth, they have no abiding place here, but the things to come they seek." F. P.

D. Conrad Dieterich's Institutiones Catecheticae, that is, Thorough Interpretation of the Catechism of D. Martin Luther. Translated from the Latin by Dr. F. W. A. Notz. Second, improved, and increased edition. St. Louis, Mo. and Leipzig. Published by F. Dette. (In Leipzig by Ernst Bredt.) 1896. price: geb. V2.00.

Dieterich's Institutiones are among the best catechetical writings we have from the 17th century. They are free of all tedious prolixity and yet, for all their brevity, offer a mostly complete account of the catechesis.

The author's work is a fairly complete dogmatics in the form of notes on the catechism. Dieterich's *Institutiones* is a fairly complete dogmatics in the form of notes on the catechism questions. Admittedly, even in this work of Dieterich's the infirmities of later dogmatics are to be found, and in addition some which are peculiar to Dieterich. But teachers and pastors, for whom the work is intended, will easily discard what is incorrect and misunderstood. We are therefore pleased to call attention to the second edition of this German translation. In the doctrine of eternal election, Dieterich belongs to those later theologians of our church who seek to combine the teaching of Scripture and the Lutheran Confession with that of later theologians. This, of course, gives some confusion. Teachers and pastors, however, will find their way easily through this piece as well. Dieterich's position on the doctrine of election by grace was already discussed by our Synod of Delegates in 1881 (Report, pp. 82-83). This second edition of the German translation also contains, on p. 513 f., a number of orienting remarks by Prof. Hönecke, "Ueber C. Dieterichs Darstellung der Gnadenwahl" ("On C. Dieterich's Presentation of the Election of Grace").

F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

General Synod. The "Lutheran Evangelist" says in an editorial note: "Faith has a moral side (a moral quality) just as much as outward walk. We are as responsible for what we believe as for an outward act." Indeed! God has revealed to us what we are to believe in the Holy Scriptures, and whoever does not believe this, or only believes it in part, or believes something else, sins. Misbelief and false doctrine are sin. But from this it follows that all who have ecclesiastical fellowship with false teachers sin just as much as those who have fellowship with other manifest sinners. Unionistic practice is not love, as is usually supposed, but lax morals - loose morals. F. P.

Liberal Ethics. The Independent writes: "We cannot adopt the ethic which is overanxious, indeed, not to use any of the devil's money to fight the devil's kingdom." So writes the "Independent" in reference to the question of soliciting and accepting gifts from brewers for Christian institutions. What the "Independent" advocates is Christian indecency. If brewing beer is really a "devil's business," then the Christian church should not solicit and accept gifts from brewers either. What the Christian church needs in earthly means for the direction of its profession, it should not ask for from "the servants of the devil," but from Christians.

F- P-

II. Abroad.

Lame Defense. A Pastor v. Hanffstengel recently let himself be heard in Braunschweig: "In recent times, the Bible can no longer be regarded as a law book, nor as a historical, natural-historical or even theological textbook. All scientifically educated theologians, even the pioneers of orthodoxy, such as Stöcker, had abandoned the doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible as untenable. It was not possible to withhold the progress of theological science from the people any longer, merely out of consideration for the rigidly believing lay orthodox and the resulting discord. Pious deceit in this field would bring no blessing. Truth must be

Ecclesiastical - Contemporary.

be the guideline for every action. In school, of course, the doctrine of inspiration is still commonplace; the children are accustomed to believe that the miracle stories, errors, etc. in the Bible are just as true as its eternal, imperishable truths. Later on the young man would become ambivalent, and when he had come to the conclusion that much of what he had learned from the Bible was not possible and could not be true, he would quickly throw everything, his whole faith, overboard with the doctrine of inspiration. It was one of the most important tasks of pedagogy, he said, to tell children the truth openly and honestly in school, so that they would not lose their whole faith in the otherwise inevitable later doubts. He did not want to see the Old Testament eliminated; it had its great value as a preparation for Christianity. The main treasure of every evangelical Christian, however, will always be the Gospel, and he will hold on to this unwaveringly if he has received the right instruction and enlightenment about the outer form of the Old Testament and its inner value in his youth." To this the Stöcker'sche Kirchenzeitung replies, "that the editor of the 'D. Ev. Kirchen.' declares word inspiration untenable, but asserts inspiration as an absolutely inalienable piece of evangelical doctrine of faith. The consequences of the article are therefore erroneous". Indeed, a void and at the same time nonsensical excuse! There is no inspiration of Scripture without inspiration of the Word. Scripture is inspired by God. But Scripture consists of concrete words. Thus, the very words of Scripture as inspired by God are designated by Scripture itself and are to be believed by Christians. The "believing," nay, "orthodox" theologians of Germany do not seem to think at all what thoughtlessness they are indulging in when they speak of an inspiration of Scripture without "word-inspiration."

F. P.

A wild Christmas party took place in Berlin under the chairmanship of the former candidate of theology Theodor v. Wächter. He had announced in numerous leaflets, as well as on posters, that coffee and cake would be served free of charge. A large crowd came together and listened to his lecture on Christ, whose birth was "shrouded in legend," but whose person was honorable and lovable. In the discussion, the anarchist, locksmith Wiesenthal, spoke first: in his opinion, the method of luring the poor with food must have something hurtful for them. In future, he said, such extravagances should be refrained from. As for "this Christ," then, he, Redner, could not regard him as an "original head," nor Christianity as an original creation. Christianity was rather a mixture of Mosaism and Buddhism. Furthermore, he, Redner, would have to declare himself against any glorification of persons and thus also against the celebration of Christmas. If one wanted to celebrate the birthdays of all famous men, one would no longer come to work :c. Comrade Müller said: the workers should not concern themselves with such questions, but only think of improving their situation; later they could also read the Bible. (Applause.) Comrade Stresemann: If Wächter wants to hold another theological meeting, he should kindly note this, so that the workers would know where to go. The workers would have no use from such a meeting, but neither would the poor. They could help themselves without JEsus. (Consent.) Comrade Gent: In view of the freezing and homeless there would be no Christmas celebration. That can only happen later, when a better social order has been formed. To strive for this is the goal of the working people. Comrade Lüdicke: If guards...

If a man professes social democracy on the one hand and Christ on the other, he is a false teacher who must be guarded against. (A. E. L. K.)

From Italy. This year's Waldensian Synod determined that the Waldensian mission church comprises 45 congregations in 46 mission stations with a total of 5,326 registered church members. Including the valley congregations, the Waldensians count 19,640 church members, that is, members entitled to the Lord's Supper, 3208 Sunday, 2427 weekday and 561 evening disciples. Within the Waldensian congregation 73,461 lire were raised for church purposes during the last accounting year, including 17,537 lire for the evangelistic fund. For the first time in more than twenty years the Synod was unable to ordain because of a shortage of candidates. (A. E. L. K.)

From France. In France a World League against Freemasonry has been founded. It is called "Labarum" (as is well known, this was the name of Constantine's cross flag) and, as the "Germania" reports, already has numerous members from the clerical and secular classes. The duties of the members are: To fight the Masonic sect by all permissible and legal means, to favor the holding of meetings and the publication of writings for the purpose of fighting Freemasonry; to attend once a year a special Mass offered to God in the intention of the early victory of the Church over the Lodge; to offer up his life to God every morning for the conversion of Freemasons; not to associate with notorious Freemasons, either in business or otherwise, and to support the members of the League in all circumstances; and finally, to communicate to the Committee the names of those who secretly belong to the Lodge. In order to reach their goal sooner, the Labarists decided to fight the Freemasons with their own weapons; they therefore created an organization similar to the Masonic one, which, moreover, has a military character. Each member has to pass through various degrees, which are to be conferred under observation of all symbolic ceremonies and signs. To the lowest degree belong the "Legionaries of Constantine", to the second the "Soldiers of St. Michael"; one must belong to each degree for at least one year in order to receive the third and last degree: that of "Knight of the Sacred Heart". For women there is only one degree, that of "Sisters of Joan of Arc". Similar to the Freemasons, the Labarists also have members who are only loosely connected with the organization and who use the designation "Comrade of St. John". The Masons make use of the triangle as a sign and sign themselves as Br...., the Labarists name and sign themselves as Br. †. Each member signs a declaration on joining and chooses for himself a special martial name by which he is known only to his comrades. Each group is called a "Compagnie," similar to that in Masonic Lodges, and all together form the French Army of Labarum, which is divided into five sections or districts, and sends its delegates to the annual meetings, which are called the "Great Guard" (Grande Gardee), and correspond to the Masonic Convention. The head of the League bears the title of "Grand Chancellor and Secretary-General." For this purpose a well-known French writer has been chosen, who has assumed the name of Br. † Paul de Régis. In only one point shall the League differ from Freemasonry: it shall be by far less secretive. The members are not obliged to observe silence about what happens in the meetings, that is, in the "guards".

(A. E. L. K.)

The conversion of Israelites to Christianity has increased greatly in recent years. From 1872 to 1879, in the so-called liberal era, only about 66 Jews converted annually; in 1880 there were already 120; in 1888 the number reached 348, and in the last year it will have exceeded 500. The main share comes from the imperial capital, namely from the circles of the haute finance and the academics. Of the latter, it is again lawyers and philologists who, if they reflect on a state position, are baptized soon after passing the state examination. On the other hand, three men and 17 women converted to Judaism in Berlin last year. Here the motive was always marriage. The decree issued two years ago by the then Minister of the Interior, Grasen Eulenburg, to the district presidents has not remained without influence on the baptisms, namely that changes of name of Jews are to be permitted only in exceptional cases for 'particularly cogent reasons. This has only been the case twice in the past year. (A. E. L. K.)

Armenia. The appeal for prayer for Armenia, issued by members of the English state church, as well as the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregationalist churches, has the following wording: "Christmas is over, the new year has begun, and still the terrible tragedy in Armenia continues. An ancient Christian people there are given over to plunder, starvation, and all the horrors of martyrdom. This is happening before the eyes of all Christendom, with its knowledge, in a land for which it shares responsibility. Men are martyred, women insulted, children most shamefully maltreated; peaceful homes are burned. There can be no doubt about these facts; the consuls have reported them, and the envoys know about them. In addition, the accounts of eye-witnesses and photographs taken on the spot are available as proof. The majority of the unhappy Armenian people are without arms; only in a few exceptional cases have they risen up against their oppressors, after years of unsuccessful complaints. The cruelties, devastations and murders still continue unhindered. The protest of the European powers has so far only caused the atrocities to become worse and the misery of the unfortunate victims to increase. Thousands of men, women and children, without shelter or food, face the horrors of an Asiatic winter. It is unbelievable and intolerable that Christendom should still remain apathetic and powerless before this terrible spectacle. We appeal to all those who have an influence on the life and work of the Church of Jesus Christ and who are scattered throughout the world; we implore them most earnestly and humbly to gather all the power of prayer that is active in the Church and to implore God the Father, Christ our King, and the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, that this disgrace may cease; that the evil may be stopped, that our selfishness, indifference, and mutual jealousy may no longer hinder the mercy of the righteous God, and prevent the salvation of his faithful people, who keep the faith even unto death." So far the appeal. Even if the newspaper reports have greatly exaggerated, as is evident from the report of the Commission of Inquiry, it nevertheless remains that the Turks perpetrated horrible atrocities against the Armenians, and perpetrated them also because they thought the Armenians were Christians. This lamentation will go to the heart of every Christian and move him to intercession. The Christianity of the adult Armenians, who are partly "Orthodox" and partly "Catholic" Armenians, is in a bad way. They are drowned in workmanship. "American Protestants" have had a "mission" in "Christian Armenia" since 1831.

F. P.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42.

March 1896.

No. 3.

Frank's Theology.

Ritschl and Frank are considered the heroes and lions of the day in the theological world of Germany. Both men, though departed from life, still exert a profound influence through their disciples and their writings. The modern rationalists have rallied around Ritschl, while Frank is regarded as the chief spokesman and standard-bearer of the ecclesiastical-confessional party. Formerly the Positives broke up into different groups. There were distinguished Hofmannians, Beckians, Vilmarians, Hengstenbergians, followers of Philippi, not to mention the actual Union theologians. Nowadays almost all German theologians who still want to be faithful and Lutheran swear by Frank. By three voluminous works, "System of Christian Certainty," "System of Christian Truth," "System of Christian Morality," Frank has established his reputation. Several of his students have already published excerpts from his writings and have attempted to popularize the theology of their master, who walks in the heaviest armor of abstract, scientific terminology. After Ritschl's theology has been presented and evaluated in context in the last two volumes of this journal, we now want to present Frank's theology in its main features and see what we have to think of this newest achievement of "positive" theology.

Frank belongs to the so-called Erlangen School. He followed in the footsteps of Hofmann and Thomasius, who had already developed their entire doctrinal edifice from the Christian I, and has further developed this theological principle of his predecessors, which in the final analysis stems from Schleiermacher, and has allowed it to grow into a solid, closed system. Thus we orient ourselves first of all about the principles of Frank's theology.

Frank bases his whole system on Christian certainty. "Christian certainty is given to the Christian as such at the same time as his Christian faith and is inalienable to the extent that his Christian state is. To recognize and point out the nature and right of this certainty is the task of theology." *System of Christian Certainty*. I, p. 1. The Christian is conscious and certain of his Christian state. And this certainty is founded in the Christian subject, is independent of all external authority. "We have here to do with the central and specific nature of Christian assurance, where no authority coming in any way from without decides for itself, but the Christian subject himself and personally, on the ground and right of his assurance-for nowhere but in the subject and through the subject can this assurance take place." P. 40. But what is the specific nature of the Christian state, and therefore the essential content of Christian certainty? "The special moral experience that lies at the basis of Christian certainty is that of rebirth and conversion, of a transformation of his moral state of life, effected by ethical impulses that do not proceed from the subject himself, but are willingly accepted by him, by virtue of which a new self, as the innermost determinant of his personal moral life, henceforth distinguishes itself from the hitherto dominant one and, in the struggle with the latter, asserts its centrally dominant position." p. 95. This new, Christian I is certain of itself, at once the subject and object of Christian certainty. "The I as the object of experience and the I as the subject of it are here so immediately together that the I need only affirm itself in order thereby to state the reality of the fact of moral transformation." p. 103. And it is this central Christian consciousness, that a Christian is conscious and certain of the fact of moral transformation, or the new I, that is the principle and source of all further Christian knowledge and certainty. "The central certainty, which rests in itself, stands in indissoluble relation to the complex of objects of faith which constitute Christian truth, and in proportion as these are included in that central certainty, the Christian subject is assured of them as of truth." If we now ask in what way the totality of the objects of faith is assured as Christian truth to the Christian who is in possession of fundamental certainty, we must first of all reject the idea that this is merely a matter of logical conclusions by which the presupposed truth, authenticated by the subject, is to be proceeded to the other objects of truth, and the reality of the same is to be proved. That such conclusions exist also for Christian knowledge, and that they occur within the process of verification, is self-evident-Christian thought needs them, as does Christian thought.

But we must guard against this from the outset, as if we had to do with logical operations or even with speculative exercises in the certainty extending to the individual realities of Christian truth. It is a question of facts of which the Christian becomes aware and certain on the basis of and by virtue of a fact of which he was certain before." "The question is how, from the fact of the new spiritual self, from the moral transformation effected by regeneration and conversion, of which the Christian is certain as well as of his existence, and indeed as of his existence, the factuality of the Christian realities which faith holds as such, but which do not as directly as those constitute the essence of the existence of the new man, can be deduced. And the opinion is this, that with that fundamental, moral, and intellectual positing, there is simultaneously posited by the subject and for the subject the total complex of Christian truth, of which it can therefore no more divest itself than of itself." The Christian subject, by positing itself, by being certain of itself, is at the same time certain of all the realities, the objects of faith, which constitute the content of Christian truth. These various Christian realities lie latent in the Christian ego. On account of the fact that he is a Christian, a Christian is also conscious and certain of all these objects of faith, and need not first draw them out of Christian consciousness by logical conclusions. But Frank admits that there are such conclusions in the field of Christian knowledge, and speaks of Christian thinking.

Thus a Christian theologian has no need of a source and standard of doctrine and knowledge apart from himself. Frank denies that Scripture is such a source and standard. He acknowledges that the believing subject "is not himself, but of him who has helped him to faith," "knows himself bound to God." "But from this it does not follow at a distance that one must place beside this subjective consciousness something else, objective, as a principle of knowledge, for instance, the Scriptures or the confession of the church or something else." *System of Christian Truth*. I, p. 91. "Taking dogmatics for a complex of the statements of faith in Christian truths, which it is, it was asked whence the dogmatist got these statements or truths, and answered that he drew them from Scripture and judged them according to the standard of the same." "For us now, who presuppose faith and the certainty of faith for dogmatics, the question no longer comes into consideration how the Christian, who as a dogmatist makes the realities of faith the object of his knowledge and exposition, has become aware of them and certain of them. We approach dogmatics as those for whom those realities are there, and who do not first have to look around for a source from which we draw them, and for a

The first thing we want is to be immersed in them and to reproduce their essence in the form of knowledge and scientific representation. But since these realities form a coherent, self-ordered whole, a spiritual cosmos, in which each piece occupies its proper place, the knowledge of them and their representation in the form of doctrine can only be congruent and true when it is systematic knowledge and representation." (p. 85, 86) The opinion, therefore, is this. The Christian owes his faith in part to the Scriptures. But the question whence faith comes does not come into consideration at all for the Christian as theologian and dogmatist. It begins with the Christian self, which is conscious and certain of itself. In this all objects of faith lie resolved. The Christian dogmatist takes all the content of his teaching from within himself, and thus needs no other source from which to draw. He immerses himself in the realities that he carries within himself, and reproduces them in systematic knowledge and representation. And this system itself, in which everything fits together so well, is both a guarantee and proof of the truth of his knowledge and representation. And this system itself, in which everything fits together so well, is at the same time a guarantee and proof of the truth of his knowledge and representation. According to Frank, Scripture, as a documentary monument of the history of salvation, belongs to the complex of objects of faith about which the Christian subject decides of itself. S. 84.

I am not sure if I am the only one, but I am not sure if I am the only one," he said. The relation that exists between the I of regeneration and the natural I assures the Christian of habitual and actual sin. The Christian finds and knows himself to be born again in the state of righteousness; Christian consciousness is at the same time consciousness of freedom from guilt. The new self carries in itself the guarantee of the perfection of the new life in eternal life. With the fact of his moral transformation, the Christian has become conscious of a power apart from himself, and that an absolute, personal power, and the absolute, personal God is eo ipso the Tri-Personal. The reality of freedom from guilt presupposes atonement, and that is an atonement made by God to Himself on the part of man, and thus at the same time the fact of the God-Man is vouchsafed. The spiritual effect, the result of which is the new self, has been imparted to the Christian through the service of a community of which he now knows himself to be a member, and thus the essence of the church, of the Word, and of the sacraments is revealed to the Christian subject. Christian certainty is related to the objects of natural life, and this interaction assures the Christian ego that the God to whom it owes its own existence has also placed the world, and especially humanity, with destiny,

to be the humanity of God. All this is elaborated in the "System of Christian Certainty". This is followed by the System of Christian Truth. The Christian subject has set apart from himself the realities that form the complex of Christian truth, so that they now stand, as it were, objectively before him. Now it immerses itself in these results of its contemplation and looks at things in their "being-as-it-is." The Christian, as a dogmatist, seeks "to take hold of the essence of those realities and to bring them to understanding in their essence." System of Truth. Then he looks still deeper into them and discerns new sides and parts of truth. Then he recognizes that these realities are based on a real principle, that is, God; he recognizes the connection and the order of the objects that are summed up in that real principle. And so a new order of things emerges for him. He now took the path from top to bottom. God, the personal, the three-personal, stands at the head of all realities, and from this supreme principle proceeds a process of becoming. This process runs through three stages, generation (creation), degeneration (sin), regeneration (redemption, regeneration, justification, church), and comes to its end in eternal life. In the "System of Christian Morality," the various activities of the spiritual life and the norms for Christian moral action are derived from the fact of man's communion with God and the Christian moral self-awareness determined by this.

One moment more, however, must be taken into account in order to understand Frank's doctrine of principles correctly. The Christian subject gains all dogmatic and ethical Christian truths in the manner indicated only when it is "generally grounded." This Frank emphatically emphasizes in all three systems. The individual Christian, and also the individual theologian, is in solidarity in his individual personality with a great community, with the community of the Christian Church, or with "the humanity of God." And this whole alone, the humanity of God or renewed humanity, is "the filling place of divine truth." Therefore the individual personality must "enlarge itself into the comprehension of the whole." System of Christian Certainty. In other words, the theologian must take into himself the consciousness of the whole, of the church; in his reproduction of divine truth, he must make use of the knowledge and experience of the congregation; he must not ignore the teaching and the confession of the church. Of course, this knowledge of truth in the church, like that of the individual Christian, is still a nascent, an imperfect one. Therefore the existence of "open questions" must be acknowledged. (p. 64) And so, finally, the Scripture finds a place in the fundamental part of Frankish Theology. The Scripture "is classified according to the testimony that

the church of God speaks as God's word". System of Christian Truth. II, p. 409. Scripture is a part, "an extract," of the experience and testimony of the church, an "effect" of the church. It claims a dignity only relatively higher than the other testimony of the church, inasmuch as it is the initial proclamation of the church, the testimony of the original Christian church. "Therefore it cannot occur to the Christian consciousness to take dogmatic statements from itself otherwise than in harmony with this documentary testimony for knowledge." System of Christian Truth. I, p. 91. So well understood! When Frank also calls Scripture the norm, and even speaks of an absolute norm of Scripture, he means it in no other way than in such a way that Christian consciousness, in harmony with Scripture, takes the dogmatic statements "from itself. The Christian consciousness merely draws everything from itself, not from Scripture, and carries in itself the certainty that all that it sets and draws from itself is true, does not first seek the certainty apart from itself in Scripture. But because Christian consciousness is generally grounded, uniting itself with the general consciousness, the testimony of the church, it also takes into account the documentary, primordial testimony of the church, the Scriptures, and rejoices when it finds itself in agreement with it, and thus becomes certain, anew, through the consensus of Scripture, of that of which it is already certain through itself. From experience and the testimony of the church, above all from the original testimony of Scripture, the theologian, in constructing his system, takes a number of proximate determinations of dogmatic and ethical statements, theological names and terms, which he would not otherwise come to. In the article on the Trinity, for example, the Christian consciousness only gets as far as the reproduction of the three-personality. The names Father, Son, Spirit, the generatio aeternaa of the Son, the proceeding of the Spirit from the Father and Son, the dogmatist takes from Scripture and, in general, from the testimony of the church. Conversely, the theological discussion at some points goes further than Scripture, solving many important questions about which Scripture gives no information. System of Truth. And so Frank, in his Dogmatics and Ethics, also operates with Scripture and church doctrine and weaves Scripture words and sayings of church teachers into his presentation without further ado. But Scripture and the ecclesiastical confession never function as the source of dogmatic and ethical statements, nor as a norm that makes those statements certain, but as incidental, subsequent witnesses to the statements of his own consciousness. And finally, this testimony of Scripture and of the church flows from the same source as the representation of the theologian, from Christian consciousness, precisely only from the total consciousness of the church.

A Christian theologian cannot for a moment be in doubt as to what to think of such theological principles, which overturn the foundation of all sound Christian theology and turn the lowest to the highest. It is necessary, in view of this latest development of "ecclesiastical theology," to recall elementary truths of Christianity. The Christian religion has to do with divine secrets which have not come into the mind and heart of any man, but which God has revealed to us. In the Old Covenant, God gave Israel his law through Moses and made his counsel and will known to them through his prophets. Throughout the Old Testament the voice of God resounds: "Thus saith the Lord," and Moses and the prophets demanded of Israel only one thing, that it should hear and heed what its God told it. Lastly, God has spoken to us through His Son. The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, has declared to us what he saw and heard with his Father, and has opened to his disciples the mysteries of the kingdom of God. And the Father has declared to men from heaven, "Him shall ye hear!" Before His departure the Lord gave to His disciples for all succeeding times the One Commission, that what He commanded, entrusted to them, they should teach to all nations, that they might hear, learn, and hold fast. The apostles then passed on to Jews and Gentiles what they received from the Lord, and all who believed received their teaching for what it truly was, as the Word of God. The prophets and apostles finally recorded in Scripture all that God had revealed to them and through them to the children of men. And Scripture is not only a document of revelation, but is itself thoroughly the revelation of God, because it was inspired by God Himself. Scripture is not a product of the church, not an expression and outflow of congregational consciousness; no, it gives and testifies to itself as God's Word in the proper and only sense of the word. We need not prove this here anew. All that Scripture says and teaches, God says and teaches. But the Scriptures are not put into the church like a dead capital. The Word of Scripture is continually flowing and moving, being brought to the knowledge and understanding of individuals and the church through teaching, preaching, and instruction. The confession of the church, too, is only the echo of the testimony of Scripture. And all Christian knowledge consists in hearing, learning, and understanding what the Scriptures say and teach, in taking into our hearts and minds the divine mysteries which God presents to us in his words. Christian knowledge, Christian consciousness, is not an independent entity, but has God's word and revelation, the word of Scripture, for its correlate, for its object; it draws everything from Scripture. God gives, and man takes away. God speaks, and man

Man hears and learns. If the word, the Scriptures, are taken away, Christian knowledge, Christian consciousness, Christian faith shrinks to nothing. To the extent that a Christian refrains from Scripture and abstracts from it, his knowledge is vain nothingness, vain darkness. Frank's statement that the spiritual cosmos has entered the believing subject can be accepted in a certain sense. God has given a bright light into our hearts, so that the clarity of Christ is reflected in us. Christ is transfigured to the hearts of believers. But this does not take divine truth out of Scripture and put it into the Christian self. It is the Word of Scripture that ignites and shines in the heart. It is God's voice that echoes in the heart. And God's Word, the Word of Scripture is and remains an instance and authority apart from us to which the Christian subject is and remains bound. As soon as the lamp of the Word is set aside, as soon as the voice of Scripture fades away, the reflection and echo in the heart of man is also lost. Thus all progress in knowledge depends only on the word of Scripture. Through the sensible, pure milk of the divine word alone do we grow and increase in knowledge, in faith, in spiritual nature and life. Because the Scriptures are truly God's Word, because here the living God speaks to us, the Scriptures at the same time make us divinely certain of what they teach and reveal to us. And all this is equally true of theological knowledge. There is no essential difference between Christian and theological knowledge. A theologian who is called to teach the church is only to be at home and practiced in doctrine before other Christians. But what he teaches, he cannot take divine truth from any other place than where God has placed it, and that is Scripture. God himself has especially instructed and bound the theologians, the teachers of the church, to the Scriptures. Joshua, who was also called to be the spiritual leader of God's people, received from God the commandment that he should not let the book of this law come out of his mouth, but should look at it day and night. St. Paul reminded Timothy, his helper and successor in the ministry of the Word, of the holy Scriptures, inspired by God, as being the only ones that could instruct to salvation. Theology is essentially scriptural scholarship. A right theologian immerses himself in the Scriptures, seeks to lift up and bring into the light the treasures of truth which lie hidden therein, and in his thought and speech goes no further than the Scriptures lead him. In short, Scripture is the sole source of all Christian knowledge and Christian certainty, the sole source and standard of doctrine. This can be seen by anyone who still knows the Scriptures to some extent and looks at them with simple eyes. A theologian who denies this basic principle of Christian and Lutheran theology has forgotten the A-B-C of Christian truth.

The first thing that I want to say is that I do not want to be a part of the world, and I do not want to be a part of the world, and I do not want to be a part of the world, and I do not want to be a part of the world. The Christian consciousness, this principle of knowledge, is not in fact a principle of knowledge. This spring is not a spring. What Christians know and ought to know of spiritual, divine things, God has revealed to them; it is impossible for man, even for the Christian, to set it by himself. And God has revealed that in His Word, in the Scriptures, nowhere else. God has not set the Christian ego as prophet and revealer of his mysteries. Even the most central Christian consciousness, the consciousness of guiltlessness, is only a reflex of Scripture truth. The Scriptures tell and testify to the Christian, and make him certain that he is reconciled to God, that in Christ he has a gracious God. Whoever turns away his eyes and ears from the Scriptures and sinks into his own ego, the consciousness of freedom from guilt is soon swallowed up again by the consciousness of sin, guilt, and punishability. The Christian subject is much less able to take out of himself the other objects of faith, which lie more or less apart from that center. If a theologian nevertheless points out certain Christian realities as the result of his self-examination, it is a great deception and self-deception. To such a theologian, even before he begins his thought process, the fundamental Christian truths are known, known from Scripture, and what he knows and has learned from Scripture he then involuntarily weaves into his thought fabric. But it is almost incredible how Frank can imagine that he sees things as they are in themselves, that he takes hold of the essence of things after he has taken them out of his ego and confronted them, how he can then continue to regard and treat the fabric of his own thoughts as if they were objective, given quantities. That is truly building into the air and riding on clouds. This is subjectivism and swarm-mindedness in the highest potency. The Christian subject is neither object, source, nor even subject of cognition in Frank's sense. A Christian subject now and never operates according to Frank's method. It is not the Christian ego that sinks into itself and tries to spin out of itself the divine truth. The Christian ego, a Christian born of the Word, directs as a Christian all his senses and thoughts to the Word which is apart from him, sits down at the feet of JEsu, the Scripture, and says, Speak, O Lord, thy servant heareth. He takes all his own thoughts captive under the obedience of Scripture. It is self-delusion for a theologian to suppose that the Christian ego in him is doing the work, when he endeavors to build up out of his ego a system of Christian realities. And it is, after all, a tremendous self-deception,

if the systematizing ego of the theologian thinks at the same time that it has absorbed the consciousness of the church of God. No, the humanity of God, the true church, is no more the place and source of divine truth than the individual Christian subject, and the true church of God does not think of producing divine truth, but confesses and boasts and says to its Lord and God: Your word is truth.

But if it is not the new I of the born-again, it can only be the natural I, which theologizes or rather philosophizes out of itself. The common sense of man seeks here to take possession of the essence of divine things. In fact, it is nothing other than "logical conclusions," common operations of the intellect, when one deduces from one point, from the fact that the Christian has experienced a moral transformation, from this effect to the cause, to God, to the essence of God, even to the Trinity and the God-man. Frank's theology, which combats Ritschl's rationalism, is itself only a new kind and edition of rationalism, rationalism in ecclesiastical garb. It is natural reason which in Frank's systems picks apart Christian realities in its own way, dissects them, and again connects them, rhymes them together. But natural reason is quite blind and dark in divine things. And so it is *a priori* certain that all its toil and labor cannot bring to light a shred of divine truth. Natural reason, when it goes beyond its own sphere and intervenes in the sphere of revelation, can only judge foolishly and wrongly. And so it is no wonder that from this systematizing process of thought, as will be further confirmed to us, all the articles of the Christian faith emerge slagged, mutilated, and crippled. It is rather a miracle that Frank's mill of reason has not ground all Christian dogmas short and small, that Frank nevertheless leaves certain elements of Christian truth standing. That is not in the system, that is inconsistency. That is a remnant of Christianity that has still asserted itself in the face of the alien theological principle. And this inconsistency is the best thing in his system and is not his merit. It is to be feared, however, that future students will form the system of their master even more consistently and make a complete *tabula rasa* with revealed truth. Yes, Frank's theological principle of knowledge is an evil, hopeless thing. That so-called "Christian subject" which, independent "of any authority coming from without," "decides itself and personally on the ground and right of its certainty," that I which decides in its own authority in matters of faith and truth, which makes and sets doctrines, arbitrarily constructs God, heaven and earth, and everything out of itself, is in essence the I,

the spirit, the inner light of the swarming spirits, that is papal infallibility, that is the I which first reared up in our progenitor Eve and wanted to be like God. And this ungodly, anti-divine ego is naturally opposed to the fundamental truth of the Christian religion, namely, that God puts to shame all glory, all merit, all wisdom of man, that God alone by grace makes man blessed, that God alone wants glory. We shall yet see for ourselves how Frank's theology runs up a storm against the shiboleth of the Christian religion, against *Sola gratia!* and *Soli Deo gloria!* is running up a storm. This ego, which displaces Scripture from its dominant position and places itself at the head, which degrades Scripture, God's Word, to congregational consciousness, to the product of men, and subjects it, like all other Christian realities, to its criticism, is the natural, sworn enemy of Scripture. It will yet be seen how badly Frank's theology maltreats the simple statements of . Scripture.

All true theology serves only one purpose, the last, highest goal set for mankind, namely, the blessedness of mankind. The theology of Scripture, which takes all its statements from Scripture, fulfills this purpose. For the Scriptures instruct us unto salvation through faith in Christ JEsu. Right theology makes the ministers of the church able and skillful to interpret and apply the Scriptures rightly, and so to make blessed those who hear them. It is evident that Frank's system has nothing to do with this end and aim. As it refrains from Scripture as the source of truth and abstracts from it, so it does not enter any further into the question of what is useful and necessary to men for salvation. In the event that a system built up according to Frank's manner achieves precisely the same results that are already ready in Scripture, then one still asks *Cui bono?* It is enough that Scripture clearly and distinctly sets before us the way to blessedness. Why, then, such a detour? Why close our eyes, shut them against the light of Scripture, and then anxiously feel and grope whether we cannot find the same way by our own impulse and instinct? Surely that is wasted effort. No, Frank's theology has a different goal than that which, for example, the practical theologians pursue with their sermons. Frank's system is its own end and goal. The ego of the theologian, and this is truly not the Christian ego, is the beginning, middle, and end of this theology. This ego pleases itself in self-examination, and rejoices and finds satisfaction in it, when it has put all wisdom and truth, as it thinks, out of itself. Glorification of science, or, more plainly, self-glorification, is the conscious or unconscious tendency of all the work of that subject who himself, personally works everything out of himself. No, not the

Modern ecclesiastical theology does not serve the salvation of men, not the salvation of the church; on the contrary, it only promotes the ruin of the church, insofar as such idle speculation still has any influence on church life. All the errors that it has brought out of itself are poison for souls. And its whole principle and tendency is and has a corrupting effect. This apotheosis of the ego draws the Christian away from simplicity and humility in Christ, and only promotes the delusion and conceit of the arrogant man.

G. St.

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

Modern theologians' attacks on God's Word.

Where is there a field on which the enemies of God in our century do not organize themselves and gather for battle? Everywhere we meet the same common spirit of unbelief that distinguishes our time from earlier times, in that it unites the world hostile to God into a whole and, as the spirit of time and the world, makes every lost man feel strong. According to the prophecy, the spirits of the devils, even if they go different ways, will in the end gather Gog and Magog together against the Lord in the whole circle of the earth, "to gather them together in battle for that great day of God the Almighty. Revelation 16:14, 20:8. f. Where, then, have the appointed watchmen of Zion remained since this battle of modern times was spoken of? But probably only in the corner in which they have placed themselves; for if the enemy had met them on the wall, and their influence on public life had been still the same as in the time before the Thirty Years' War, we could not even discuss the philosophical, humanistic, beaux-spirited, Masonic, pedagogical, and literary campaigns against the Bible, without meeting the theologians further than it happens. They have gradually become the fifth wheel on the wagon. The orthodox allowed themselves to be lured into the philosophical spider's web, in which, while they played with science and world power, the power of faith was sucked out of them, so that they learned and practiced pure doctrine like arithmetic. After the victory over rationalism, a recent theologian wrote: "Theology has emerged dripping from the philosophical glut and must put up with being found most amusing. It wanted to be the fisherman who makes a move, and has fallen into the water with the larvae." (Ztsch. f. Protest. 5, 314.) The pious Spener testified with earnestness against leaving the fear of the Lord. His disciples, the Pietists, wished to raise up the Church of God again, but not with

They were not building with one hand and wielding arms with the other, but more in the manner of the hermits and monks who had fled the field. Instead of going out as men of faith with the sword of the Spirit against the enemy, they wanted to abandon the great heap and build little churches within the church out of the sighing Christians. They themselves drank from the open fountain of the abyss, taking back into the house the spirit of mysticism that had been driven out by Luther, and which in the meantime had wandered through arid places. One had too much spirit and thought too little of words. One gave room to a rapturous indulgence that tore spirit and word apart and let human feeling speak into the faith that God had once given to the saints. Instead of remaining firm with the Schmalkaldic Articles "that God gives no one his Spirit and grace without or with the preceding outward word," they soon lost the firm ground, the Scriptures full of spirit and power, and became "enthusiasts, that is, spirits who boast of having the Spirit without or before the word, and thereby judge, interpret, and turn the Scriptures or oral word to their liking.... . This is all the old devil and old serpent, which made Adam and Heva also enthusiasts, leading from the outward word of God to spirituality and conceit, and yet doeth it also by other outward word, ... just as if the Spirit could not come through the Scriptures or the oral word of the apostles, but through their Scriptures and word it must come". Many Pietists got so far down the slippery slope that they listened to the mystical arch-enthusiast Casp. Schwenkfeld, who had taught: "There is an eternal word of God, the almighty Father, and a transient external word, which has been written in the holy scriptures or letters. Both are as distinct as the silver from the silver, as the image from the truth, as flesh and spirit, as perishable and eternal, as creature and Creator; yea, as highly as the heavens are distinct from the earth, and the thoughts of God from the thoughts of men, so highly and much are these two words, namely, the inward word of the Spirit, and the outward word of the written letter, distinct in their nature and essence. He that buildeth upon the letter and the outward word alone is like a foolish man that built his house upon the sand." (Hast: *Gesch. der Wiedert.*, p. 189 f.) Thus they also began to chide the word full of spirit and life with the papists, philosophers, and mystics as a "dead letter". This was closely connected with the flirting with the fundamental error of all reformed sects, which does not allow the gospel to be a means of the Spirit's grace, but only a dead doctrine of a grace acquired through Christ, but distant and closed up in heaven; according to which the sinner who has been worked over by the law, although he lies on the ground like the gout-broken man, first runs and

to which he is to ascend himself by praying and storming heaven. Where this error has taken root, one is no longer sure what is God's word and what is free grace. The evil enemy was not afraid of the pietists who had left the solid ground. If they crept sighing around his castles, he became the more courageous to pour out his sack. The garden of God was soon to be a charnel field, Ezek. 37, was to be. The second generation of Pietists already produced a Christianity so unsubstantial, marrowless, sapless, and disjointed, that the power of the Church was sought in the Laodicean union ideas of Professors Pfaff and Thomasius. This did not cause the spirit of subversion coming from England and France any distress. "The Union theologian Tholuck must confess that "after 1730 the Pietism of Halle did not bear any more fruit. In 25 years 6032 theologians were trained at Halle; but there was nothing to be seen of them when the enemy broke in. "Neither in the time of Calove, Carpzove, Schelwige, nor in the time of a Spener, Francke, Breithaupt, could unbelief have celebrated such triumphs." The Hall orphanage became a seat of unbelief, and the Hall professors became among the most active enemies of the Bible. "The disputatious theologians of the seventeenth century had looked around proficiently in science. A Flacius, Calovius, Quenstedt instill respect in us still today by their knowledge. Since the Spener school arose, this changed." (Tholuck: Verm. Schr. II, 7 ff.) In this an unbeliever sees the main reason. But the main blame is to be sought in the fact that the firm and certain word of God was lost. There was no longer any watch in the church, as Cl. Harms says. The "men of the spirit" still fell in love with the Turk-god of the philosopher Wolf, brought the church under the Egyptian yoke of state tyranny, and became the drag carriers of the so-called Enlightenment. If individuals resisted at first, it was not with proof of spirit and force, and soon it was said, "Philosophy and maiden Echo always retain the last word." (Kzt. 1832, p. 349.)

First Semler's run-up.

J. S. Semler († 1791), the father of German rationalism, taught the young theologians to find honor in becoming parrots of the philosophers. Pietist and Methodist bellows had failed to accomplish revival with him; therefore he had early thrown himself upon Wolffian philosophy, which, as Claudius writes, carried it so far in the Demonstrirsucht as to hold a disputation on the subject: "A student is not a rhinoceros." That is something for young people who have fallen out with God. Semler also got into such a *räsonniren* and *Kritisiren* that already at his theological examination a superintendent told him that he

should see to it that he does not criticize beyond the Lord Christ. Of course, he also held his bit of reason to be the common reason, as has been the fashion ever since one has been working toward a general declaration of the infallibility of reason. As a newspaper writer in Koburg, then as a professor in Halle and author of 171 writings, the vain man became the "gatekeeper for the quietly ripening new ideas and systems" which the rationalist loudmouths simply called "science". He wrote: "I wished to prepare the way, as it were, for our comrades-in-arms, that they might all the more easily be led thence, from whence the open field might be further surveyed." His school "soon tore down the last barriers which stood in the way of free research" - with this lying name the sacrilegious critical addiction adorned itself, free of the fear of God, however, but enslaved by the prince of lies and darkness - "in the field of biblical criticism, and prepared the new results which have since been gained in all parts of this science and which finally transformed the whole form of theology in general. This is what his people praised him for (cf. Reuß: *Gesch. der hl. Schriften N. T.* p. 170. Credner: *Einl. in das N. T. I*, 43.), who called themselves the believers in thinking, because they believed or thought they were thinking, and considered criticizing to be the highest level of thinking. Semler enthused in particular about the Dominican friar Rich. Simon (f 1712), who sought to make the New Testament doubtful, considering "that the Protestants would be attacked from their most vulnerable side by a critical history of the Bible." (Credner: *Einl. in das N. T. I*, 31 ff.) With the Papists he begged his chief ruses. In the Gospel he found no more than a pandering to Jewish thoughts. At the Council of Trent, a prelate had also said that "the Cardinal of Cusa had very sensibly remarked that the meaning of Scripture must depend on the time, and that it must be explained according to the prevailing custom; that, therefore, one should not be surprised if the Church explained Sacred Scripture differently at one time than at another". (Wessenberg: *Kirchenverslgn.* III, 219.) Scripture is dark and doubtful, like a waxen nose, which may be turned as one pleases, wrote the great ones of the pope, as Canisius, Bellarmin, etc. In like manner Semler and his rationalists declared all that did not suit them in Scripture to be "temporal sayings," no longer valid for enlightened times; for Scripture was not written for later times, and the most important thing for the interpreter was "to enter into the temporal ideas of the common, uneducated heap." (Credner, II, 94.) The Scriptures were no longer regarded by them as the source of knowledge of divine truth, but they entirely abolished the distinction between them and other books, holding every book to be divine so far as it is spiritual and moral. "The concept of the canon is changed",

wrote Semler (cf. Reuß, op. cit., p. 132). In the evaluation of his writing: "Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Kanons," the "Göttinger gelehrten Anzeigen" (Göttingen Academic Announcements) of 1771 said: "Actually, this question is whether everything that we now regard as parts of the Bible was inspired by God, namely, by those who are the authors of each individual book. . . . What the author calls divine inspiration we do not know at all. Sometimes it is only a general government of providence that men of nobler insights have written out something that serves for moral improvement, and in this sense not only the Jews but also other peoples have had writers in their poets, legislators, and the like who were also inspired. Sometimes he seems to place the inspiration merely in the godly frame of mind and virtuous disposition of the writers, which, of course, was likewise wrought by God in the heathen." (p. 826 f.) The prophets were to him nothing more than Jewish secretaries of state. (p. 836.) He and his people regarded the Bible as a dark old book, to which at most "science" had a key. Theology, therefore, was to be only a science, independent of religion and "far different" from it. If at times divine revelation and inspiration were still spoken of, then only a light was meant by it, which one can also still search for in the heads of the newspaper writers. The sacred writings were old thalers, said the lüderlichen vr. Bahrdt after, which, though fine, are no longer valid. "A wise prince, he coins them and puts an efficient copper in them; there it may then cursire away again." (Corresp. Blatt, 1826. p. 294.) It was not at all disputed when the preacher Reinhard wrote: "Scripture is no more to the rationalist than any other human book." (1829. p. 563.) Only an ecclesiastical saying was supposed to have given it a higher position; unbelief heard no more of words spoken by the Holy Spirit. The philosopher Kant's word may be applied to such spirits, "One can speak of nothing with more audacity than of what one understands nothing." Scripture itself says of them, "Their person boasts like a fat belly; they do what they only think of. They destroy all things, and speak evil of them, and speak and blaspheme highly. What they speak, that must be spoken from heaven; what they say, that must resound on earth." Ps. 73:7 ff. This lie, too, that the Scriptures were a mere product of the church, was only begged off to the papacy. Without the authority of the Church, the Holy Scriptures had no more weight than Aesop's fables, said one in the Council of Trent. (Wessenberg, III, 211.) Already against Wiclef it had been asserted: "The church could just as well (as the so-called Gospel of Nicodemus) have rejected these four gospels and approved others, since it was within its free will and its authority to do so.

The Jesuits had the power to approve or condemn what they wanted, and therefore the people should believe the church more than any gospel. (Böhringer: Kirche Christi. Bd. 2. Abt. 4. I. Hälfte. S. 301.) In the confession, which the Jesuits demanded from the Protestants in Hungary (about the year 1673), it is even said: "We confess that the Roman pope has the power to change the Scriptures, according to his will, to add or to take away." (Harleß: Jesuitenspiegel. p. 60.) Such authority over Scripture rationalism also wished to claim for itself; therefore it asserted that the Church had made the canon. Enviously he looked after the Jesuits, who had stripped off all shyness before God's Word, and asserted: "Laxer notions of inspiration, especially among the Jesuits, substituted for them (the Papists) what ecclesiastical authority might take away from free movement. Strictly speaking, they ran less risk of being heretical by their own than did the Protestant interpreters." "It is possible that the movement that started with Zwingli, if it had been allowed to follow its first impulse, would have led to a more independent science"; but - Lutheranism with its clinging to the Bible word! Among the Reformed there would still have been a "freer development of science," and Semler wanted at least "to return to Calvin's concept of canonicity." (Reuß, op. cit., p. 244 ff.) He flirted with "Socinians" and Arminians as well as with Papists; for the authority of Scripture was to be overthrown at all costs. There was no enduring until "no authority was more valid than that of the Spirit" (that is, the spirit of scholarship); For "among all the deformities in which the demonic army surrounds the book of books, the lowest are those who, instead of the goat's beard, wear two white lobes under the chin, and over the body the surplice, and who, trampling the Bible under foot, and making the vilest gestures against the sacred, yet hold fast to the right of administering the Christian sacraments". (W. Menzel: Critique of the Mod. Consciousness of the Times. p. 120.) Could they then produce from history any proof that Christians scattered throughout the world would have come together to make a Bible? Not a thought of it! One of their school must confess, "Alas, we possess no tidings, much less any authentic monument, of the gathering." "The strange agreement of several eminent and distant churches as to the origin and standing of a certain number of Scriptures did not rest on the decision of a synod or other ecclesiastical authority." (Reuß. pp. 112. 109.) "The history of the Paschal controversy vouches for the fact that in the 2nd century no synods were capable of producing concordant opinions among Christians, and synods of that century, therefore, cannot have been the ones to which we owe the fixing of the canon." "Heracleon,

a Gnostic who lived in the first half of the 2nd century wrote a commentary on this gospel (Johannis).... From the fragments that have remained to us from Heracleon's Commentary, one can see what effort it often cost him to bring his system into agreement with the words of this Gospel. Why did he not rather leave the book aside, which was only forced to conform to his interpretations? Surely the book must have stood in reputation at that time; surely it must have been protected by a famous name." - "The Montanists and their opponents contended against each other with the utmost bitterness. Both certainly could not have united to accept the same writings as canonical. Since both of them nevertheless used these four Gospels, it is obvious that they must have attained canonical status earlier. Schmidt: Krit. Geschichte der neutest. Writings. 1804. I, 28. 136 ff.) Yes, of course, the sacred writings brought their authority with them as soon as they came from the hands of their authors. Their authors had received direct enlightenment and a direct calling from God to testify to the divine revelation in words which they did not speak, but which the Holy Spirit spoke through them. Cf. Joh. 20, 21. ff. Apost. 10,39-42. 26, 16. Gal. 1, 1. No one but them was given this promise. Joh. 14, 26. 15, 26. f. 16, 13. What the apostles said was canonical in itself and had to be considered so by every church, while the church could not make one line of an unapostolic man apostolic or canonical. Every official word of an apostolic man which could be proved as such retained its divine authority for all time, and only what was in writing could be proved in later years. "What an apostle wrote as such is by itself canonical, be it written to whom it may. What is a guide for one Christian is a guide for all; what is canon for one congregation is canon for all." (Ev. Kzt. 1829. p. 251.) One could only collect the canonical writings from the congregations who had received them from the hands of the authors, and bring them into a collection.

G. G.

(To be continued.)

(Submitted.)

The meaning of the resurrection of JEsu Christ.

(Conclusion.)

003 The apostle also saith, 1 Cor. 15:17, "If Christ be not risen, they also which are asleep in the Lord are lost." Those who have fallen asleep in the Lord are those who have died believing in Christ their Saviour. These who have died believing

Christians, says the apostle, are lost if Christ is not risen. If Christ is not risen, then we Christians have no hope for our loved ones who have fallen asleep, that they may live and be saved; then we have no hope for our own death, and our Christian hope of an eternal and blessed life is gone. This is how it would be if Christ had not risen from the dead. We Christians would be the most miserable of men if we hoped in Christ alone in this life. But now Christ is certainly and truly risen, and so those who have fallen asleep in Christ are not lost; we have hope for our departed loved ones, hope in our own death. Christ's resurrection is the firm ground of our hope. Christ's resurrection vouches for our resurrection. Christ's resurrection is the foundation of the Christian's hope for their resurrection and for eternal life. Christ's resurrection gives us that certain Christian hope which does not disgrace the fact that death is now a defeated, conquered enemy.

For this reason Christ came into this world, to overcome sin and the wages of sin, death, for mankind. He did it by his suffering and death, and by his death he made our death nothing. And by his resurrection the Lord makes us certain that death is conquered by him, that he is Lord over death, that death can no longer rule over him, indeed never could rule over him, that he, the Lord of death, when he died on the trunk of the cross, voluntarily laid down his life and took it again from himself in his resurrection. And the Lord has conquered our death for us, in our stead. Now we are sure that we have been saved from the dominion of death, that death no longer has any power over us, that it can no longer hold us, that we too will rise again in the power of Christ's resurrection, here to new, spiritual life and there also bodily to new, eternal life. Our future resurrection is based on Christ's resurrection. Now that Christ has risen by His own power and has proved Himself to be the victor over the death that reigns over all flesh, the words of Christ come into their proper light when He promises His Christians: "I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die." "I live, and ye shall live also." "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Since Christ, our Head, has passed through the grave and death, and has risen again, we know that He will not leave us, His members, behind either, that He has power to raise even our mortal bodies.

The main evidence for this truth is the already often mentioned 15th chapter of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. Visualize

Let us look again at the context of the first part of this wonderful proof of the apostle. The apostle wants to prove the resurrection of the body against the deniers of our resurrection. And he bases this on Christ's resurrection. This is the thought which the apostle carries through the whole first part of this chapter up to v. 28: Christ is certainly and truly risen; this no Christian can deny without giving up his whole faith. But if Christ is risen, then there is a resurrection of the dead, and in him also his faithful are made alive. The apostle reminds his Christians of the gospel preached by him, which they also would have accepted, by which they also would be saved, the gospel of Christ crucified and risen. He shows them how certain Christ's resurrection is, certain by the testimony of the Old Testament, by the eye-witness of the apostles and first disciples, and by his own testimony. Then the apostle continues v. 12. "But if Christ be preached that he is risen from the dead, how say some of you that the resurrection of the dead is nothing?" *οτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐ ἐστι,*

That is, "that the resurrection of the dead is not, that there is no resurrection of the dead. If there be no resurrection of the dead, neither is Christ risen; but this cannot be possible, or the whole preaching of the gospel, all faith and hope, would fall away. Christ's resurrection, that is the apostle's thought, vv. 12-19, is certain, and Christ's resurrection makes us sure that there is a resurrection of the dead, that God has power to bring life again out of death. But, some one might object to the apostle, it is true that Christ is risen, and thus it is proved that there is a resurrection of the dead; but how does it follow from the fact that Christ is risen, that believing Christians also will really rise from the dead? And so in the following passage, vv. 20-28, the apostle shows how closely connected with Christ's resurrection is the resurrection of Christians, and how that vouches for it and makes it certain. V. 20: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that sleep." The "firstfruits" refers to the firstfruits which the children of Israel once offered to the Lord from their harvest and from their herd. As this firstfruits offering was followed by the whole harvest, representing, as it were, the whole harvest, so also Christ in His resurrection presented Himself as the firstfruits offering to His heavenly Father, and thus vouchsafed the resurrection of all who sleep. Beautifully Luther also interpreted this word "firstfruits." He writes: "Yea, saith he, Christ hath well withstood the devil and death, because he sitteth on high, that no man can hurt him,

*) St. L. VIII, Col. 1148 ff.

But what do I get out of it? Or, how come I to this, because I remain behind, and am now in the power of the devil and of death? To this St. Paul finely answers in one word, saying: "Christ is risen, and hath become the firstfruits of them that sleep. For in this word 'firstfruits' he intimates that he is not alone, but that there are more to follow. For you must not look upon this man as having been raised from the dead for his own sake alone; otherwise we should have little comfort in this, if he should not continue, and be of no more use to us than if he had never been made man. . . . But therefore we must look upon him, that this dying and rising may be to thee and to me: and as he died for our sakes, and was laid under the earth, even as thou and I die and are laid under the earth; so he rose again for our sakes, and hath made the change, that as he was brought to death by us, so by him we should come again out of death unto life: for by his death he hath swallowed up our death, that we also should all rise again, and live, even as he rose again and liveth. Wherefore he is called the firstfruits of the dead, that he should go before and lead the whole multitude after him. For where the first is called, there is more to it than one person, but must be included those who follow after, the other, the third, and so on, all joined together, as many as are asleep; otherwise he could not be called the first, if he alone had risen, and no one should follow after him. . . . And what is more, in calling Christ the firstfruits of them that slept, he signifieth that the resurrection should be considered and understood as if it were already begun in Christ, yea, as if it were already more than half done; that what is yet of death should be regarded as nothing but a deep sleep, and that the future resurrection of our bodies should not be otherwise than as one suddenly awakened out of such sleep. For the most important and best part has already taken place, namely, that Christ, our head, has risen from the dead. But because the head sitteth on high, and liveth, he hath no more need, neither must we which are clinging to him, as his body and members, afterward. . . . Forasmuch then as Christ is passed over, and reigneth in heaven above sin, and death, and the devil, and all things, and hath done this for our sakes, that he should bring us unto himself, we must no more care for the resurrection, or for our life, though we go and rot in the earth. For now it is called no more than sleep, and is to be done before him but for one night, that he should awake us out of sleep."

The apostle then goes on to say in v. 21, 22: "Through one man, through Adam, death came into the world. For in Adam they all die. In Adam all who have Adam's nature and being about them are subject to death. Through One Man comes the resurrection of the

For in Christ they are all made alive, all who belong to Christ, all who are planted in him through faith, are made partakers of a new life in him; they are taken from the dominion of death. The resurrection of believers, the resurrection to eternal life, is based on Christ's resurrection. V. 23-28. Still the apostle carries out the thought that Christ's resurrection vouches for the resurrection of his believers. First Christ rises, the firstfruits; and he rises that he may reign, be king of his church, and fully lay all his enemies, who are already overcome, at the footstool of his feet, and deliver his church from them. And this is where the reign of Christ, the reign of the Risen Lord, finally comes to pass, so that even death, as the last enemy, is completely laid low and swallowed up by life, by eternal life.

The same way the apostle speaks 1 Thess. 4, 10. ff. Also here he only speaks of the resurrection of the believers. He calls their death only a pity, because through Christ's resurrection their resurrection is guaranteed. He assures that Christians have hope for those who sleep, that God will raise them up again, and bases this hope on Christ's death and resurrection. And so it is in many passages, e. g. Col. 1, 18. where Christ is called "The firstborn of the dead," 1 Cor. 6, 14. 2 Cor. 4, 14. 1 Pet. 1, 3. 4. Apost. 26, 23. Phil. 3, 10. 11. Rom. 8, 11. etc.

Thus the Scriptures everywhere base the resurrection of the righteous and the faithful on Christ's resurrection, namely their bodily resurrection, the resurrection of the body. As Christ was bodily resurrected, so also the believers will be bodily resurrected, that is, they will be given back the same bodies they had on earth. The Lord, says the apostle Rom. 8, 11, will raise "our mortal bodies", the same mortal bodies that we have here on earth, but they will then no longer be mortal. The substance of the bodies will be the same, but they will have completely different characteristics, a different form, and a completely different way of being than here on earth. "The Lord will transfigure our vile body," says Phil. 3, 20.

The apostle says that he will transform us, change us, give us a different form. He will transform our lowly body so that it will be conformed to the body of his glory. A body of glory, a glorified, glorious body, the Lord brought forth from the grave. This is how the evangelists describe the body of the Lord. The Lord did not form a new body for Himself when He rose from the dead, but the same body that was formed from the essence of the Virgin Mary, this same body the Lord made alive again. The tomb was empty when the Lord rose from the dead. His disciples knew the HErr again, they recognized Him by His old familiar voice. The Lord carried the desire

and showed them to his disciples. He let them touch him to prove that he was not a spirit but had flesh and bone, and since they still did not want to believe, he ate and drank with them. But this body of the Lord had completely different characteristics. The Lord no longer comes and goes in human fashion, but appears and disappears. Suddenly he stands in the midst of his disciples, and they know not whence he came; just as suddenly he disappears again, and they know not whither he has gone. The Lord is no longer bound by the barriers of space. He rises and goes forth from His tomb, since it was still shut up with the stone. He stands in the midst of his disciples, though they were gathered together with the doors shut. The body of the Lord was now transfigured, it was a spiritual body, it was no longer bound by the limits of space and time, it was free from all human weaknesses and imperfections. "He is called a spiritual body," says Gerhard, 1) "not because he has no flesh and bones, and is changed into a spirit, but because, though the corporeal substance remains, he is endowed with the properties of the spirit. But these are the properties of the spirit, that it is invisible, that it does not move successively from one place to another after the manner of this world, that it has no need of food or drink, that it passes through solid bodies without hindrance," etc. Such a spiritual body had the Lord when he came forth from the grave. And when the Lord appears to his disciples and makes himself visible to them, when he lets them touch him and eats and drinks with them, he does not do this out of necessity, as if he had to eat and drink to preserve his spiritual body, but he does it for the sake of his disciples, for our sake. He wanted to make his disciples certain of his resurrection, so that they would be eye and ear witnesses of it for all time, for all generations of men.

And the body of the believers will be similar to this body of Christ. The Lord will raise it up, as the apostle says, in incorruption, in glory, in power, in immortality. "A natural body is sown, and a spiritual body shall rise," a body no longer bound by space and time, free from all human weakness, and a docile instrument of the soul.

Our resurrection is based on Christ's resurrection. Because our head is risen, we are sure that we, his members, will not be left behind, but will rise with him. Christ's resurrection, then, is the ground of our Christian hope of eternal blessed life. Without Christ's resurrection our hope falls away altogether. But, interject the rationalists here, how can all our hope in Christ's resurrection be

1) Citirt bei Nebe I. a. O., S. 135.

hang? The resurrection of the body is based on Christ's resurrection, but it is not essential. Even if we reject Christ's resurrection, and thus the bodily resurrection in general, we still have the full consolation of eternal life. Though our bodies may not rise again, yet our souls are immortal and live forever in God. But let us remember that such an immortality of the soul, so completely detached from the bodily resurrection, is nothing but a figment of our imagination. We have no scriptural ground for it. Scripture knows nothing of such immortality of the soul without the resurrection of the flesh. The Scriptures point us with our hope chiefly to that great day when the Lord will come again, when he will raise the dead, and then both body and soul will rejoice in the living God. The apostle Paul having said, that if Christ be not risen, they also which have fallen asleep in him are lost, adds, 11 Cor. 15:19: "If we hope in Christ alone in this life, we are the most miserable of all men." If there is nothing in the resurrection of Christ, then we hope in Christ in this life alone, then there is no other life, then we live for this earthly life alone, for this short span of time, and then it is best to live on the principle, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall be dead," and yet with death all is over. There is only an either-or here. Either Christ is not risen, and then the pantheists and materialists of our time are right; then there is no bodily resurrection, no immortality of the soul, no personal continuance after death; then we Christians are fools to hold fast our faith and our hope; or else Christ is risen, - as he certainly and truly is - and then it follows with inexorable consistency that our Christian faith is true, that our Christian hope stands firm even against the gates of hell and death. Then we Christians may no longer lament at the death of our loved ones as those who have no hope, because we know, since Christ died and rose again, that God will lead those who have fallen asleep with Him through Jesus, then Christians are no longer the most miserable, but the most blessed of all men, because we have passed from death to life, to eternal life.

Thus the hope of each individual Christian for eternal life is based on Christ's resurrection. Through Christ's resurrection it becomes a certainty of faith. But on Christ's resurrection rests also the hope of the whole Church, the hope of her final, complete redemption and deliverance. "God raised Christ from the dead and seated him at his right hand in heaven," says the apostle Ephesians 1:20 ff, "above all principality, power, authority, dominion, and all that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come.

And hath put all things under his feet, and hath made him the head of the church over all things." "For this cause also," Rom. 14:9, "Christ died, and rose again, and was quickened, that he should be Lord over them that are dead and alive." As the risen and exalted Christ now administers his royal office, is the king of grace of his church, distributes through his Spirit the benefits he has acquired, brings his own into his kingdom through his Spirit, is with them always to the end of the world, protects and preserves his church so that even the gates of hell cannot overpower it, and extends it ever further to the ends of the earth. Thus Christ reigns as King until all his enemies are laid at the footstool of his feet. And when at last the last enemy, death, is utterly laid low, then Christ delivers up his kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all, "then shall be fulfilled the word that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. Death, where is thy sting? Hell, where is thy victory? But the sting of death is sin; but the power of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which hath given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 15, 55-57.

This is the meaning of the resurrection of Christ. It is the reason for our faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and our Savior and Redeemer. It is the assurance of our salvation and our righteousness before God. It is the foundation of our Christian hope. It is the foundation of our whole Christian worldview. He who takes away Christ's resurrection takes away Christian faith and hope altogether. This we must therefore steadfastly hold to in the face of all attacks, all scorn and derision of unbelief; this we must more and more make the centre of our preaching, of our exhortation and consolation, this great salvation fact of God: The Lord is risen, he is truly risen, raised by the glory of the Father, that we also, having died to sin, may walk in newness of life, here temporally and there eternally.

G. M . . . r.

Miscellany.

The Stundists in Russia. The number of Stundists in Russia is at present estimated at 250,000. Most of them live in the southern third of European Russia, while only a few are found in the north. It is well known that since 1870 they have suffered much from the repressive measures instigated by the Russian clergy. Prof. G. Godet has recently published a small paper on this subject, in which he also gives an interesting characterization of the sect. According to this, the Stundists form an evangelical current with a reformist tendency. In the Holy Communion they see only the memorial meal, most of them also reject the

Some of them do not want to know anything about the sacraments. Their one and only thing is the Bible, which they read a great deal, both alone and in company with others. Since the publication of a pocket-sized New Testament in 1864, they carry it with them everywhere. Admittedly, since they lack theological education, they come up with many a wonder and one-sidedness. Thus they reject war, the taking of interest, and consider the existing agrarian property rights inadmissible. These latter ideas were probably what made them appear in the eyes of the Russian Emperor as a communist and anarchist sect, over which persecution was then opened. And yet the Emperor has no more quiet, industrious, peace-loving, and devoted subjects than the Stundists. They distinguish themselves from their peers by their orderliness, cleanliness, and moderation. The spirits, to which the Russian people are so devoted, they have renounced from the beginning. The Stundists do not have a common creed; the Bible holds this place among them, and as there is no lack of different interpretations, there are also divergent views among them. But they do have a certain ecclesiastical organization. According to the biblical model, presbyters, elders, preside over their congregations, chosen from among the older, experienced men. They lead the common worship and officiate at marriages and funerals. Although they are not theologically educated, they must be well versed in the Scriptures. They also have to visit the congregations and maintain their communications. Among them are zealous young deacons, who represent the elders in the church service, keep the church books, and especially take care of the youth and the sick. Of course, these elders and deacons are not professional clergymen, but they work beside this office like the others. They also receive no salary, but are only compensated for official tires. This organization, however, has been disturbed by the persecution of recent years. Since these leaders of the congregation were primarily targeted, they could no longer move freely and openly exercise their office. The service of the Stundists is described as follows: They clear out the largest room in one of their houses, place a small table with a white tablecloth at one end of the hall and a chair for the preacher. When the people have entered, they greet each other with the brotherly kiss, men and women separately, and sit down. Then they sing, and the ear witnesses praise the special beauty of their songs (which are only partly translated from English) and their singing style. Then a chapter from the Bible is read and explained by the elder, after which everyone is free to add something. The women are not allowed to speak, but they are allowed to do so in prayer. The prayer is done on the knees. Finally, the service is concluded with the

Our Father concluded. The form of the marriage is also significant. The parents of the betrothed present her to the eldest. He first asks the bride: "Is it your own free will to be united in marriage to this young man, or has someone, your parents or someone else, forced you to do so? She answers: It is my own free will. Then she is asked: Do you love this young man? Finally, will you love him and care for him when he is old and sick? After the bridegroom has answered the same questions, the congregation sings a song that contains a beautiful prayer for the bride and groom. The elder then calls them to embrace and join their hands. This concludes the ceremony. Of course, such a wedding ceremony has no official validity. Only those performed in the Russian church are recognized by law.

(A. E. L. K.)

The Effect of Alcohol in the Areas of the Evangelical Heathen

Mission. At the Fifth International Congress for the Combating of the Abuse of Spiritual Drinks, which met in Basel on August 21, 1895, Dr. H. Christ gave a lecture on the effects of alcohol in the areas of the evangelical heathen mission, which showed in a shocking way what curse brandy has brought to those distant peoples, how it threatens to destroy the work of the mission. Right at the beginning Dr. Christ confesses that here is an area of even greater guilt and misery than in the European homeland. He says: "We whites present ourselves as the teachers and leaders of the tropical peoples; we justify the conquest of their lands by saying that it is only through us that they attain a dignified existence. A stronger untruth, a bloodier mockery never passed European lips than this assertion. Yes, we whites should be the teachers of the dark races; we have our privileged position only in order to raise our weaker brothers to us; efforts are also made through the Christian missions, but on the whole we must confess: we are corrupting the peoples of Africa through our brandy! That is not our mission, God forbid! But that is the way we carry out our so high and beautiful mission. That is why there is so little blessing on all the colonial undertakings of the new age." Further, he cites several judgments of travelers, missionaries, and natives, such as that of the English explorer R. Burton, who writes after his journey in the Jorubalande: "It is my sincere belief that if the slave trade with all its horrors woke up again, and against it Africa could get rid of the powder and rum of the whites, it would win in the exchange," or of the Rev. Johns in Lagos: "Here in Lagos now (1887) 1, 230,000 gallons are received annually (now more than two millions) and of this 1, 200,000 gallons are so-called Trade-Gin, that is, wretched, destructive stuff. Our people are brutalised and demoralised, how can they have any desire for wholesome trade?"

have? The slave trade was a great evil for Africa, but the damage of brandy is much worse; better to work hard as a slave than to have the yoke of drunkenness over our whole people." Kama, the chief of a black tribe, who at great sacrifice had deprived his people of even the ancestral millet beer, says in a complaint to the English Government Commissioner, "I have fought a long battle with my people, and resisted them with peril of my life, to turn them from drink, and just as I have brought them so far as to see how beneficent my laws are, comes this invasion of the liquor merchants. I fear the liquor of the whites more than all the lances of the matables, which kill the body, for that is over in a moment, but drink destroys both body and soul." The head of the Basel Cameroon Mission laments in his last report in 1894: "Schnapps, that baleful destroyer of all progress and culture, is penetrating ever deeper into the popular strata, and the most powerful idol in the country is already liquor. The same dominates all public and private life no less than the secret society and the spirit service did before," and another missionary writes of a funeral service: "Hooting and shrieking groups danced up and down as if possessed; eerily the dark eyes rolled in the distorted faces. Everything revolved as if in a frenzy, inflamed by the enjoyment of the brandy fusillade, which, emptied into wide basins, ladled out with large drinking glasses, was served in the most liberal manner to the heated dancers and the surrounding spectators. . . . The liquor, however, was German fusel, imported from Hamburg." Dr. Christ adds, however, that North Germany unfortunately regards German West Africa as the main outlet for its mass of inferior brandy (in 1893 1,149,132 litres of brandy to the value of Mk. 550,000 were imported into Cameroon). In 1893, 1,149,132 liters of brandy worth 550,000 Mk. were imported into Cameroon, while the entire Congo State imported only slightly more than 1,400,000 liters in the same year), and believes that the great counter-mission of brandy first requires a change of public opinion in European and German Christianity itself, and that it is the duty of Christians to raise their voices without interruption against this state of affairs, which cries out to heaven, but that the goal of all work can only be one: the complete prohibition of the brandy trade to the natives. He concludes with the wish that the Congress 1. inquire of the German Government by what date the investigation resolved by the Reichstag in 1889 concerning the prevention and restriction of the trade in spirits in the colonies will be concluded, and 2. ask it to bring the level of taxation on spirits in its West African territories at least up to that of the English Gold Coast and to prohibit the distribution of spirits as an addition to payments and wages to the natives. (A. E. L. K.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Norwegian Synod. The "Gemeindeblatt" reports: Prof. H. G. Stub, since director of the theological seminary of the Synod of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America at Robbinsdale near St. Paul, Minn. follows an appointment as pastor of the Norwegian Lutheran congregation at Decorah, Ia. where the Norwegian Synod has its college. Pastor Stub remains editor of the Norwegian Synod paper, Kirketidende.

With regard to the New York Reformer Parkhurst, we had expressed doubts in the "Lutheran" as to whether he was to be considered a faithful preacher, the word, of course, taken in the biblical sense. The "Lutheran Evangelist" was very indignant about this judgment. But we had good reason for our judgment. Parkhurst's "civil-reformatory" activity alone makes him at least suspect. A pastor who knows how to say something Christian to his congregation, namely, to preach the Gospel, will not easily let this stand and turn his real activity to "bourgeois reform". Next, we thought especially of the fact that Parkhurst, last year, before his departure for Europe, even acted up before newspaper reporters as a patron of Dr. Briggs, who denies the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and perverts the whole Christian doctrine. Parkhurst spoke as if it were quite immaterial what doctrine was preached in the church; he sneered at the efforts of his Presbyterian brethren to protect the church from the unbelief of a Dr. Briggs and comrades. This should also have been known to the editor of the "Lutheran Evangelist," for Parkhurst's pronouncement was in the secular and ecclesiastical papers of his day. It is strange, however, that Parkhurst has not been held in such high esteem by the "Evangelist" of late. And why not? Well, because Parkhurst has taken offense at one of the three articles of faith of American Lutheranism, the article of total abstinence from spirituous beverages. Parkhurst thinks it advisable that in New York the sale of beer be permitted at certain hours on Sunday. This is so alarming to the "Evangelist" that doubts arise in his mind as to Parkhurst's greatness as a reformer! F. P.

Separation within the Salvation Army. Ballington Booth, the head of the Salvation Army in America, has not obeyed the order of his father, "General" William Booth, to return to England. The father and "General" thereupon relieved Ballington Booth of the Command and assigned the same to Eva Booth. Ballington Booth has now left the old connection and will form a new division of the Salvation Army, which is to work among the socially superior, while the old organization is not to be disturbed in its work among the degenerates of human society. F. P.

Archbishop Kenrick died here in St. Louis on March 4 at the age of 90. Kenrick first became widely known for speaking and voting against the infallibility dogma in 1870. Later he submitted, as did most initial dissenters. The Roman necrologies praise this *sacrificium intellectus* as a particularly glorious Christian virtue. F. P.

The Ohio Synod needs \$35,000 annually to operate its ministry of love and education. But since this sum has not been received, a debt has arisen...

of nearly \$75,000. To diminish this a large Easter collection is to be levied. 1000 persons are to give \$10.00 each, 2000 \$5.00 each, 3000 \$2.50 each, 5000 \$1.00 each, 10,000 50 cts. each, 25,000 25 cts. each, and 35,000 10 cts. each, 20,000 children 5 cts. each. If this plan can be carried out, \$48,250 will be received. (Luth. Herald.)

General Council. The Lutheran Herald reports about Bethany College of the Swedish Augustana Synod: "Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kan., Dr. Swenson, President, has received a new pipe organ with three manuals worth \$5000 for the new auditorium and gymnasium, which can hold 4000 people. There are 425 students and 22 professors in the college. During the past year contributed to the payment of the debt: President Cleveland, Gov. Morrill, King Oscar II of Sweden and Queen Sophia of Sweden." How may the college have come by this high protection? F. P.

A new mission to the Jews in New York. The Herald reports: Among the Jews of New York the Augustana Synod wants to begin mission. Father M. Rosenthal of Fort Dodge, Iowa, a Jewish proselyte, has been called as missionary. Thus the Swedish brethren of the Conciliar take up this important work in New York, which has hitherto been carried on in the metropolis on the part of the Lutheran Church only from Missouri.

Roman Propaganda in New York. Archbishop Corrigan pays great attention to "missionary work" among Protestants. Church services" have been established, to which Catholics are only admitted if they bring at least one Protestant with them. Preaching in these "services" is done by the Paulists, an order whose members are specially trained for "missionary preaching" among Protestants. F. P.

II. Abroad.

Director Albrecht Görth, in his book "Die Erziehung der jungen Mädchen" ("The Education of Young Girls"), and teacher Ziegler, in his "Jugendschriften-Warte" ("Youth Writings Card"), following Görth, also included the literary products of Mrs. Lina Morgenstern **among the questionable literature for young people.** The aforementioned pedagogues complained about "women" and "female scribblers" whose "insipid, fantastic, sweet and finally sanctimonious chatter" evoked a frivolous, thoughtless sensuality in the female youth, incited them to the pursuit of pleasure, to love affairs, etc., and to play a frivolous game with the most sacred feelings of the human heart, etc. These authors included, in particular, Louise Bühne and Lina Morgenstern. Louise Büchner and Lina Morgenstern were to be counted among these writers in particular; as proof, reference was made to the latter's novella, "Liebe und Leid" (formerly titled "Blüthenleben"). Mrs. Lina Morgenstern took the path of public action and obtained a fine of 40 marks against Director Görth from the court of lay assessors in Leipzig. The trial against teacher Ziegler took place on January 9 before a Berlin court of lay assessors. Ziegler denied the intention to insult and invoked his right as editor of a teacher's organ to fight bad youth writings and to print the judgment of a recognized pedagogue. Mrs. Morgenstern, on the other hand, declared that she had been personally insulted and portrayed as the representative of "contemptible" views. In addition, her book was her first work, written as early as 1869, and it would be wrong to advance it to her now, since she had written many other truly recognized works. The expert witness was the royal school director Regierungsschulrath

Dr. Wätzoldt was invited. He criticized the overproduction of female youth literature, especially the so-called "Backfischlitteratur", since it was on the whole not very suitable to educate young girls to become independent personalities. The book "Liebe und Leid" (Love and Sorrow) contains only a love story between a girl who has just left school and a Polish refugee. It merely spoke of love and described the love life between the two. He could not find anything in it about "contemptible views of life", but on the other hand a book that talked about love for 200-300 pages was not very suitable for young girls. It is true that individual moral sentences are included, but without a vital connection to the whole. The simple healthy piety is missing. The second expert was Preacher Richter from Mariendorf. He declared it outrageous and irresponsible that educated people who aspire to the noble should personally disparage a woman like the plaintiff, who had striven for decades to make the female sex fit for the seriousness of life, with insulting expressions. In Mr. Görth's book, 49 outstanding women writers were pilloried as "smearers", against whom the moral police ought to protect. The expressions against the plaintiff contained in that criticism were inadmissible, quite unmerited and simply unworthy of the cause. In the end, the verdict was a fine of 150 Mk. for teacher Ziegler, and the plaintiff was granted the right to publish. The court found the criticism against Mrs. Lina Morgenstern to be inaccurate. Criticism must stop at the personal honor of other persons, and only in view of the fact that the defendant was animated by idealistic aspirations did the Court refrain from imposing a severe prison sentence.

(A. E. L. K.)

From Mecklenburg. Regarding the burial of persons killed in duels, the Mecklenburg government has sent the following rescript to the state parliament: For us, the principle of the revised church order of 1650 is decisive for the question of granting or refusing church burial of persons killed in a duel, which reads: "Whoever dies in his sins without all repentance and conversion shall not be buried in the ground with Christian ceremonies, but shall be quietly buried without all chants and processions, where he has his place of burial." The duelist who falls to the blow or the shot of his enemy leaves life at a moment when he has openly rebelled against the word of God, against the fifth commandment. By his deed he has separated himself from the church and the Christian community, dies in his sin without repentance and conversion, and therefore cannot be buried by the church and the Christian community as belonging to it. It is not, therefore, the fact that he falls in a duel, but the circumstance that in the moment of rebellion against God's word he passes away without repentance and penance, that is the reason why he must be denied a Christian burial. If, however, the duelist has not fallen to the blow or shot of his adversary, but is still alive for a longer or shorter time and comes to the realization of his sin, he will be granted a Christian burial, provided he bears witness to his penitent attitude. The situation is no different with his surviving opponent, who is also not to be granted ecclesiastical communion with its honors and rights without further ado, but likewise only in the case of successful repentance. The Rescript cannot recognize a need for a modification of the above principles, which are applied in both Grand Duchies, or for any other fixation of the same. (A. E. L. K.)

From Alsace. The Protestant pastor Kiefer was also present at the dedication of the newly built synagogue in Balbronn (Alsace), which took place on 10 December. After several rabbis had spoken in the synagogue, he also gave an address. He emphasized that even if there were different religious confessions, all nevertheless pursued a common goal, to do the will of God and to carry it out in the works of universal charity. "Movingly," reads the Jewish report, "he concluded his words, which resounded in all hearts, with the petition: Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name." (P. a. S.)

Russia. About the new sect of the Bjeguny or "runners" that has appeared in the Tomsk governorate, we learn from the "D. E. K." The following: These sectarians proclaim that at the present time in the world, but especially in the Russian Church and State, the Antichrist is ruling quite openly in a whole series of personalities, preferably in the representatives of the administration and the clergy. Therefore, he said, one must not live in the world where everything bears the mark of the Antichrist, but must flee from the world and go to deserts, mountains, and forests. In order to escape the bondage of Antichrist, the sectarians have severed all connection with the State and with society, have ceased to be enrolled on the revision lists, to pay taxes, and to furnish themselves with passports, and have proclaimed as a principle of life that those who feel strong should fight with the devil, but the timid should flee; that is, they acknowledge the possibility of a twofold relation to the governmental power: Either open combat with it, with all its institutions and all its order, or, in case of weakness, flight from Antichrist into forests and deserts. The main mass of the Bjeguny are in the taigas of Tomsk, Kolyvansk, and Mariinsk, especially in the former. The Bjeguny are not content with a free and unattached life in the forests and marshes; all their efforts are aimed at breaking off the kingdom of the Antichrist in one way or another; for this purpose they do not even shrink from violent measures, from time to time forcibly abducting followers of the kingdom of the Antichrist into their deserts and forests and forcing them into their way of life.

The German Colonial Officials and the Protestant Church Services. There is little that can be said about the church attendance of the officials in Cameroon. In the past there was usually a German church service every month, but it was usually poorly attended. When Governor von Soden made a visit to Mangamba in 1889, we also came upon the German church services. In answer to the missionary's question as to why so few officials attended the services, he said that there were only a few Protestants there besides himself, and that he could not expect the Catholics to attend the Protestant services. But in those days the services were still well attended compared to now. Whereas at that time, in addition to 10 to 20 civil servants, a number of officers and marines also attended, later hardly 5 to 10 civil servants and almost no one from the navy attended the services. As a result, the German church services were no longer held every month, but about one every three months. An invitation was always written for these, which was circulated to all Europeans on the Saturday before. But even since the German services have not been held so frequently, attendance has not increased. Mostly empty pews are preached. (D. E. K.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42.

April 1896.

No. 4.

Frank's Theology.

(Continued.)

After we have oriented ourselves about the principles of Frankish theology, let us see what form it has given to the individual articles of the Christian faith. It will be confirmed that what remains of Christian truth in this system has truly not been gained through the reflection of the "Christian subject," but that everything that the I has worked out of itself is vain error and does not agree with Scripture. It is impossible for us to go into all the individual points of the doctrine here, and we will only consider the most important dogmas.

As far as the dogma of the inspiration of Scripture is concerned, it is already evident from what we have said above about the relation of Frank's theology to Scripture, that Frank has thoroughly broken with the early church and common Christian belief in the literal inspiration and absolute infallibility of Scripture. He sees in Scripture only a product of the church, the testimony, the proclamation of the early church. And since the members of the early church were still sinful men, capable of error, their testimony, the Scriptures, are also fallible. "The conception of our ancients of the absolute and absolute truth of all that is written cannot be regarded as an expression of the strength of their faith. And I would not take upon myself the responsibility of teaching a Christian that faith in the truth of salvation involves faith in the absolute truthfulness of the Scriptures, or in the paramount truthfulness of the Church in the original collection of the Scriptures." System of Christian Truth. II. p. 421. There, p. 427, the origin of the New Testament Scriptures is described as follows: "It is always the congregation of God, the church, which carries the Spirit of God in itself by virtue of its fellowship with the glorified Mediator of salvation, and by virtue of a

The holy authors spoke and wrote God's Word in the spirit of inspiration, which was also preferred in other respects. They did so as members and organs of the early Church, in which the freshness of the immediate memory of the salvation of the Redeemer's life was united with the fullness of the first spirituality in a consecration that surpassed all subsequent times of the Church. It was an enthusiasm which, in these organs as elsewhere in the Church, can no more be separated from the spiritual possession and spiritual empathy of faith- *εχοντες αυτό τό πνεύμα της πίστεως χατά τό γεγραμμένον 'Επιστευσα διό ήλάλησα, χαί ήμείς πιστεύομεν, διό χαί λαλούμεν*

(2 Cor. 4, 13.)." Inspiration, then, according to Frank, is a desire which does not differ essentially from the other possession of the Spirit, of which all the members of the church are worthy. The Church bears the Spirit of God in herself; the primitive Church possessed a special fullness of the Spirit, and from this spiritual life of the congregation the New Testament Scriptures have sprung forth. The sacred authors drew what they wrote from themselves, from the memory of God's saving deeds in Christ, and in their writings they made a confession of their faith. The rule here is: I believe, therefore I speak. The Old Testament Scriptures are defined as "a historical and documentary memorial of the destiny and guidance of Israel, which was first set up by the same God of salvation to whom Israel owed its entire knowledge, endowment, and guidance by means of the same powers. System of Christian Truth II. P. 73. That is, in other words, God chose Israel to be His people, and then endowed them with His Spirit and gifts, and wonderfully directed their history. And it is to these very potencies, to the election, endowment, direction of God, that the Old Testament Scriptures owe their origin. God chose prophetic men, gifted them with his Spirit, and thus enabled them to speak and write, and caused their writings to be collected and united into a whole, which was now regarded by the people of the Old Covenant as a documentary monument of their destiny and history. The writings of the prophets, like those of the apostles, came into being in the same way as the writings of other enlightened men who gave expression to their religious knowledge, experience, and conviction in what they wrote. Frank dismisses the powerful apostolic testimony of 2 Tim. 3, 15-17 with the short remark: "This statement does not go beyond the fact that the Old Testament Scriptures came into being through the influence of God's Spirit, which appears here as a component of the New Testament faith and is therefore established for it. Yes, this is a dictum of the sovereign theological ego, to which language and word-meaning must submit. Theopneustia is not any desire or effect of spirit, but a very special, unique effect of spirit. It is not of the sacred authors that St. Paul says that they were inspired, but of the Scriptures themselves.

he calls inspired. *Πάσα γραφή θεόπνευστος*, that is, according to the language.

This is the only way of saying that God breathed into the holy authors everything they were to write and have written.

Frank tries to extract the article of the holy trinity from his own ego, as he does with all teachings. In the "System of Christian Certainty," he deduces from the consciousness of freedom from guilt, in which the consciousness of guilt-attachment is suspended, the divine trinity, and summarizes the result of his reflections in the following sentences. He said, "The guilt into which God brings man is contrasted with the liberation from guilt that he, as the other, has set in relation to the first effect. And the action of the third has for its presupposition, for its reason of possibility, the twofold causality of the first two factors, while it, too, is the effect of the one undivided and indivisible Absolute, and as it itself comes from it, so it relates the subject who experiences its effect to it." I. p. 325. "This personal spiritual power, then, which in its turn assures the Christian of his Christianity, sets him in relation to the God who is the cause of the relation of freedom from guilt, and does not make him despondent before the God in whose guilt he found himself as this natural man." I. p. 322. It is the One Absolute to whom sinful men are indebted, who has freed them from guilt, and who assures them of freedom from guilt. But it is another which brings sinful men into debt, another which has caused freedom from debt, and another, the personal Spirit of God, which relates men to the first two. How? Does the consciousness of freedom from guilt, Christian thought, really demand *a priori* the assumption that it must be an Other who holds man guilty, an Other who settles him from guilt? Might not guilt-attachment and guilt-release be effected by one and the same Person? Does not Scripture ascribe both also to One Person? Does not Scripture testify, for example, that God the Father, as the Holy One, is angry with transgressors, but at the same time, out of free love, sent and gave His Son to be the Savior of the world? In the "System of Christian Truth," Frank deduces the personality of God from the concept of the Absolute, and the three-personality from the personality. These are philosophical juggleries at which every philosopher of skill will laugh. From the nature of human personality as the creaturely image of the absolute personality, a trinity in God is inferred. "For this much is certain in all ways, that when we divide the process of human personality into its moments, we likewise encounter a triplicity, without which the person would not be what it is.

It is only in this respect that the threefold - temporally undivided, a self-contained rotation of nevertheless distinguishable moments of life - exists at the same time and in unity, and only in this respect is the personality of man given. In the divine personality, which we have recognized as the Trinity, the one thing that is analogous to this human process of personification is that even the divine absolute personality would not be without this rotation of personification, which is in itself, in its moments par excellence, at the same time, of personification, personification, and in the unity of both." System of Christian Truth. If this analysis of personality and the analogy between human and divine personality were to be accepted, it would still not follow that the three moments which constitute the concept of personality must be conceived in God as independent persons distinct from one another. The punctum saliens, the three-personality, is not obtained in this way. This is what Frank finally admits when he writes: "But even if that analogy of human personality is true here, the fact of absolute divine personality goes beyond it, inasmuch as the moments present there diverge here into hypostases, and now the same applies to the difference and interrelation of these as applies to those moments there. But what is missing is added from the concept of the absolute: "In the eternal self-movement of God, who is thus absolute and at the same time personal, the self-setting is such that this very essence of the absolute God confronts itself as the other, the set, the fullness of the setting in itself, in the form of I-ness," and so on. Because God is the Absolute, and because in God everything must be thought absolute, as perfect as possible, so here with God also the being-law must be conceived as a person, so here the being-law confronts the setting as ego. That is truly fibbing with concepts. And it is a profanation of the sacred when the mystery of the most holy Trinity is drawn through the common shell of understanding, and logical operations are made with the three divine persons, which prove to be fallacies. No, we Christians honor one God in three Persons and three Persons in one Godhead, because God has revealed Himself to us in His Word as the Triune One. Without this revelation we would know nothing and suspect nothing of the mystery of the Trinity. And if we Christians attribute to one person, the Father, especially the creation, to another, the Son, especially the atonement, the redemption, to a third, the

If we ascribe to the Holy Spirit, especially the sanctification that He relates us to the Son and the Father, we follow only the Scriptures, not the deceptive voice of our own consciousness.

But what is the result of those philosophical-rationalistic reflections on a triplicity in God? Frank's doctrine of the Trinity ultimately amounts to Sabellianism on the one hand, and to subordinationism on the other. He writes, *op. cit.* p. 203: "In this image of the Son the archetypal Father has and sees himself, for he would not have and know himself as Father if he did not have and know himself as Son." So not God, but the Father, the first Person of the Godhead, has and knows Himself at the same time as the Son, as the second Person! What God knows of Himself, that He is. So the Father is at the same time the Son! Hereby the hypostatic distinction of the Son from the Father is entirely blurred; the three Persons of the Godhead are blended with each other, and appear quite really only as "moments" in the eternal self-movement of the One personal God. Further, the characteristic difference of the Son from the Father is thus defined: "Conditionality exists as such between the begetting Father and the begotten Son, the radiating archetype and the radiated image, the speaking subject and the spoken word, but conditionality in that form of the same as we perceive it within divine absoluteness, as conditionality of the self-conditioning." "The thought cannot arise, then, as if the aseity, which is the essence of the absolute God, belongs only to the Father and not also to the Son. The relation of the Son to the Father is here defined as one of conditionality. This conditionality is called "a conditionality of the self-conditioning." This is a *contradictio in adjecto*. He who conditions himself, who is not conditioned by anyone else, is unconditioned. Frank also assigns aseity to the son, acknowledges that he is of himself, but aseity in the form of conditionality, that is, a conditional unconditionality. This is nonsense. Frank finds in the scriptural designation of the second person of the Godhead as the begotten Son, the spoken Word, etc., a conditionality expressed, in that he infers without justification from earthly, human relations to the relation of the eternal divine Persons to one another. The Son is begotten of the Father, the Word is spoken by the speaking subject, and thus, as Frank concludes, conditioned by the Father, by the speaking subject. But if this condition is at the same time a condition of the self-conditioning, we come to the monstrous idea that the Son begat himself, that the Word spoke itself, similar to the talk of a "being under law" of the Father, "that the self-setting God sets and knows himself to be set as Father," p. 203, to the idea of a begetting and self-setting of the Father.

fatherhood of the Father. In all this confusion of terms, so much is clear that Frank ascribes to the Son a truly conditional, dependent, and therefore derivative Deity, as he suggests in his construction of the Incarnation of the Son of God from the sentence: "The hypostatic character of the Son of God is that of conditionality. We reply: A conditional God is not a God; a conditional deity contradicts the concept of God not only of Christian consciousness, but of Scripture. And Scripture presents us with a very different picture of the eternal Son of God than Frank's theology. If in Scripture all the divine names and titles of honor, all the divine works proper to the Father, are also ascribed to the Son, if the Son of God is called 1 John 5:30 the true God, then the Son is God in the same sense, degree, and measure as the Father, God in Himself and of Himself, *causa sui*, *Αὐτόθεος*. If St. Paul calls Christ "God over all," Rom. 9:5, then the Son, in spite of his hypostatic difference from the Father, that he is begotten of the Father, is nevertheless, like the Father, the very highest God; he has no one, not even the Father, over him, is dependent on and conditioned by no one, not even the Father. Frank, too, makes the well-known statements of Scripture concerning the deity of Christ his own, but he only takes the words of Scripture into his mouth and takes the right sense and understanding out of the words. Let it henceforth no longer be said that the modern theologians of a "positive" direction leave intact such fundamental articles of the Christian confession as that of the triune God, of the true deity of Christ! Their hopeless philosophizing and rationalizing falsifies and devalues the "Christian realities" which they still recognize in the thesi.

It is characteristic of a theologian's point of view how he teaches and judges sin and the natural state of man. Frank develops from the Christian consciousness and the contrast between it and the natural consciousness of guilt not only the nature of sin, but also the history of the Fall and the fall of the devil, as well as the difference between human and diabolical sin. It would take us much too far here if we wanted to accompany the systematizing I on all its erroneous courses. It is sufficient to state the fact of the development. Frank defines sin, the "original essence" of sin, as "the desire of a good that lies within the creaturely destiny, with the setting aside and breaking through of the barrier drawn by God for this purpose. System of Truth. I. p. 439. He describes the Fall of Man in the following words: "The woman looked toward the tree and lingered in the imagination of the good which the fruit of the tree might bestow upon her.

She possessed in communion with God." How he thinks of sin is further evident from such statements as the following: "According to this, the essence of sin, notwithstanding its further possible self-increase, and notwithstanding the difference remaining between the satanic and the human case, consists everywhere first of all in a reversal of the egoity due to the personal creature as wanting itself and the world in God, to such a one as wants and sets itself and the creaturely good apart from God, above God, and thus against God." "In this reversal of the egoity that is willed by God into the egoity that is contrary to God, one must not merely oppose the creaturely good to God, namely, in such a way that the personal creature wills itself above God and therefore against God. But the worldly good and the worldly love in opposition to the highest good and the corresponding devotion always want to be drawn into the process of the reversal of that egoity at once: the ego desires self-satisfaction by giving up its self to an idolatrous, creaturely good instead of giving itself to God as the highest good." "Man cannot renounce the fact that he seeks himself in devotion to an absolute, but he can reverse the God-willed, primordial truth of this relationship into its opposite, into a caricature of that truth: the setting up of an absolute which is only the fiction of such a thing, devotion to it which does not lead to the finding but to the losing of the ego and yet is always accomplished in the opinion, in the intention, of satisfying one's own ego through it. And if, therefore, we hold that sin is always first willed and accomplished *ratione boni*, not with the simple intention of being against God, we must immediately add: *sub ratione boni absoluti*." "If the good for which the sinner desires, by which he seeks and wishes to satisfy himself, may after all be in itself a quite real good, not a merely dreamed good; if it may be the whole world with all its beauty and glory, it is still always a false and deceitful one, that it inserts itself in the place of the absolute which in truth it is not, and therefore also deceives the sinner as to enjoyment." Accordingly, original sin is briefly defined, p. 449 ff. as an evil desire of the heart, which *eo ipso* includes in itself an anti-divine direction of the will. According to Frank, then, sin, original sin, like actual sin, is primarily and essentially evil desire, world-lust, and world-love. Man desires a creaturely good and seeks self-satisfaction in the enjoyment of it and sees in it the absolute, the highest good. Sin is always willed and accomplished *sub ratione boni*. The sinner is concerned only with one good, either with a single creaturely good or with the whole world and its beauty and glory. Only in so far as he breaks through the barrier set by God does he, with such desire, at the same time go against God and live without God and move apart from God. By taking part in the creaturely

If a man finds all his pleasure in the good, his taste for God, the highest good, is spoiled. What the Apology of the Augsburg Confession says against the scholastics, that when they speak of original sin they stop at the inclination to evil and leave out the greatest and most necessary thing, namely, that the natural man despises God, does not fear and trust God, and is hostile to his judgment, is also applicable to Frank's theory of sin. It is nothing other than Pelagian-Pagan leaven. The relation in which Frank places the two factors of sin, evil desire and the will contrary to God, to each other, is precisely the contradiction of what Scripture says of man's corruption. The beginning of Eve's sin, as Luther aptly explains in his Genesis, was unbelief, that she did not believe the word of God and became hostile to it; when her heart was loosed from God and his word, only then did evil desire take root in her and give birth to the sin of the deed. The actual essence of sin, the basic mood of sinful man according to Scripture, is enmity against God. Rom. 8, 7. The apostle Paul draws the picture of men as they are by nature in Eph. 4, 18. 19. with the following words: "whose mind is darkened, and they are alienated from the life that is in them. through the ignorance that is in them, through the blindness of their heart," and then it goes on to say, "and they give themselves up to fornication, and do all manner of uncleanness, together with covetousness." The last, then, evil lust, flows from the first, the alienation of the heart from God, not vice versa. Yes, one sees it clearly, which is the real source of modern theology, which draws everything from its own consciousness, namely, the natural ego. In theology the natural ego has to come to terms with the fact of sin, but seeks to minimize and palliate it as much as possible. It is the natural ego that seeks to discover all kinds of remnants of the good in the natural man.

And so Frank is eager to put the supposed good sides of the natural, unconverted man in the light. He admittedly teaches the lack of freedom of the natural man, explains p. 467 ff. that the fallen man only has freedom of choice within the creaturely goods, that he is enslaved by sin, that he cannot turn to God, the highest good, on his own, by his own impulse. On the other hand, however, he emphasizes "the moments" in which he sees the ability of sinful man to be redeemed. He writes, p. 499. 500: "The whole life of the natural man, in so far as it aims at satisfaction through goods which he desires instead of the Rur infoern, consists in a chain of deceptions: sin lies to him and he must experience that it lies to him. Even the enjoyment itself, which consists in the taking possession of the

The joy that is given in the form of an idolatrous good falls far short of the measure of expectation, and after the enjoyment, the joy that has been enjoyed appears to be stale and tasteless. Man hoped to find reality, and lo it is nothingness; he wanted to gain freedom, and he is oppressed by the goods of his choice; he sought life, and the longer the more he feels his life disintegrating under the power of death. Thus he goes from illusion to illusion, and yet he cannot refrain from making new illusions for himself." "Certainly it is at first thought a punishment to man that he cannot attain to rest and satisfaction by the way of sin." "But it is equally certain that afterwards, under the influence of positive graces . . . the same experience of unsatisfactoriness and inner emptiness will become a motive for man to try the other, higher good which the calling grace holds out to him and offers. I will set out and return to my former husband, for then I fared better than now,' says the adulterous people, since before they ran after their lovers, etc." That experience of being unsatisfied thus becomes to the apostate man a motive for turning back to God, though under the influence of positive traits of grace. In the natural man himself there is a motive to conversion, a cause to something good, which is consequently itself something good. A second moment of the ability to redeem, according to Frank, is the character of sin as "ignorance, which does not go against the living God with full consciousness and determined will, but in the choice of goods, while devoting itself to created things, still means the absolute and ... thus regarded, however, also constituted a moment for the preservation of man's ability to redeem himself". If the natural man, not with full consciousness, not with resolute will, goes against God, and with his devotion to created things still means the Absolute, then there is still something left in his consciousness and will that does not resist God, but rather leans toward God. Thus, in the natural, unconverted man, there are still a few scraps of true knowledge of God and the fear of God and love for God. Further, Frank appeals to the fact of conscience, the law written in man's heart by nature. "Therefore, in order to understand the natural man's capacity for salvation, we must add the fact of conscience, of which it is as undoubted that it belongs to the natural state of life, as it is, on the other hand, that it bears the character of a restraint in man, which is apt to hinder his progress in the way of alienation from God." (p. 502) "The natural man is not to be denied the ability to fulfill the moral demands made upon him by his conscience. P. 510. "The natural man is able to overcome his opposing desire, and to meet that demand which is made upon him by

"We are in a position to recognize all that is morally good which is found in the actions of the natural man." From here we are able to recognize all the moral good that is found in the actions of the natural man. Frank conceives of conscience not only as "an absolute authority standing above man" (p. 506), but at the same time as a moral power in man which holds him back on the path of alienation from God, so that he cannot entirely get away from God. The natural man is able to overcome the evil desire of his heart and to fulfill the demands of conscience or natural law, and this fulfillment of law is really and truly fulfillment of the demands of God. The natural man is able to perform good works which are truly morally good, that is, which are also regarded by God as good works. A fourth weight, which Frank puts in the scale in favor of the natural man, is the natural knowledge of God, or natural religion. Of this it says, p. 515, 516: "Now this nearness or manifestation of the living God would not be able to determine the natural man to any religious movement, if it were not for the indestructible trait, previously discussed, inherent in him, to set himself up for the Absolute and the Absolute for himself." The natural man, therefore, if he makes use of the natural knowledge of God, can bring himself to truly religious movements, that is, to movements of heart and will directed toward God. Thus *motus spirituales* are found in the natural man; an indissoluble pull toward God is inherent in him. Frank finally sums up his characterization of the natural man in the words: "Nor have we said that only a *justitia civilis* in the proper meaning of the word is possible to the natural man: the moral activity which we have assigned to him can go far beyond this, up to a real devotion to moral goods, moral ideals, and a corresponding self-denial. The only difference is that the apostate man is not able, on his own initiative, to restore himself to the normal relation to God from which he has emerged.

These remarks amount to the semipelagian view of the natural man as a *semimortuus*, coincide with the antitheses which the Lutheran confession expressly rejects, and contradict the clear testimony of Scripture. According to Scripture, the natural man is "dead in sins," Eph. 2:1, spiritually dead, quite dead, not half dead. There is not a speck of spiritual light and life in him, not a speck of true knowledge of God, fear, love, trust in God, not a better impulse and movement, not an affection, not a draw towards God. St. Paul confesses, "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." Rom. 7:18; so in the natural man, which is but flesh, dwelleth no good thing. And if the apostle of the flesh

If the natural man's attitude is determined as enmity against God, it is because he resists God completely, not only indirectly, not halfway, but with all his consciousness, with all the strength of his heart and will. In the connection in which the apostle speaks of conscience, of the law written in the heart of all men, in the 2nd and 3rd chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, he proves that the Gentiles, like the Jews, are under sin, and have no excuse. There is, it is true, a *justitia civilis*, which is also found among the Gentiles. But of this is true what the Apology says: "All holy, honorable living, all good works, as much as a man may do on earth, are vain hypocrisy and abomination to God." Scripture calls natural righteousness "an vile garment." And where St. Paul remembers the natural knowledge of God, Rom. 1:18 ff, he points out that apostate men have denied and despised it, and that such knowledge only serves to make them inexcusable before God. It is not necessary, indeed, to recall further scriptural testimonies. All Scripture, and our confession according to Scripture, teaches and confirms that in unconverted men only evil is to be found, nothing good, and describes in the strongest terms the utter, unfathomable ruin of men. But it is well to be understood that the proud ego of the old man, and a systematic which has grown out of this ego, rebels against this scriptural truth with all its might. G. St.

(To be continued.)

The position of Lutheran symbols in relation to Scripture - proof that our confession represents literal inspiration.

(Continued.)

The opponents of the doctrine of inspiration prefer to cite Luther as their source. They try to present it as if they had only advanced a little further along the path that Luther himself had already marked out and trodden. Luther's writings, then, have also been ransacked by the enemies of the divinity of Holy Scripture in the interest of gaining from them testimony to the modern unscriptural and un-Lutheran position on the doctrine of inspiration. That this can only be done by twisting, distorting, misquoting, and misinterpreting Luther's clear words has been repeatedly demonstrated, especially in this journal. Nothing is more nonsensical than to want to stamp Luther in this, as in any other piece, as the father of modern theology. After all, it can be proven from almost every major writing of Luther's that he had an inspired, infallible

108 The Position of Lutheran Symbols on Scripture - Evidence, Scripture believed and taught. This also applies to those confessional writings of our Concordia which flowed from Luther's own pen. Indeed, if we had no other symbolic writings than the Schmalkaldic Articles and Luther's two catechisms, even then a Lutheran faithful to the confession could not remain wavering in his position on the word-inspiration of holy Scripture.

Luther now speaks, as in general, so also in these three symbols of the holy Scriptures as the Biblia, or the Old and New Testaments. 175, 3. He is especially familiar with the expressions: *verbum, scriptura*, the word, the Scripture. 330, 11. 459, 62. 321, 3. 322, 4. 379, 17. The whole books of Scripture taken together are to him the whole Scripture, 378, 17. 18. The Bible is to Luther the Scripture, the Word, the book *χατίξοχ-ήν*, the book *sui generis*, unique in its kind among all the millions of books in the world. And to be sure, Luther considers the Bible to be the book, the Word par excellence, because it is God's Word, holy Scripture. God's Word is stereotyped, but by no means meaningless, thoughtless title Luther attaches to Scripture. 473, 63. 65. 477, 81. For while all other books have men as authors, the author of holy Scripture is God Himself. In the same sense Luther also calls the Bible the holy Scripture, or the whole holy Scripture, 379, 17. 18. 175, or the holy word of God, *anctum Dei verbum*, 471, 52. And this is not out of mere habit, but with emphasis Luther attaches the attribute "holy" to Scripture, for the same reasons, namely, why he calls it God's word, because to him it is not a human product, but has its origin in God.

But when Luther speaks of the Word of God and of the Holy Scriptures, he is not thinking of things that can be distinguished objectively. Luther knows only One Word of God, and for him that is the written Word. For Luther, the terms "Scripture" and "God's Word" designate one and the same thing. Luther therefore also connects the two expressions when, for example, he refers to the Bible as "Scripture and God's Word. 339, 56. And if Luther also calls Scripture by its main content, the Gospel, he does not think of the Gospel, like God's Word, as an independent entity independent of Scripture. God's word, Scripture, and gospel are to him equivalent expressions. 503, 31, 32, 471, 54, 455, 38. Therefore, what he says of the gospel or the word of God is also true of Scripture.

That Luther really wants to be taken seriously with the names and titles he gives to Scripture is clear enough from his own words. He himself draws the conclusions that lie in these designations. God's word does not stand to Luther on the same level with human writings: it is not to him like another trumpery. 404, 96.

That for which one has God's word must not be held in such contempt as if some Holhippite had spoken it, quasi Cares quispiam aut Thressis homuncio illud dixisset sanxissetque. 415, 152. Verbum Dei non est tale quales sunt aniles fabulae aut carmina lyricorum. Dietrich of Berne, for example, held against God's word, is loose talk. 378, 11. All spirits and scholars in a heap are not so wise as the divine majesty in the smallest finger. 501, 12. Now the Scriptures are not men's, but God's word. The prophets prophesied not of human will, but of the Holy Ghost, Spiritu Sancto inspiranti locuti sunt. The Holy Spirit impelled them to speak, a Spiritu Sancto ad prophetandum impulsus sunt. And indeed the Holy Spirit spoke through them, per eos⁸. The sacred writers were not spontaneously active like other authors, but they were only the instruments of the Holy Spirit, who is to be called the actual author of sacred Scripture. Luther writes on page 323, 13: "And St. Peter says: The prophets prophesied not from human will, but from the Holy Spirit, yet as the holy men of God. But without outward words they were not holy, much less would they still have been driven to speak as unholy men by the Holy Spirit; for they were holy, saith he, since the Holy Spirit speaketh by them." According to Luther, then, the holy Scriptures are God's Word in the most proper sense. The Bible is to him the product not of a man but of the Holy Spirit. Of all that is revealed and said in Scripture, we must confess what Luther says, e. g., of baptism, that the same was not conceived or invented by a man, nor spun out of his head, non esse humanae rationis commentum, sed ab ipso Deo institutum. 485, 6. In every text of sacred Scripture we have before us a divine, and not a human, testimony. 409, 120.

But if the Scriptures are the Word of God, it follows that they are infallible, without error, and in all truth. That all kinds of falsehoods and errors are found in human books is due to the fact that their writers are human, and that all men are capable of error and liars. But as little as God himself can err, so little can the book he has written err. A fallible inspired writing-one of the many blunders which modern theology has born-is an ontradictio in adjecto. With inspiration Luther is also set the inerrancy of Scripture. This he also sharply expresses in the symbols before us. Truth and God's Word or Scripture coincide for him. He who preaches God's word is a preacher of truth, and he who does not preach God's word is a preacher of lies. 416, 162. In every word of Scripture we have before us a pure, unadulterated word of God. Luther writes 409, 120. 121: "For here you have a certain text and divine testimony,

That he hath commanded this, but hath not commanded a word of that. But this is the shame and sad blindness of the world, that no one believes such things; so the devil has bewitched us with false holiness and the appearance of his own works. For this cause I would gladly (I say again) that men would open their eyes and ears, and take such things to heart, lest we be deceived again from the pure word of God into the devil's lying ways." "For it is said in 434, 262, that where there are pious preachers and Christians, they are judged by the world to be heretics, apostates, even rebels and desperate evildoers. For this God's word must be most shamefully and venomously persecuted, blasphemed, punished with lies, perverted, and falsely drawn and interpreted. But let this go its way; for it is the way of the blind world to condemn and persecute the truth and God's children, and yet to regard them as no sin." And in 396:55 Luther writes: "And among the liars are also the blasphemers, not only the very gross ones, well known to everyone, who unashamedly profane God's name (who belong not to our school, but to that of the executioner), but also those who publicly blaspheme the truth and God's word, and give them to the devil." Thus, for Luther, Scripture is truth, divine truth itself, and to question the truthfulness of the Word of Scripture is, in his eyes, blasphemy, because it declares the truth of God itself to be the devil's lie.

For this very reason our church also strictly follows the holy Scriptures in everything, because the Scriptures are infallible to her. Luther says, concerning infant baptism, 494, 57: "So we also do with infant baptism: we bring the child to us with the opinion and hope that it will believe, and ask that God will give it faith; but we do not baptize it on this, but only on the fact that God has commanded it. Why is this? Because we know that God doth not lie; I and my neighbour, and summa all men, may file and deceive, but God's word cannot file, *verbum Dei nec potest errare nec fallere*"; and 495, 60: "God's order and word cannot be changed nor altered by men." 407:13 Even when our carnal reason and feeling rebel against it, Luther knows no other counsel than to believe the infallible Scripture on its word. Therefore," he says 510:76, "if you cannot feel it, believe the Scriptures, for they will not lie to you, as your flesh knows them better than you do. Yes, St. Paul continues with Romans 7: "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing. If St. Paul may speak such things of his own flesh, we will be neither better nor holier. But that we feel it not is so much the worse, because it is a sign that there is a leprous flesh, which feels nothing, and yet rages and devours. But, as I have said, thou art so utterly dead,

But believe the scripture, which speaketh judgment against thee, *saltem scripturae credas, quae tibi non mentietur*. Sicut enim os Christi dicit ac loquitur, ita quoque est, ut qui neque mentiri novit, neque fallere. - Therefore do only what thou art able, and let God see to it how he nourishes thee, and gnug creates; if he has promised, and never yet lied, he will not lie to thee." 501, 14. 416, 165.

The truth and certainty of our faith and hope stand and fall with the truth and infallibility of Scripture. The word of Scripture is the only ground on which faith rests, in which it is anchored. If, therefore, the inspiration and the infallible certainty of holy Scripture are called into question, faith also falters. For Luther, faith is not a human opinion, a belief that something is probable for which one has no reasons, or at least no sufficient reasons. Faith, according to Luther, means being divinely, infallibly certain of something on the basis of infallible Scripture. If the infallibility of Scripture falls away, this faith must also sink to human, deceitful thinking and hoping. As in a syllogism the *conclusio* falls with the major, so also faith collapses in itself when the content of Scripture and the infallible ground of Scripture are taken from it. The supreme principle of every conclusion of faith and of every piece of Christian hope has for its content the divinity and infallibility of sacred Scripture. He, therefore, who denies inspiration, abandons the certainty of Scripture, and with it the faith and hope of Christians. With reference to the Amen in the Lord's Prayer, Luther writes in 483, 119: "But there is power in this, that we also learn to say Amen to it, that is, not to doubt that it is certainly heard and will be done. For there is nothing else but the word of an undoubted faith, who does not pray on the ebb, but knows that God does not deny him, because he has promised to give it." And concerning the words of the Lord's Supper he says 501, 19: "Mark and keep these things well, for on these words stand all our foundation, protection, and defense against all error and seduction that have ever come or may yet come." Further 500, 12-14: "From the word you can strengthen your conscience and speak: If a hundred thousand devils come with all the devils, how can bread and wine be Christ's body and blood, etc.? then I know that all the spirits and scholars in a heap are not so wise as the divine majesty in the smallest finger. Now here is Christ's word: Take, eat, this is my body. Drink ye all of it; it is the new testament in my blood, etc. Then we stand by, and look on them that shall master him, and do otherwise than he hath spoken. This is true, that if thou shalt do the word of it, or look upon it without the word, thou shalt have nothing but bread and wine: but if they abide in it, as they ought and must, according to them it is the body and blood of Christ indeed.

For as Christ's mouth speaks and speaks, so it is that he cannot lie nor deceive." The clear word of Scripture alone, according to Luther, gives assurance of faith and is able to overcome *imbecillitas conscientiae*. With a saying under his feet Luther dared to offer defiance to the whole world and to his own flesh, and even to the weak Melanchthon a word of Scripture was able to stiffen his back. "It is hard - says Melanchthon in his treatise on the Schmalkaldic Articles, 337, 42 - that one wants to separate from so many lands and people and lead a special doctrine. But here is God's command that everyone should beware and not be in agreement with those who lead unrighteous doctrine or who intend to maintain it with desolation. Therefore our consciences are well excused and assured. For the great errors that go into Pabst's kingdom are seen with every eye, and the Scriptures cry out with all their might that such errors are the devil's and Antichrist's doctrine." Thus Luther was divinely certain of his faith, because he had for the same a clear, infallible word of infallible Scripture. And the assertion that only from Christ did the Scriptures become certain to Luther is the Lutheran position on the Scriptures turned upside down into its very opposite.

For Luther, Scripture is not only divine truth and thus the unshakable foundation of faith, but also the divine power for salvation. If Scripture were only the word of men, its effect could only be a finite, human one; but now that Scripture is the word of God, its effect is also supernatural, divine. Of this power of the Word of God, Luther writes 377:9-12: "For this reason I beg such lazy guards or presumptuous saints to let themselves be persuaded for God's sake and to believe that they are truly, truly not so learned and high doctors as they let themselves think, and never think that they have learned this thing or know all things well enough, even if they think that they can do it all too well. For though they might know and be able to do it to the best of their ability (which is not possible in this life), yet there is much profit and fruit in it, if it be read and practised daily in thought and speech; namely, that the Holy Ghost is present in such reading, speech, and remembrance, and giveth ever new and more light and devotion unto it, that it may taste and be received better and better, as Christ also promised in Matt. 18: Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in their substance. For this it helps mightily against the devil, the world, the flesh, and all evil thoughts, if one deals with God's word, speaks of it, and writes poetry about it, so that even the first Psalm blessedly praises those who act day and night according to God's law. Without doubt you will not burn incense and other incense more strongly against the devil than when you handle God's commandments and words, speak of them, sing of them or think of them.

This, of course, is the right consecration water and sign for him to flee and to be chased. For this reason alone you should read, speak, think, and do such things, if you have no other fruit or use for them than to chase away the devil and evil thoughts. For he cannot hear nor suffer the word of God, and the word of God is not like other loose talk, as of Dietrich of Bern, etc., but as Paul says in Romans 1: a power of God. Yes, of course, a power of God, which does the devil's hurt, and strengthens, comforts, and helps us out of measure. And what shall I say? Where I should tell all the profit and fruit that God's word worketh, where would I take paper and time enough? The devil is called a thousandfold: but what shall the word of God be called, that chaseth and destroyeth such a thousandfold with all his power and might? Surely it must be more than a hundred thousandfold." Luther speaks no less gloriously of 405:100-102: "For let it be told thee, though thou couldest do well, and be master of all things, yet thou art daily under the devil's dominion, which resteth not day nor night to creep upon thee, that he may kindle in thy heart unbelief and evil thoughts against the former and all commandments. Therefore you must always have the word of God in your heart, mouth and ears. But where the heart is idle, and the word is not sounded, he breaketh in, and hath done the hurt before it is known. Again, it hath power, where it is earnestly considered, heard, and acted upon, that it never passeth away without fruit, but always awaketh new understanding, delight, and devotion, and purifieth the heart and mind: for the word is not idle, nor dead, but active and living. And though we have no other use or need, yet let this provoke every man, that thereby the devil may be chased and driven away, and that this commandment may be fulfilled, and be more pleasing to God than all other glittering hypocrieses." 403, 94.

In the Word of God, which is both infallible truth and divine power, we therefore possess an immeasurable treasure. *Tanti thesauri facti sumus compotes, quo major aut amplior nullus reperiri. potest.* 404, 97. "The Word of God," says Luther 403, 91, "is the sanctuary above all sanctuaries, indeed the only one that we Christians know and have. For even if we had the bones of all the saints or holy and consecrated garments in a heap, we would not be helped by them; for they are all dead things that no one can sanctify. But the word of God is the treasure that sanctifieth all things, whereby they themselves, the saints, have all been sanctified." Precisely because in the Scriptures one has to do with God's Word, no sin is so grave as contempt for it. Luther writes in 404, 96. 97: "Therefore not only those sin against this commandment who grossly abuse and desecrate the holiday, but also those who, for the sake of their avarice or frivolity, make the holiday a holy day.

114 The position of Lutheran symbols in relation to Scripture - a proof of this, But also the rest of the people, which hear the word of God as another thing, and go in and out of the sermon only out of habit; and when the year is expired, they can go to the sermon as much as to the sermon. For hitherto it has been thought that it would have been a good thing to hear mass or the gospel on Sunday, but no one has asked for the word of God, nor has anyone taught it. Now, because we have God's Word, we nevertheless do not stop the abuse, and always let ourselves be preached and admonished, but hear it without earnestness and care." With such contempt we deserve, according to Luther, that God should rob us of his word and blessing, and again raise up false preachers, who lead us to the devil, and suck out our sweat and blood, 416, 163. 403, 95. 470, 47. 48. 452, 22.

If Scripture is the inspired Word of God and as such the infallible divine truth and the infallible, unshakable foundation of our faith, then Scripture alone can be the source of all Christian doctrine and the norm of faith and life. According to Luther, it is the duty of Christians to direct their whole life, being, and doing according to God's word, ut totam hanc vitam nostram ad divinorum verborum amussim et regulam instituamus, 402, 89, ut tota vita nostra ad ejus gnomonem et regulam non discrepante amussi respondeat. 405, 103. Scripture determines what is to be taught and believed in the church, and indeed, according to Luther, among the articles of faith are all the pieces which are found in Scripture, omnes particulae, quae tradit scriptura. 449:5 Spiritual knowledge in the church is knowledge from Scripture, that is, knowledge whose content and extent are determined by Scripture alone. 384:22 God's Word is the sole measure of all theological truth. Luther's aim was precisely to bring the content of Scripture to bear again, nothing more and nothing less. For Luther, therefore, Scriptural truth is the only criterion of truth in the doctrines of faith, and unscriptural truth is the criterion of falsehood. Everything in the church must be considered and judged according to God's word. 424, 209. The recurring question with Luther is: What is the text of St. Paul? 384, 11. To all opponents he calls out: The Scripture teaches alfo! 486, 12. And of his own fine doctrine he boasts: It rhymes with Scripture in the best way. With reference to baptism, Luther writes in 485:3: "First of all, one must know well the word on which baptism is founded, and thither goes all that is to be said of it." And what applies to baptism, Luther applies to every doctrine of faith: it is based exclusively on the written Word of God. Thus we believe that we receive forgiveness of sin in the Lord's Supper, because the words so stand. 502, 22. The text, the text alone decides the question, whether the bodily eating and drinking is something

...whether it's good for you or not. In this our faith adheres to the two little words "for you. In this our faith does not go astray, for these two words, which sustain our faith, are words of Scripture, words inspired by the Holy Spirit, and therefore infallibly certain and divinely true words.

According to Luther, everything in the church must submit to this authority of the Word. The church is more than its servants, more than the bishops, popes, and conciliar authorities, but God's word is more than the church. It is true that the church is to judge everything and pass judgment on everything, but everything is to be judged according to the holy Scriptures and God's Word. Luther says in 330:11: "Neither Peter nor other ministers of the word may ascribe to them any authority or supremacy over the churches. Let no one burden the churches with his own statutes, but let it be said here that no authority or authority is more valid than the Word of God." Concerning the writings of Augustine and other church fathers, Luther writes 303:15: "It is not valid to make articles of faith out of the work or word of the holy fathers, otherwise it would also have to become an article of faith what they had for food, clothing, houses, etc., as was done with the sanctuary. The Word of God is said to be an article of faith, and no one else, not even an angel. *Verbum Dei condant articulos fidei et praeterea nemo, ne angelus quidem.*" This is rule in the Christian Church, and rule without exception. As Luther, therefore, does not want to know anything about a spirit and an effect of the same without and before the word, so also nothing about writing, judging, and judging about and against the Scriptures. 321, 3. 4. what is invented and fabricated without and apart from God's word are to him reprehensible little human fables and the devil's lies. 301-305. 403, 92. 93. 426, 221. 424, 209. 409, 121. 395, 54. 331, 16.

The Ten Commandments, the Faith, and the Lord's Prayer, which have been in use in the church from time immemorial, are not the fruit and consequence of a gradual development of doctrine that has taken place over the centuries, but rather pieces of teaching taken from Scripture. In the preface to the Large Catechism it says of the three main pieces mentioned, 384, 15-19: "These are the most necessary pieces, which must first be learned from word to word, and should accustom the children to recite them daily when they get up in the morning, go to table, and go to bed in the evening, and not give them food or drink, unless they have said it. Likewise also every householder is to be careful with his servants and maidservants, that he keep them not with him, when they cannot or will not learn it. For it is not to be tolerated that a man should be so crude and savage, and not learn such things, because in these three things all that we have written is recent, coarse, and most simple.

in the Scriptures. For the dear fathers or apostles (who they were) have thus put in a sum what is the doctrine, life, wisdom, and art of Christians, what they speak and act about, and what they deal with. Luther's aim in his Small Catechism was not to deposit his own theological views - he had none - but rather to summarize briefly and succinctly what we have before us in Scripture. The Catechism is supposed to be the lay Bible, that is, a short extract from the Bible, for the common man, as it were the Bible in nuce. 518, 5. In the superscription to the preface to the large Catechism, Luther therefore also calls the Catechism of the whole sacred Scripture a short summa and excerpt, *summa et improprie totius sacrae scripturae*. 375. and 379, 18 he says of the Catechism that it is a short extract and transcript of the whole sacred Scripture, - *totius scripturae quasi quoddam compendium est, brevemque illius atque summariam descriptionem continet*. And as the catechism intends to be nothing but a resumè of the sacred Scriptures, so the purpose of the same is no other than to bring the young into the Scriptures. 385, 24. 25.

The fact that Scripture is the highest, indeed the exclusive principle of truth in the Church is something Luther makes clear to catechists and catechumens alike, especially in the Small Catechism. When, for example, the Catechism asks, "What then are such words of God?" or "Where is this written?" and then answers, "Thus write the holy evangelists, etc.," or "St. Paul speaks to the Romans on the sixth verse," Luther thereby also clearly indicates that he does not want to know of any other source of divine doctrine of faith than the holy Scriptures, and of any other criterion of the truth of faith than Scriptural truth. 361, 3. 362, 10. 13. 365, 3. If, therefore, a theological question has been answered by a clear and distinct statement of the holy Scriptures, the highest thing that the Christian, the theologian, and the whole Church can do has been done, according to Luther. Such a doctrine, for which book, chapter, and verse of Holy Scripture have been cited, is incontestable, divine truth. Scripture is the absolute word of God. Everything that is written in Scripture is *eo ipso*, because it is written in Scripture, from the Holy Spirit, and need not first be legitimized as divine truth by a higher authority. The Christian sermons, however, as well as all pure writings and books, including our Lutheran catechism, are relatively God's Word, because Scripture comes into play in them, and they must prove themselves to be divine truth with Scripture. Deeper than the Scriptures we do not, we cannot, climb. For if we stand in the Scriptures, we thereby stand on the rocky ground of eternal, infallible divine truth itself. "It is written," is Luther's first and last and only answer to every question of faith.

According to our confession, the task of the theologian does not consist in drawing conclusions and expanding the area of spiritual truths by dialectical treatment of theological concepts, but solely in ascertaining what Scripture teaches and in citing clear Scripture for his statements. While modern theology seeks to arrive at the knowledge of truth by deepening into one's own self, Luther calls to every Christian and also to every theologian: "Vide quid scriptura loquitur, keep only to the Scriptures." 511, 83. And the right Christian and theologian art consists for him precisely in this, that one does not allow himself to be led away from Scripture. "Therefore - says Luther 495, 63 - we must be valiant and armed, and not let ourselves be led astray nor turned from the Word, that we do not let baptism be a mere single sign, as the enthusiasts dream, ne a verbo Dei divelli et abstrahi nos patiamur." Concerning the words of the Lord's Supper in particular, Luther writes in 501:19: "Mark and keep these things well, for on these words stand all our foundation, protection, and defense against all error and seduction that have ever come or may yet come." This is precisely the lamentation of the enthusiasts, that they allow themselves to be carried away by God's Word. Luther writes in 495, 61: "But they, the enthusiasts, are so blinded that they do not see God's word and commandment, and do not regard baptism and authority any further than as water in a brook and pots, or as another man, and, because they see neither faith nor obedience, it shall count for nothing in itself."

This sole authority of Scripture is now championed by Luther against all enthusiasm and rationalism, which places the spirit of man above Scripture and casts it as the judge of God's Word. Luther sees his whole struggle against Pabstism as essentially nothing other than the struggle against enthusiasm. For above, apart from, without, and in opposition to the holy Scriptures, the pope declares himself to be the sole authority to decide on truth and error in matters of faith. Instead of placing himself under the word of sacred Scripture, the pope asserts: *Omnia jura esse in scrinio sui pectoris*. Of the papacy Luther says: "But God's commandment was not to be put up, but left lying, or rushing about, so that a child could not think, and for that reason open his mouth according to that which we have put up, and not once saluted God for it." 407, 114. And in connection with the Schmalkaldic Articles, Melancthon says 328, 6: "Besides this, he also arrogates to himself this, that he has power to make all kinds of laws concerning divine service, changes in the sacraments, and doctrine, and wants his statutes and ordinances to be held equal to other articles of the Christian faith and holy Scripture, as they cannot be relaxed without sin. For he wills to base such authority on divine law and holy scripture; yea, he wills that it should be based on the holy scripture and on the holy law.

to the commandments of God, and that is still worse, he adds this: All these things one should and must believe, forfeiting eternal blessedness." Luther therefore rightly judges in 321:4: "For the papacy is also a vain enthusiasm, in which the pope boasts that all rights are in the shrine of his heart, and what he judges and calls with his churches is to be spirit and law, even if it is above and against Scripture or the oral word." The Reformation is nothing other than the victory of the Scriptural principle over enthusiasm and rationalism in the papacy.

But above all, it is the rationalism and enthusiasm of the enthusiasts, who do not believe that they possess the truth and life principle in spiritual things in the foreign ego of the pope, but in their own ego, against which Luther defends the infallible authority of Scripture. 525, 13. Instead of submitting to the Scriptures, the enthusiasts, according to Luther, follow mad reason, 487, 12, and judge, interpret, and twist the Scriptures and the oral word to their liking. 321, 3. It is the *clandestinus et seditiosus diabolus*, the lying devil, which rebels against all divine order and truth, which manifests itself in enthusiasm. 495, 61. page 322, 5 it is said, "It is the old devil and old serpent, who made Adam and Heva also enthusiasts, leading from the outward word of God to spirituality and conceit, and yet doing it also by other outward word." Enthusiasm is the lying principle inherent in all men, the delusion of the natural man that he has no need of the Scriptures, but rather that he has in himself the very source of spiritual light and life. "Enthusiasm - says Luther 322, 9 - has been in Adam and his children from the beginning to the end of the world, instilled and poisoned into them by the old dragon." Now as, according to Luther, the Scriptures are the pure source of all spiritual divine truths, so precisely is enthusiasm *origo, vis, vita et potentia omnium haeresium et papatus et mahometismi*." 322, 9. "Therefore we ought and must insist that God will not deal with us men except by his outward word and sacrament. But all that is praised by the Spirit without such word and sacrament is the devil." 322, 10.

But as enthusiasm and rationalism reject Scripture, so at bottom it rapes reason itself. According to Luther, it is the mad reason, the *insana ratio*, which the new spirits raise to the banner. By conceding the floor to natural reason in spiritual matters, they also make fools of themselves before the forum of sound reason. He who exalts himself above Scripture and fights Scripture with his reason, comes at the same time into conflict with the fundamental laws of all sound reason. The *sana ratio* knows its limits, and only the frenzied, the unreasonable reason presumes in divine

He was the first to be given the opportunity to make a decision on the matter. *Insana ratio perverse et praepostere judicat.* 487, 13. In Luther's eyes, therefore, the rationalists were nothing else than clods, doltish spirits, ccrassi, nasutuli, μωρόσοφοι, novi spiritus, 321, 4, and their wisdom is nothing to him but nose-wisdom, super-wisdom, fables, and folly. 489, 28-30. 494, 58. "*Superciliose admodum fabulantur, insaniunt novi illi spiritus,*" says Luther 489, 29. The whole charge of the new spirits, who despise the written word and raise their own spirit to judge over it, is to Luther a mere knave's piece and the devil's mockery, *mera sycphantia et diaboli illusio.* 487, 15.

This decisive stand of Luther for the sole authority of Scripture in theology and his energetic struggle against any interference on the part of reason, characterizes Luther's appearance from the beginning, and it is a gross lie when modern theology claims that Luther also recognized the Christian experience of salvation as the principle of theology. In 1508 Luther became professor at Wittenberg, and his position on the question of principle in theology was from the first so clearly determined and energetic that Dr. M. Pollich was able to prophesy of Luther: "The monk will make all the doctores mad and bring up a new doctrine and reform the whole church. For he rests upon the apostles' and prophets' writings, and stands firm upon JEsu Christ's word." Nor was the fruit of his struggle left out, for on July 8, 1516, Luther wrote to Lange about Aristotle, who Luther considered the representative and embodiment of reason in theology: "Aristotle ... has no audience." In September 1517 Luther delivered his *Disputatio contra scholasticam Theologiam*. In the same Luther drives Aristotle, reason, out of the house of God, out of theology, with powerful blows. We call attention only to the following theses: "*Theologus non fit, nisi id fiat sine Aristotele. Theologus logicus est monstrosus haereticus, - est monstrosa et haeretica oratio. Frustra fingitur logica fidei. Nulla forma syllogistica tenet in terminis divinis. Si forma syllogistica tenet in divinis, articulus trinitatis erit scitus et non creditus. Breviter, totus Aristoteles ad theologiam est tenebrae ad lucem.*" In the writings which followed one another more and more rapidly from the year 1517 onward, Luther spoke out more and more frequently and decisively that in theology only Scripture was to rule, and that reason had nothing to write poetry or to judge. Thus, in 1520, he concluded his writing against the papacy with the words: "But I ask that whoever wants to believe in me, arm himself with the Scriptures." To Henry VIII, in 1522, he exclaimed: "On the Scriptures I stand and abide!" And in his writing against Latomus of 1521, Luther declares, "*Non enim vel Gregorius, vel ullus angelus.*

120 The attacks of modern theologians on God's Word.

habet aliquid statuere in ecclesia aut docere, quod e Scriptura probari non potest."

Thus, from the beginning, Luther stands with his faith and his whole theology solely, but also fully, on the ground of Scripture; and the major to all his theological statements has precisely the inspiration, the divinity and infallibility of Holy Scripture, as its content.

F. B.

(To be continued.)

Modern theologians' attacks on God's Word.

2. Rationalistic Criticism Addiction.

Now how is the Bible to be approached? This question caused the old rationalists much distress; for that the apostles, driven by the "genius of their time," had also written only for the old time and could now no longer be heard, was certain to them from the beginning. In consequence of Semler's criticism, he was considered the most learned who could cut away the most from Scripture. "Criticism was at the time of my appearance an entirely uncultivated field," Semler wrote repeatedly (Tholuck: Verm. Schr. II, 54). By this, however, he meant the nitpicking or "negative criticism, that one sought to shake everything that had been established up to that time in the field of the New Testament"; for of this pronounced hostility to the Bible such a critic says: "The real criticism awoke only when doubt began to stir, when one's own Christian (?) consciousness became conflicted with the contents of the Bible, when the reputation of the Bible already began to decline." (Hahn: Ueber den Stand der neutestamentlichen Kritik 1848, p. 12 f.) Insolently enough, here and there an unscrupulous knave declared the sacred writings to be falsified in general, so that Semler, "surprised by the aberrations of younger contemporaries, was at last frightened by his work and almost lost faith in his science". (Reuß, p. 260.) The disbelief grew over his head, as well as that of his still somewhat more conscientious friends Michaelis, Baumgarten, Ernesti. One fell quite openly in his school to the Manichaeian and Papist blasphemies of Scripture (cf. Hunnius Apost., p. 975 ff). The so-called "common sense" was already in such abundance among his pupils that, as Hamann says, one could make whole herds of gergeses full, sated, and fat with it. They treated the Scriptures as a tailor treats cloth, and pretended to the church that even if all the New Testament Scriptures were scribbled away, "Christianity in its ideal conception would still remain unharmed. They wrote introductions by which no one could be introduced to the Scriptures.

(Credner I, 51. 49.) What wonder when the Hall students buried the Bible in a solemn funeral procession and sang: "The introductory science is a free and independent science, which as such charts its own course and to whose decisions dogma must submit. (Credner I, 51. 49.) What wonder, then, if the Hall students carried the Bible to the grave in solemn funeral procession, singing as they did so: Now we bring the body to rest! (Kzt. 1845, p. 352.) What wonder, too, when they, together with some of their teachers, ran around naked in a warm room of Dr. Semler and celebrated indescribable feasts! (Tholuck: Verm. Schr. II, p. 118.) After he had called in the Gergesen herds, he no longer needed to be surprised at their goings-on. Of course, he did not want to push the blasphemy as far as Lessing, Bahrdt, Basedow; but for that he was thrown away by his own people and received a reprimand from the minister of culture of the godless Prussian king. Thus he had only misfortune with the spirit he had conjured up. He still wanted to hold on to something of the Bible; but what did rationalism do with it? The pope had long since called it a dangerous toy. Semler wanted to be an honorable critic; but those ungodly men who claim that the sacred writings have been falsified do not even possess civil respectability. He who alleges the forgery of a bill of sale, without being able to produce proof of it, is everywhere considered a base scoundrel, and a blasphemous of divine documents should be any better? The father of lies, indeed, sometimes resorted to this blasphemy, "ye have no more the genuine Bible," but only to tease the Christians a little; he soon fell silent, and was ashamed when he should bring proof; for it must be admitted, indeed, that forgeries of texts have been attempted by heretics like Marcion, and by scoffers; but no sleuth has ever been able to find that the Church has adopted such a forgery. The pagan Celsus accused the Christians in the second century of such; but Origenes answered him, "I, for my part, know of no men among us who have falsified the evangelical history but the disciples of Marcion, of Valentinus, and, where I am not mistaken, of Lucianus. But this crime cannot be laid to the charge of the faith of Christians, but is to be imputed to those alone who have thus tampered with the Gospels. Would it not be most unreasonable to blame all the frauds of the Sophists, and all the false opinions of the Epicureans, the followers of Aristotle, and the rest of the philosophical bands, on philosophy itself? And it is equally unjust to accuse and condemn true Christianity because some have endeavored to corrupt the evangelical history, and to put forward new doctrines which quarrel with the doctrine of JEsu." (Contra Celsum, translated by Mosheim, p. 191 f.) What has the Christ-

How can the Church be held responsible for distortions of the Bible by enemies? If a lady from Washington, the wife of a well-known politician, and a Jewish ship's doctor claimed before me that in their Bible it says: "Cain slew his brother Abel; go and do likewise," that is not the Bible which the church has handed down and passed on! If a babbler thinks that the first Christians were not so exact in their use of the words, he thinks that they did not hold their treasure in higher esteem than he does. History shows, however, that every falsification of the text was at once discovered and put to shame; that from the beginning the Church watched over her sacred documents, and became the more vigilant the more enemies arose. Then, unawares, such a chatterer again chides the Fathers of the Church for having been too timid in their caution. Who can deny that the writings of the Roman and Greek classics never had to pass through such fire as the biblical writings found from the beginning in the criticism of their enemies? "There is not even a single work," writes the Catholic Prof. Hug, "whose origin and age are attested by so many testimonies, and by such writers as reach so near up to the time to which such a work is attached." (Einl. i. d. Schriften N. T. I, 35.) Why did their passport remain unobjected to? They bring no spirit of God with them; therefore they find no hostile fortress in the world. The hatred of the flesh against the spirit drove them to all the tricks of the lie. Semler, Lessing, and others claimed that the Gospels were too unanimous to be authentic. "As long as the strict theory of inspiration prevailed in the church, according to which the sacred writers were only instruments of the Holy Spirit, so long could this unanimity of the Gospels not be noticed," said Gieseler (Hist.-krit. Versuch. 1818., p. 31). But now it was said that the Evangelists must have drawn from a common source, from a primal Gospel, which no longer exists. No, cried others, they could not have come from one source; to us they are far too contradictory. So the ant-people of the Babylonian scholars dragged themselves off to gather reasons against the holy book. They paraded reasons like soldiers, and with them smote themselves. Just as the Pietists had wanted to peel the spirit out of the letter, the kernel out of the shell of Scripture, according to their liking, so Semler wanted Bible excerpts for the people, in which only what "serves for moral improvement" and fits the time should be kept. He threw out a whole number of scriptures from the Bible, according to his liking, and made the interpretation of the Scriptures the mere handmaiden of unbelieving science. Where the fear of God was thus wholly gone, nothing could restrain the iniquity that declared the children of God's house their bread to be a serpent.

On one point only did the critics believe they had a firm hold. No one can deny that in the ancient manuscripts of the Bible there is a multitude of readings. The less the enemies had seen of it, the more noise they made of it. A collection of the scribal errors of older copyists, and of the sayings deviating in single words from the text of the Bible, which are found in writings of church fathers, was indeed too tedious for almost all to occupy themselves with; nevertheless, they shouted much about it, without in the least considering that it is much worse with the writings of the heathen. But it is true that God has never miraculously prevented the memory of a church father from mixing in wrong words when reciting a biblical saying, any more than he has prevented our children from distorting his word when reciting their tasks. When the number of copies of the Bible increased, he prevented the spelling mistakes as little by miracles as he now prevents the printing mistakes. Let us then examine the resulting readings with the sincerity and thoroughness due to a Christian critic! This no one did with greater diligence than J. A. Bengel († 1752), who was therefore called "the pea-reader". Under doubts and temptations he had become a critic; but with him it went according to Hamann's words: "Criticism is a schoolmistress to Christ. As soon as faith arises in us, the handmaid is cast out and the law ceases. The spiritual man then judges, and his taste is surer than all the pedagogical rules of philology and logic." (Kzt. 1828, p. 229.) God allowed the sincere man to succeed. Bengel later wrote: "The more closely I have been forced to examine the Scriptures for the slightest possibility, the more have I been raised up by that grace which makes hearts firm." (Apparat. crit. p. 634.) He recognized that by the readings not a single doctrine of Scripture is changed, and praised Divine Providence, which has watched over it that wickedness has not been able to bring in its poison. All enemies, if they are honest, must testify to "the comparative unimportance of most readings," and confess with remorse "that no truth indispensable or important to her (the Church) is touched thereby." (p. 173 f.) Bengel therefore wrote to a student: "About the various readings in the New Testament I would have more to say to you than this letter could contain. Eat the bread as you find it, and do not worry whether you find here and there a grain of sand from the mill. Christ and his church present themselves everywhere in the garments of weakness and lowliness; so it is also with his word; yet he and his word are without blame, however much the world may resent them. I find this very thing perfectly suited to the character of Christ and his word. If the holy scriptures, which have been so often copied,

If the miracles of the Holy Spirit, which so often passed through the defective hands of men, were without any defect, the miracle would be so great that the belief in them would no longer be a belief. On the contrary, I am surprised that many more different readings have not arisen, and that the existing ones do not in the least shift the foundation of our faith. So confidently put aside this doubt that once tormented me so terribly." (Corresp.-Bl. 1833, p. 526 f.)

3. Rationalistic zeal against Bible reading.

The rationalists, however, were not at all concerned with a sincere examination. They only wanted to get rid of the Bible in a decent way and, if there was no other way, also in an indecent way. In a paper of 1816, "Untersuchung, ob die Bibel in unsern Zeiten als ein Volksbuch zu empfehlen sei," Bible reading was rejected as "catholic leaven," and this rationalistic fool's paper was warmly recommended for that very reason by the papist paper published in Munich in 1818, "Mit welchen Bedingungen ist die Bibel ein Lese- und Lehrbuch? "Do not read so much in the Bible; otherwise you will go mad," preached a Bavarian pastor (Corresp.-Bl. 1826, p. 407). Prof. Oertel lamented over nothing more than the wide distribution of the old Luther Bible. In a translation test, after which he wished to see an excerpt from the Bible made, he simply inserted in Matth. 16, 19. the words: "And are you only completely enlightened." (Ibid. 1836, p. 22. 72.) Thus appeared quite a number of diluted translations, which were more reinterpretations and forgeries than translations. Or what is it when Joh. 3, 5. 6. in Hezel's translation of 1809 reads: "You can certainly believe me, replied Jesus, whoever is not born again through a baptism that obligates him to rational principles, cannot become a citizen in the kingdom of God. What is born of a sensual being is also a sensual being; but what is reborn by rational principles is also a rational being?" If the Rationalists were especially incensed against Luther's translation, even the Reformed Hagenbach must confess: "It was not so much a matter of the improvements of the individual, but rather of the whole juicy color that the stupid eyes could no longer bear; it was the whole mode of expression of Luther's grainy, forceful language that no longer appealed to the effeminate ears. Here, too, everything was to be put in order for human understanding, everything was to be trodden under foot and translated into the comfortable, convenient language of everyday life. Moses, David, Isaiah, Paul, even Christ himself, were to speak as they would have spoken now, if they had had to preach a test sermon before the new Consistorial Council." (Vorlesgn. V, 315.) But not merely that! The holy scribes should

Become rationalists or leave the world. When the children of darkness looked at the Bible as it is, they said, "It is not fit for the people. The Catholics are quite right when they allow only the clergy to read it. The people cannot examine it as we do; therefore they should not dare to examine it, but leave it to us. We will tell them what the result of our research is." (Corresp.BI. 1832, p. 229.) This alliance of the papacy with the rationalistic enemies of the Bible, which is nothing special for us, so hurt a remaining Christian in the Roman Church that he wrote: "It is a sad phenomenon in our Church that scholars who want to be orthodox, yes, even general vicariates, put on the banner of the external authority of Protestant neological writers (who are hostile to the faith) as a breast defense of their proofs against the general reading of the Bible, and make their opinions into pallisades of their own. Admittedly, such use and commendation of Protestant neological writers is just right with them and agreeable to Rome; . . . whereas the neological-rationalistic Protestants are again so extremely kind and grateful against them, the Reg. IV. Indicis libr. proh." (the pope's Bible prohibition) "into their literary protection, and do not know how to praise highly enough the decrees of the Curia, the Jesuits, and the popes against the permissibility of general Bible reading as the most wise measures. Thus Roman Catholics and Protestants, and even ecclesiastical dicasteries (courts) on both sides, lend their hands to rationalism and seek in united alliance to supplant the positive Christianity, the faith in revelation, all the more bendifully and surely. It is truly the secret and open mischievous signal for Bethlehemite infanticide, to kill the Savior, who has become a foolishness and an annoyance to them. Secret wickedness is stirred up in this. 2 Thess. 2:7." - Now, from all sides, enemies of the revelation appear, either directly or indirectly, and repeat objections that have already been made a thousand times and refuted just as often: the Word of God is in many passages dark, ambiguous, mysterious, and sometimes contains so many offensive, annoying, and contradictory things that the freely permitted reading of the Bible can rather mislead than reprove the common man; all enthusiasts, all heretics, all lying prophets, and seducers of the people have their false views and outlooks from the Bible. The wretched men who do not deign to reproach the Bible in this way, or to accuse it of such defects, are, without knowing it, practising a sad craft. They play secretly in cahoots with deists, the half-brothers of atheists." (The Bible Not a Book for Priests Only. 1818, p. 152 f. 43.) To us this alliance of Pabstism with freethinking is not very striking. "Precisely in the most distinctive of their natures, in their fundamental articles, the Roman Church and the rationalistic party are

one. . . . Both take their wisdom from men. . . . Both leave the righteousness that is before God to be acquired by men themselves." (Corresp.-Bl. 1827, p. 35.) Did the Pabst's enmity against God's Word, after all, go so far as to induce even the Turkish Sultan to prohibit the distribution of the Bible (Ibid. 1834, p. 424), whereas the Armenian Catholic priests also said Mass for the Sultan's sick son. (Kzt. 1838, p. 317.) When in 1799 the Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany, through Bishop Ricci, wished to effect a reformation of the churches and convents, monks, nuns, and priests were found mostly sunk in materialism and denial of God, so that nuns in interrogation denied the personal God and immortality, declared voluptuousness to be paradise, etc. In the monastery libraries the situation was wretched; in one large monastery they did not even possess the Bible in its entirety, but only individual pieces of it. Now who protected this godless rabble? The fanatical papists aroused the superstitious people to revolt and did not let up until the bishop was in prison. (Ev. Kzt. 1828, p. 270 ff.) Thus papism and unbelief always helped together.

(To be continued.)

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Parochial Schools in the East. The "Lutheran Herald" writes: "The number of parochial schools within the ministry is shamefully small. One must take off one's hat to the congregations that have them, for they provide proof of willingness to sacrifice for a cause that enjoys no special favor even in the ecclesiastical (!) "circles of our time. What a parochial school is worth becomes evident every year at the Confirmand lessons. There is an enormous difference between children who have enjoyed the blessing of a church education and those who have only been to a free school, which, for all its other good qualities, lacks a religious foundation. It is a pleasing perception that the number of Saturday schools is increasing, which are under the direction of the pastor and in which primarily that is done which the free school lacks, the religious instruction by means of the biblical history, the hymnal and the catechism. To be sure, the pastor burdens himself with this school, which can be quite burdensome at times; but something comes out of this work, even if it remains unpaid. A pastor does many things for which he is never paid; God will reward him one day. The confirmands who have been to the parochial school or Saturday school are more likely to remain faithful to the church than those who merely come to Sunday school. They hear and know more about the church, and therefore they prefer it to the children who have grown up in superficial unionism in the free school, which has no intention of doing so. In this respect, however, the Lutheran Church cannot be a match for the free schools.

the reverence that this national idol claims for itself. Here in the East the time seems to have passed when one could proceed to reintroduce the parochial school system." (!) "All that can be done, and ought to be done, is to strengthen the schools that still exist, so that their numbers do not diminish still further, and to encourage the pastors to increase the number of Sunday schools, and to make the Sunday schools more and more strictly Lutheran." Let us hope the writer is mistaken in his appraisal of the facts.

F. P.

A Statement on Sunday Legislation by Pastors of the New York Ministry. From the "Lutheran Church Gazette" we take the following statement: "We, the undersigned, members of the Brooklyn Pastoral Conference of Lutheran Pastors of the Ministry of New York, in view of the movement extending over wide districts of our city to enforce the celebration of the Christian Sunday by law, and because we have been repeatedly urged to participate in this movement along with our congregations, hereby declare the following as our position, on the basis of the Word of God and the confessional writings of our Evangelical Lutheran Church: 1. We hold that Sunday should be sanctified, where the sermon and God's word are not despised, but kept holy, gladly heard, and learned. (2) That such sanctification can never be obtained by the law, since the law has no power to renew and sanctify the heart. (3) That the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and the holy sacraments, are the only means by which man can be brought to the true renewing of the heart, and so to the sanctification, not only of a single day, but of the whole life. (4) That we recognize as binding, as Christian citizens who are to be subjects of the authorities who have power over them, the present law enacted by the state authorities, according to which, for the greater sanctification of Sunday, all public houses are to be strictly closed, and that we bind it upon the conscience of all Christian citizens to render the obedience due to this law, as long as it may exist, with all fidelity and in view of their responsibility before God. (5) That, while we concede to this law a certain power to maintain the outward civil order, we nevertheless, for the reason stated in 2. above, and in the light of history (Puritan legislation of New England), deny all and any power to promote the right sanctification of Sunday, pleasing to God, or to make the hearts of men better and more pious. (6) That, in our honest opinion, in its present form, instead of promoting the moral welfare of the people - for which purpose laws are given - it opens wide the door to hypocrisy and much dishonesty. (7) That we herewith express our disgust at the manner in which this law is often attempted to be carried out. We declare that the system of espionage, which is so popular in some places, as well as the method of obtaining recognition for the law, which is practiced by means of dissimulation, lies, and deceit, are among the most morally reprehensible things of which morally responsible, let alone Christian, men can be guilty. In response to the invitation to join the movement to force the legal celebration of Sunday by exerting pressure on our municipal administration, we hereby most emphatically object to the entanglement of church and state which underlies this movement. We believe that in a country where state and church are separate bodies, the church has the right to promote Christian citizenship through the means entrusted to it by God, but not to come before the city authorities with weapons of its own choosing.

9. Finally, we declare that a Sunday of gluttony and an unholy nature is an abomination to us and that we will always fight against it by virtue of our office. In conclusion, we declare that a Sunday of gluttony and unholiness is a particular abomination to us, and that we will always testify and fight against it by virtue of our office. On the other hand, we repeat that we see the only help for a general and blessed celebration of the day not in impotent laws, but in the renewal and sanctification of human nature through the preaching of the gospel of Christ JEsu. Brooklyn, Kings Co, N. Y., March 9, 1896." So much for the statement. The same is right inasmuch as it rejects the State legislation for the celebration of "Christian Sunday." In contradiction with this is clause 4, because in it the "state authority" is actually granted the right to enact laws "for the greater sanctification of Sunday." Christians recognize Sunday laws as binding, and Christians can help to make them, insofar as these laws are enacted for purely social reasons, e.g. so that men and animals may have rest on one day of the week. As soon as the laws enacted by the state are justified on religious grounds, as in the words "for the greater sanctification of Sunday," there is a mixture of state and church, and Christians cannot approve of such legislation. F. P.

II. foreign countries.

From the Reformed Church of France, the "D. E. K." reports the following announcement: On January 23rd, Mr. Alfred André, Director of the French Bank, member of the Synodal Council of the Reformed Church of France and its Synodal Board, of the Paris Consistory, and President of the Evangelical General Committee of the Society of Young Christian Men, died in his 62nd year. Born in 1827, he was led to a righteous conversion at the age of 38 by the revival discourses of the English evangelist Radcliffe, to which he bore witness through all his distant life. A busy man of high position and great fortune, he advocated evangelical efforts not only with his purse, but with his person and his word. He gladly entered into personal intercourse with the poor and the little people. To the Paris Association of Christian Young Men he made the princely gift of 300,000 frcs. His death is a loss for all French Protestantism.

Portugal. The newspapers carried the news that all Protestant missionaries had been expelled from the Portuguese colony of Laurenzo Marques, South Asrica. The Portuguese government now denies this. Only those missionaries had been expelled who had openly fought against the Portuguese rule. Portugal had only done what every government was not only entitled but also obliged to do. F. P.

Africa. The Africa Association now, in the fourth year of its existence, intends to found its first work. In the landscape of Usambara, the East African Switzerland, a square mile of land has been acquired for the establishment of a colony for freed slaves. It is situated high and healthy, is also covered with forest and traversed by various watercourses, and is therefore well suited for its purposes. The construction of a colony for freed slaves will, however, cause great difficulties, since freed slaves often voluntarily return to their old yoke. For a part of the freedmen and many children, however, the colony will become a sweeping home. (D. E. K.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42.

May 1896.

No. 5.

Frank's Theology.

(Continued.)

We now turn to Frank's doctrine of the person of Christ. In view of the abundance of Christological material, we can only examine some of the main points in more detail here. We will also refrain from further pursuing the path briefly sketched above, p. 68, on which "the Christian I" places the God-Man out of himself.

Frank begins his Christological reflections by discussing the possibility of the incarnation of the Son of God. He points out the close relationship of the Logos to human personality. "Here the infinite and the finite do not stand opposite each other in abstract exclusiveness, but on the one side we have absoluteness, but in the form of conditionality, and on the other conditionality, but as an after-image of absoluteness. The essential image of the father, which bears the consciousness of eternity in itself as a conditional one in divine self-conditionality, and the creaturely image of God in the form of the son, in whom eternity is also placed in the heart, namely in the form of creaturely conditionality, relate to one another in such a way that the personal consciousness of the one can be taken into that of the other: That the former is not a priori reluctant to be conscious of himself in the form of creaturely human consciousness, and that the latter is not denied the possibility of being taken into the form of divine, but conditional, consciousness. For the unity to which it comes with the Incarnation of the Son, to the I of the divine image and the human likeness, wants to be thus placed on the consciousness of personality, without the essential difference of that which forms the content of consciousness being thereby abolished." System of Truth. II. p. 100. 101. "It is the character of human nature, created in God's image, that its personhood can be elevated to the status of a human being, without any subtraction from its essence.

It is the character of the latter that it can enter into the framework of human personality without destroying its essence. Frank wants to maintain the essential difference between God and man, between Creator and creature, and calls it "an intemperate, blasphemous self-exaltation" if it should occur to man to make himself personally one with God. P. 99. But yet he brings the person of the Logos and the human personality very close together. The Logos, like man, stands in relation to God, the Father, in conditionality; the Logos is the divine, man the creaturely image of God; the Logos, like man, bears in himself the consciousness of eternity. The character, the nature of the Logos means that he can also become conscious of himself in the form of creaturely-human consciousness, and the character, the nature of the human personality means that it can be raised to the embrace of Logos-consciousness. It is therefore quite natural that in Christ the divine and the human consciousness should be factually united in one consciousness of personality, in one I, and it is easy to understand that the Logos became man and man was raised to the status of Logos. We stand here near an abyss, the abyss of Pantheism. It requires but a little leap to cross over the narrow gulf between the Son of God and man, who is also the image of God. And a disciple of Frank, who has entirely cast off the bonds of ecclesiastical tradition, perhaps dares to make this leap once more, and in Aenere makes humanity God and God man. Frank denies "the necessity" of the Incarnation of the Son of God "in the general sense of the order of creation." But if the character of the Logos is designed to enter also into the form of creaturely-human consciousness, and the character of human personality is designed to embrace also Logos-consciousness, then a beautiful plan and design of God would have remained unexecuted if the Son of God had not become man. Christian thought, which has discovered so many related traits in the Logos and in man, necessarily demands that the related should meet in reality and unite with each other. The Scriptures place Christ, the God-man, in a quite different light from the beginning. That God became man is, according to the Scriptures, a miracle, the miracle of all miracles, Isaiah 7:14, 9:6, a great mystery, 1 Timothy 3:16, that surpasses all thought, imagination and understanding of man. The God for whom no thing is impossible, Luc. 1, 37, has done the unbelievable and unheard of and has lowered His incomprehensible being into the body of a man out of incomprehensible love for the fallen race of men. Where the scripture puts both sides of Christ together, the divine and the human side, as Rom. 1, 3. 4.

9:5, in the prologue of the Gospel of John, it marks the infinite sublimity of the divine over the human. The eternal Word, who is God Himself, the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, became flesh. He who is God over all came from Israel after the flesh. Frank evaporates the unique miracle of God's grace by trying to make it as plausible as possible to human reason.

Frank imagines the act of the Incarnation of the Son of God thus: "The Incarnation of the Son of God is really to be grasped as such and not merely as the assumption of human nature, so that by virtue of the eternal determinateness and self-determination of the Logos, its eternally pre-existent subject became in time a human subject." p. 93. "The Son of God did not merely enter into the sarcasm of human existence, he did not merely accept and appropriate human nature, but he became flesh, he transformed his mode of being, that of the Logos, into the mode of being of the flesh. But this he has done . . . in that the subject of becoming remained identical with itself, did not cease to be what it is, did not break off from itself or perish in another existence, but knew itself as the eternal Logos and bore witness to itself as this." S. 106. After recalling JEsu's self-designation as "Son of Man," Frank continues: "If this is the case with the Son of Man, and if herewith in any case the fact of a real human person is established, the integrity and completeness of which at the present time requires much less proof than it did before old age, then that theological conception seems to be invalid which, in consideration of the initiative of the Logos in the Incarnation and of His subject who is identical with Himself, taught an anhypostasia of human nature and an enhypostasia of it in the Logos. Yet even this theologumenon is not somehow founded in the immediate Christian faith, but contains only a conclusion drawn from those two presuppositions which are in themselves correct." P. 123. 124. The existence of the God-man, the *unio personalis* which follows from the *unitio*, is p. 125: "On the basis of what was said earlier about the possibility of the Incarnation of the Son of God as the Second Person of the Triune God, we have to teach such a personal unity of the Son of God and the Son of Man by virtue of the Incarnation and from the first moment of it, according to which the conditionality of Logos-consciousness enters into the conditionality of human personhood and personality formation, and the latter realizes itself in the conditionality of the former. The Son of Man, who has become the Logos, is conscious of himself as such, and the characteristic of his personality is that he knows and wants to know and recognize himself as the Son of God; and the Son of God, as the incarnate Son of God, has the characteristic of his ego-consciousness precisely in that he knows and wants to know and recognize himself as the Son of God.

Son of Man." Further, p. 126: "Everywhere there is an I that is unified in itself, whether the Son of Man is conscious of himself as the Son of God or the Son of God is conscious of himself as the Son of Man, a unity according to which the hypostasis of the Logos, which has its essence in the conditionality of absolute self-conditioning, The hypostasis of the Logos, which has its essence in the conditionality of absolute self-condition, formed within itself the egoity of the human nature prepared for it, which was capable of the absolute in its relative, God-image self-condition, and the human personality, by virtue of such its ability, took into itself the hypostasis of the Son of God, without being shattered by the fullness of this divine content." It is not enough, then, for Frank to conceive of the Incarnation of the Son of God merely as assuming human nature. He rejects the ecclesiastical doctrine of the anhypostasia of Christ's human nature and the enhypostasia of it in the Logos. He ascribes to human nature its own independent personality. The Son of Man, apart from His association with the Logos, was a real human "person." The Son of God and the Son of Man are therefore two distinct, independent persons. These are obviously Nestorian reflections. And the Son of God has now become the Son of Man, and the Son of Man "has become the Logos." But how these two Persons, each of whom asserts not only its own peculiar essence, but also its own personality, are nevertheless to form One Person, that is incomprehensible, that is more than a miracle, that is an absurdity, a contradiction in terms. And if Frank, in order to gain and hold fast a unified I, represents the matter in such a way that the I of the Logos formed into itself the I of human nature, and in turn the human personality took into itself the hypostasis of the Son of God, if he calls that "becoming," which John 1:14. calls the "transposition," the "realization," the "realization," the "realization," the "realization," the "realization," the "realization." 1, 14. as a "transposition," when here again he resorts to the similar nature of the logo-personality and the human personality, he thereby awakens Eutychian conceptions, the idea of a blending and fusion of the divine and the human. It is precisely in the unio personalis that the mystery of the person of Christ culminates. And when man, with his coarse understanding, tries to reproduce this unfathomable mystery, he destroys it. The ecclesiastical doctrine of the absorption of human nature into the unity of the divine Person of the Logos is not another way of figuring out this difficult matter, not a conclusion, but the simple reflex of the clear scriptural statements in which this mystery is revealed to us. St. John testifies, "And the Word was made flesh." Joh. 1, 14. The Logos is the active subject here. And this subject remained the same, even as it became what it was not. For the disciples saw in the Word made flesh the glory of the only begotten Son from the Father. And so the "becoming" does not include a transposition, a transformation. The Word became flesh. Flesh

is a designation of human nature, not of human personality. So the Logos, remaining what he was, this same divine I became man after body and soul. A statement of the kind that the flesh or the son of man became the Logos is not found in Scripture. When St. Paul writes in Gal. 4:4 that God "sent his only begotten Son, born of a woman," the opinion is that this divine Person, the Son of God in the fullness of time, came forth from a woman, that is, was born, that is, was precisely born man, took on human flesh and blood from the virgin. And Heb. 2:14 we read that the Son of God "became partaker of the flesh and blood of the children of men." And so this flesh and blood is the very flesh and blood of this Person, the Son of God, the Logos' own nature. Scripture, where it describes the act of the incarnation of the Son of God, speaks only of this divine I and of human nature, not of a human I with which the Son of God had united himself. But in that the Logos assumed and made human nature his own, this nature found in him, in his I, its independence, its support and continuance, or its personality. The result is that the incarnate Son of God is now both God and man in One Person, and knows, wills, feels, testifies to Himself both as Son of God and Son of Man, as Scripture clearly teaches.

Frank's Christological views are especially prominent in his remarks on the humiliation and exaltation of Christ. "The act of the Incarnation was at the same time an act of the divine glory's divestiture, even though the divine glory is by no means merged in the incarnation. With the divestiture there is no more a change in the nature of the Son of God than with the Incarnation; but to refer the former and the humiliation that followed it merely to the Son of Man or to the human nature assumed by the Logos, with the continuance of his absolute consciousness of God, violates the absolutely fixed unity of the God-human I, and is just as impossible for faith bound to Scripture as it is for dogmatic thought founded on it. The divestiture was, in the first place, that of the incarnate subject, who transformed his consciousness of being a Son into the form of a developing, finite human consciousness, in such a way that the Son of Man became and remained conscious of himself as the Son of God, thus preserving the identity of the incarnate and incarnate subjects." Of course, it is no less true that he who has entered the bounds of human existence and human consciousness knows himself as the eternal Son of God, who as such is in heaven, irrespective of his earthly existence, and who therefore ascribes to himself equal honor, equal power, etc., with the Father, and who, from the relation of the Father to the Son of God, is the Son of God.

But all this he is and has and says of himself according to the way of man, carrying in the finite vessel of human consciousness the undisguised possession of his own sonship with God and of his divine essence. If anything were to contradict the actual appearance of Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, it would be the supposition that, beside or above this human consciousness, there stood another, absolutely absolute and divine one, or even that the latter had taken the place of the former." The entry of the Son of God, by virtue of a self-determination that arose out of his free love, into the bounds of human existence, more nearly the transposition of his eternal Son-consciousness into the form of finite human consciousness that was becoming temporal, but which, by virtue of its image of God, was nevertheless capable of being a receptacle for this divine content, humanly speaking, the consciousness of the eternal Son, that is his divestment. (p. 147) One otherwise misses the consequence in this passage. While, on the one hand, there is talk of an "alienation of divine glory," of a glory which Christ "had before" and laid down at his incarnation, p. 121, on the other hand, there is ascribed to the incarnate and humiliated Son of God "a divine glory latent in him," which was made manifest in his miracles. p. 156. P. 156. But this much sufficiently follows from what has just been communicated, that Frank is a Cenotic. Not the *ἰλαρχος*, but the Son of God,

who is about to become a man, is for him the subject of divestiture. Yes, he goes beyond the earlier representatives of kenosis, such as Thomasius. It is not enough for him to define self-emptying as the renunciation of certain divine attributes. He wants to see the unity of the person of Christ placed on the consciousness of personality. And there he teaches precisely a transposition of the eternal Son-consciousness into the form of a developing, human self-consciousness. He expressly denies that an absolute, divine self-consciousness existed beside and above the human self-consciousness. The Son of Man was only humanly aware, by virtue of his human, finite self-consciousness, of himself as the Son of God. A change in the nature of the Logos is said not to have occurred, but a complete change and transformation of his self-consciousness. How? Is not this an absurdity, an unthought: a Son of God with only human, finite consciousness, who knows of himself only as a man knows of himself? What is self-consciousness but a reflex of being? A person is conscious of being what he is, and in the way that his nature and condition entail. God is the Absolute and conscious of Him as such, and that is absolute consciousness. The consequence of the system, the consequence of dogmatic thought, demands that he who is conscious of God be conscious of God.

The first thing is to deny the absolute, divine self-consciousness of the human being, and to deny the divine ego and being as well. Dörner has already rightly held this against the modern Cenotics, that to give up divine self-consciousness is also to give up the divine essence. No, Christ is One Person, the God-man, a unified God-man I, and thus a unified God-man consciousness also belongs to Him. We cannot, of course, put ourselves with our thoughts into the consciousness of the God-man. The God-man is and remains a miracle before our eyes. We remain within the limits of Scripture in all that we say of this "marvel. And Scripture also allows us to see into the absolute, divine self-consciousness of the incarnate, humiliated Son of God. When He testified of Himself and said: "We speak what we know, and testify what we have seen" (John 3:11), and: "No one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son" (Matthew 11:27), He spoke such things out of His eternal consciousness as the Son.

Incidentally, in his description of the divestiture and humiliation of Christ, Frank does not stop at self-consciousness, but teaches in general a transposition of the Logos into the bounds of "the human mode of existence," teaches "a depotency of the eternal Son of God into a Son of Man," p. 152, 156, and consequently denies this Son of Man divine omnipotence and omniscience. "For the sake of our faith, and not merely and first of all for the sake of our knowledge, we cannot send ourselves into a God-man, whose absolute subject consciously rules the world, while the child Jesus lies in the manger; may we deny the factual correctness, not merely the conceivability, of the opinion that the man Jesus could have had a humanly developing consciousness, if his hypostasis were that of the absolute Logos-consciousness? we must object to the opinion that the absolute, unchangeable knowledge of the Logos is compatible with the partial non-knowledge of human nature, quite apart from the specific question which tends to be raised here, how the possession of omniscience on the part of the assumed human nature can be reconciled with its temporary renunciation of its use." Our knowledge is bound to the Scriptures. But the Scriptures set before us this man Jesus, who walks in lowliness on earth, at the same time as the ruler of the world, who directs and guides all creatures according to his will, as the all-powerful, all-knowing God, as an all-powerful, all-knowing man. And this very thing is of the greatest importance to the faith of ordinary Christian men. For if the whole, full Godhead is not in the wag, if Christ's martyrdom, death, and blood was not God's martyrdom, death, and blood, then our redemption and reconciliation are in a bad way. The actual

The main reason why Frank cannot send himself into such a god-man is his rationalism. With his small mind he cannot rhyme divine omnipotence, divine omniscience, absolute Logos consciousness with human lowliness and impotence, partial ignorance, a developing human consciousness in one subject, and therefore he denies those divine attributes and leaves only these human attributes. Now, if rhyming is to be used here, we will soon have rhymed away the whole of Christ and Christianity.

Frank defines the state of exaltation as follows: "The exaltation of Christ as the counter-image of divestiture together with humiliation is the drawing in and transposition of the human form of consciousness into which the Logos had entered into the divine form, so that henceforth the I of the Logos is at the same time conscious of itself as man. S. 205. "The absolute Logos-consciousness, entered at the Incarnation into the bounds of a developing human personality, knowing itself as the eternal Son of God in the form of a human consciousness, submerged at last in and with this human I into the depths of death, Now the divine consciousness of the Logos breaks through from the depotence it had achieved by virtue of its self-empowerment to a mode of existence in which the human form of consciousness into which it had previously entered is lifted up to itself and henceforth, as this Son of God, is conscious of itself at the same time as the Son of Man." P. 217. So here again not only a unitary, but a simple self-consciousness. To the incarnate Son of God, in the state of humiliation, only human self-consciousness was proper; now, in the state of exaltation, He has exclusively an absolute, divine self-consciousness. Human self-consciousness was lifted up to divine self-consciousness, drawn into it, transposed into it, and thus wholly absorbed into it. The exalted Christ, according to his divine self-consciousness, knows and feels himself to be a man. From this it follows, since a person knows himself as what he really is: the exalted Christ, as the Son of God, is *eo ipso* the Son of Man. The human being is wholly drawn into the Godhead and swallowed up by it, Frank here admits: "We cannot refer to any direct Scriptural testimony in this case." "But," he continues, "for this reason our statement is not an arbitrary theological comment, which could also be otherwise." And now he again brings his *ceterum censeo*, and reminds us that "the human being, by virtue of his being made in the image of God, was from the beginning designed to receive the divine glory into himself." That in Christ the Logos-consciousness could first be completely absorbed in the human consciousness, and that now the human being is completely absorbed in the divine, is explained by the fact that the human being, the human personality, and the I of the Logos are encompassed by one frame, that they are basically one, that the genus be-

The natural, self-deifying ego of man has formed a god-man here according to its own desire. He was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man, and he was a man.

Frank describes the work of Christ as active and suffering obedience, which Christ voluntarily assumed. This obedience was an atoning, salvific performance. But how does he mean this? "We understand by the atonement of the Mediator of salvation that performance in virtue of which he took upon himself and satisfied the whole requirement of the law, namely, of the violated law, towards the sinful human race in willing obedience, therefore in sinlessness." "This atonement of the mediator of salvation is a salvific one ... since unity with the divine will is now established in the midst of punitive repression, and, thus the latter is itself deprived of the ground for its continuance." P. 179. By *obedientia activa* and *passiva* Frank understands something quite different from what the Church has hitherto meant by it. Christ, according to him, took upon Himself the requirement of "the law violated," which is suffering and death. He calls it a "delusion, as if the strict observance of all the individual prescriptions of the law were necessary for the attainment of *obedientia activa*, whereas what is to be expressed by it in the first place is nothing else than the willing acceptance, the spontaneous assumption of the suffering which, according to the will of the Father, was to come upon the Son of God incarnate for such a purpose." p. 174. The incarnate Son of God willingly assumed the suffering assigned to Him, that was His active obedience; there was no need of His observing the individual precepts of the law. And this willingness to suffer was expiatory and salvific. Frank herewith denies and declares as delusion what the Scripture Gal. 4, 4. so clearly testifies. God sent his Son into the world, born of woman, and "put under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law." The law, under which Israel was, is the sum of all God's demands upon man, especially upon Israel, all that God would have man do and leave. And it was to this law that Christ was subject, and he took it over, thus fulfilling all the commandments of God. And this very obedience served for our redemption. In "the spontaneous assumption of suffering," according to Frank, the *obedientia passiva* also merges with its salvific effect. "But this suffering of the God-human Mediator of salvation was not expiatory for its own sake, as if by the suffering itself, however deep and great it might be, God's reaction against sin could be brought to a standstill, but only in so far as this suffering is one willingly assumed, borne in conformity with the will of God, and in it, therefore, the obedience of the Mediator of salvation is expressed." P. 172. This is also contrary to Scripture. Certain as the

If Jesus' willingness to suffer is atoning, it is certain that his suffering itself, the greatness and severity of his suffering, also served to atone for our sins. For the Scriptures teach that through the death, the cross, the blood of Jesus Christ, we are redeemed from our sins and reconciled to God. Rom. 5, 10. Eph. 2, 16. 1 Joh. 1, 7. Frank also speaks of a substitutionary atonement. But here also he adopts only an ecclesiastical expression, while he rejects the thing to which this name alone fits. He denies, as we have just seen, that Christ has fulfilled God's commandment and law in our stead, has done what we have failed to do, and has thus done enough for our disobedience. But neither does he want to know that Christ endured the punishments we deserved. "But of course we must immediately add that this substitution, if it is to agree with the concept of salvific atonement, must be conceived differently and more sharply than it was in the older evangelical theology. It was "an error to allow Christ to have endured the punishment which fallen man would have had to endure as an unredeemed man, and then to proceed from this scripture-less theologumen to the vexatious inquiry, how far Christ's endurance of the punishments of hell, since they were not eternal, was equivalent to the torment of the damned, which, by its nature, is endless. (p. 188) "If, for the sake of Christ's substitution, it should be required that he should have suffered what the damned human race should have suffered, the *satisfactio vicariaa* would be invalid, since Christ did not suffer this. P. 189. What Frank here sets forth as a scriptural theologumen is in reality scriptural truth, and what he sets forth as truth is a fundamentally false theologumen. When Isaias, 53, 5th, writes XXXbXXXXXX XXXX, it means nothing else than that our punishment, the punishment we deserved, was upon Christ, so that we are now free from it. And what is forsaking God, in the strict sense of the word, but torment of hell? The curse of the law, which Christ bore in our stead, Gal. 3:13, truly includes eternal death, hell, and damnation. As Frank masters the Scriptures here and punishes lies, so on the other hand he deprives the frightened consciences of the consolation they need. What shall we oppose to the terrors of death and hell, if we are deprived of the consolation that our substitute also endured death and hell in our stead? Frank understands the substitution to mean that it belonged to the seed of woman, that is, to the whole human race, "to make the atonement that brings salvation," and that the other Adam really made this atonement, which sinners could not make. But where does Scripture say that God demanded salvific atonement from the fallen human race? No, the Scripture testifies only to the two things: on the one hand, that God demanded obedience from men, and punished the transgressors with punishment, death and

On the other hand, that God sent his Son into the world for the reconciliation of the world, and that Christ fulfilled all the righteousness of the law in our stead, and bore and atoned for the punishments of our sins. So Frank also breaks off the top of this article of the reconciliation of the world by Christ, or takes the heart out of it, as it were. From his point of view this is well understandable. For to the natural ego, which fantasizes and philosophizes in its system, the cross of Christ is a foolishness and an annoyance.

G. St.

The main service of the Evangelical Lutheran Church

For the Preservation of the Liturgical Heritage and for the Promotion of Liturgical Study in the American Lutheran Church Explained and

Provided

with Old Church

Singing Tunes by Frederick Lochner, Pastor. St. Louis, Mo.

Concordia Publishing House. 1895. XII and 294 pages quarto
in half french \$2.00.

The sense of order belongs to the dispositions of a rational creature, and the lack of it is sin or the consequence of sin. It is all the more fitting for us Christians to have a holy sense of order, which is determined or co-determined by the new spiritual life within us, even and especially when we are practicing our sonship to God together, as happens in Christian congregational worship. But order does not only mean that everything unseemly and disruptive is kept away, but also that, when we do things together, the persons involved and the things they do are so constituted and relate to one another and fit together in a way that corresponds to the nature and purposes of the event.

Now it belongs to the essence of Christian congregational worship that God presents the goods of his salvation to the congregation and makes the latter skillful and willing to accept and rejoice in his goods of grace, and that the congregation accepts in faith what God gives it in grace, appropriates and seals it, and thus, made rich in all things, now also offers the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving to the God of its salvation, and also honors him in prayer by asking in general and in particular for further gifts from God's mild hand of grace in faith. The means by which God will continually bestow his salvation on his church are the means of grace; the order which he has instituted for the public administration of the same is the public ministry of preaching; the sacrifices of the church are sacrifices of the hearts, sacrifices of the lips, and sacrifices of the hands; and the end of all worship is the salvation of souls, and the glorifying of the grace of God in Christ JEsu, our

HErrn. This is also the basis for the order of worship in the church. In a building, the main part of the whole building, or that by virtue of which or for which the building stands or is to stand, must be decisive, or at least primarily determining, for the arrangement of the individual parts of the building, and everything that does not stand in a serving relationship to the whole, but wants to become an end in itself, becomes disorder. Thus the great cathedrals of the Middle Ages, with all their manifold architectural beauty, stand as sad witnesses and images of a ghastly distortion of public worship, for they are not suitable for a congregation built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets to be enriched in all doctrine and knowledge and in the consolation of the Gospel and, as a priestly people, to offer their sacrifices to God himself, But with their high, wide rooms, their semi-darkness, and their distant main altar, they were designed as temples of a mysterious sacrificial cult, which was performed by human mediators between God and the congregation, not by the congregation, but for the congregation, so that the sacrilegious service of the Mass, into which the entire public worship of the congregation had actually been transposed, was decisive for these sacrificial temples. Thus the congregation that assembles in such a papist sanctuary is not, in the sense of the papist transposition of the congregational service, a royal priesthood that takes grace for grace from God's hand and offers praise and worship to his God, but an unholy people for whom, at an altar of atonement, a mediating, anointed, and shorn priesthood is to acquire grace and, through its actions, bestow blessings on the living and the dead. Thus it is easy to explain what our confession mentions with the words: "In many countries, as in Italy and Hispania, etc., the adversaries do not preach the whole year through, but only during Lent. Then they should cry out and lament, for this is to overthrow all worship, for the greatest, holiest, most necessary, highest worship, which God has required in the first and second commandments, is to preach the word of God." Apology 213.

In these words, however, it is also made clear what we have to consider and observe as the main part of Christian congregational worship, namely, the preaching of the divine Word. True and beautiful Dr. Luther writes: "If man is to come to work with God and receive something from Him, it must happen in such a way that man does not start and lay the first stone, but God alone, without all request and desire on the part of man, must come first and make a promise to him. The same word of God is the first thing, the foundation, the rock, on which all man's works, words, and thoughts are subsequently built, which word man must gratefully receive and faithfully follow the divine promise.

Believe, and doubt not, that it be and come to pass as he hath promised. As surely as the new life of the Spirit must first be wrought in man before it can be active, and as surely as it needs constant nourishment and strengthening in order to continue to grow and work, so surely must the administration of the means of grace be and remain the main part of the public worship service. This is not to say that all the means of grace must be in use in every service. And if one asks which part of the administration of the means of grace is to be regarded as the chief part, among all the activities belonging to it, then one will have to grant this position to the audible proclamation of the gospel in the public sermon, as the confession says: "The greatest, holiest, most necessary, highest service.... is to preach God's Word." It is in preaching that the gospel comes to its fullest and most versatile use and effect; there the word of Scripture is used for teaching, for punishment, for correction, for chastening in righteousness, for comfort against sin, and under the cross. Hence it is quite properly spoken *a parte potiore*, when for "going to church" one says also "going to preaching." So also the pastor who knows and appreciates the sermon as the main part of the service of his congregation, will have an incentive to turn his main effort to the fact that his congregation is well provided for especially in this part. Thus, the most grievous infractions in the church service, and in the rooms in which it is held, are those which stand in the way of, or detract from, the sermon. We cannot, therefore, subscribe to the view of congregational worship according to which it was not the sermon but the celebration of the sacraments that marked the climax of the service and made the service the principal service. We hold that the main service of a Sunday or feast day is the one in which the audible Word is proclaimed in the greatest detail and heard by the greatest number of listeners. On the other hand, it should be noted that the celebration of the Sacrament belongs to the same class of divine services as the sermon, since it is, in the main, not a sacrifice, but the administration of a means of grace, according to which what is done is essentially the same as the purpose of the sermon for the assembled congregation. But even in so far as in the sacrament God acts with the communicants in particular, while the sermon is addressed to the whole congregation, the importance of the sermon as a performance of the congregational service is the predominant one.

In the second place, then, are those ordinances in which the congregation presents to God what it has to present to Him, and these also stand in various relations to one another and to the ordinances of the first class, to which the arrangement and structure of the congregational worship is subject.

has to be taken into account. Here, too, the Reformation has restored the congregation to the enjoyment and exercise of its rights, which had been stolen from it under the pope, and the liturgical order will also be related to the fact that in it and through it the congregation will be made lively and active and instructed to cooperate vigorously in the performance of these holy Christian works. For this reason, we should not call it order, but rather avoid as disorder everything that makes this cooperation more difficult or prevents it, such as, for example, when the organist leads the congregation with a full organ, when melodies unknown to the entire congregation are chosen, when the responsories are assigned to the choir, and the like. For this very reason it is advisable to introduce and maintain a certain uniformity in the order of worship in a church body consisting of a larger number of congregations, since such uniformity makes it possible for a Christian to participate in the service without difficulty, even as a guest in a sister congregation or after moving to one. Thus Luther, soon after the work of the Reformation had first taken shape in Wittenberg, while he wanted to leave the congregations complete freedom to arrange the outward orders of public worship according to their Christian judgment, nevertheless saw to it that a form existed according to which those who wished to do so could be guided; His liturgical writings from the twenties were in every respect quite reformatory works, in which Luther, with a firm and yet again with a tender hand, eliminating what was wrong and sparing what was good and beautiful, gave the German Church of the Reformation guidance for a worthy structure of congregational worship, and the Lutheran Church has also gratefully used these works and continues to use them to this day.

Our Synod, too, has not gone its own way on new paths with its Church Agenda, but has compiled its liturgical Church Book "from the old orthodox Saxon Church Agendas." It has not, like the Anglican Episcopal Church, imposed its Book of Common Prayer on the congregations and pastors by ecclesiastical legislation for general use, but has only recommended it as a good and beautiful guide and collection of forms, and in this sense most of our congregations have taken it into use. It is true that there have been several requests for minor changes in one or the other part and for the addition of some more forms; but the Synod has not yet been able to decide to take these requests into account in the manner indicated, probably also for the reason that our dear Mr. Pastor Lochner, by publishing a collection of liturgical forms, which are also mostly taken from the old Lutheran texts, has been able to make the most of them.

The Church has already taken into account the existing need for agendas and church ordinances.

Another liturgical work by the same author is now before us under the title "The Main Service of the Evangelical Lutheran Church". We would like to call this work a commentary and an instruction manual for our church agenda. It is true that this work, which is based on many years of detailed liturgical studies, does not follow in its progress the individual parts of the Agende in the sequence presented there, but rather, as the title already indicates, adheres primarily to that part which bears the title "Main Service on Sundays and Feast Days with Communion". Certain parts of the main service, which are not included in the order of service of the Agende, such as the Introit, the Communion exhortation and the Pax Domini, which are found in other old orders of service, are also dealt with. The author has been especially careful to bring the individual pieces to historical and liturgical understanding in their own right and in their context. In addition to the various hints and advice for the execution of the individual liturgical acts, we count the carefully selected and compiled musical pieces as instructions for use. The appendix on "the places for the liturgy" should be especially useful to pastors and congregations who are planning to build a church and who want to design the interior of the new church with liturgical sense and taste. What touches us soothingly about the whole work is the sobriety that comes to light with all love for the matter and a warm appreciation of liturgical beauty and expediency, which does not rave about liturgical forms, does not let decoration and adornment become the main thing in public worship, but holds fast the one thing that is necessary as that which all the rest must serve, and we join in the wish which the honored author expresses at the end of his preface with the words: "God keep us in His pure Word and Sacrament, and so let us live in His Word, that also in regard to the public worship of God, all that is entwined in ceremonies and ways by human hands around the means of grace, may serve the same, and thereby appear not as a made, but as a natural and real ornament in the common use of the means of grace and in the common confession and praise of the Most High."

A. G.

News about the progress of the work on our St. Louis Luther edition.

Repeatedly, from several sides, the wish has been expressed to me, that I would now and then give news about our Luther edition in our journals, so that also in our own circles more interest for it would be aroused, and those who do not yet possess it, would be stimulated to acquire it. I am not able to do this in any other way than by pointing out errors in other editions that have been improved in ours, because I understandably cannot take care of praising and extolling my own work.

Herewith, then, I give the news that the fifth volume is completed in manuscript and is in progress in the printing house, and that I have progressed so far in the editing of the sixth volume that I have just finished the revision of the old translation of Luther's slogans on Isaiah, also the new translation of Luther's interpretations of Hosea in triple relation (namely, according to the Zwickau manuscript, according to the Basel edition, and according to Veit Dietrich's edition), about 2100 columns. All this material is, as I said, in Latin, and the editing was partly connected with great difficulties, because the text of the Latin originals is often very corrupted. This is true not only of the writings already present in the old editions (e.g., in the more extensive explanation of the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, in the small section § 207, there are three serious textual corruptions, which were recognized neither by the editors of the Latin nor by the old translator), but also of the writings in the critical editions of recent times; to a greater extent by the Erlangen edition, to a lesser extent by the Weimar edition. We want to prove the correctness of this statement for these editions with one scripture each.

From the Erlanger we select the interpretation of Hosea, edited by Dietrich, exeg. opp., tom. XXIV, p. 165 sqq. We will say nothing of the hundredfold false, many times senseless, and sense-disturbing interpunction, which is dismissed in the Weimar edition, vol. XIII, p. XXXVI, with these words: "The Erlanger edition is not at all to be taken as a pattern in this." The most common compendiums, as those for que, quam, quod, tur, are not properly resolved, and we meet p. 291 and p. 297 with the word quoquam instead of quoque; p. 295 postque instead of postquam; pp. 282. 299. 348. 397. 440 quod instead of quam; pp. 242 and p. 485 quam instead of quii; p. 377 quo instead of quod;; p. 322 qua, instead of quae; p. 235 premunt instead of premuntur. Proper names

are written in small letters: p. 222 and p. 396 *aquas* instead of *Aquas* (*Aach*); p. 265 *lyra* instead of *Lyra*; p. 523 *aquila* instead of *Aquila*; p. 349 *salus* instead of *Salus* (the goddess of salvation); p. 374 *cupidinem* instead of *Cupidinem* (*Cupido*); p. 377 *priapum* instead of *Priapum*; and vice versa we find p. 209 *Paulo* instead of *paulo*. A curious is p. 487 the word *levinati* instead of *Levi nati* (born of the tribe of Levi). We meet with words which do not exist: P. 223 *connovatur* instead of *concionatur*; P. 279 *impenditium* instead of *impendentium*; P. 375 *indignitationem* instead of *indignationem*; P. 499 *stulus* (not a misprint, for even the Wittenberg reads thus) instead of *stultus*; P. 330 *destincti* instead of *distincti*. P. 167 *habet* instead of *habent*; p. 273 *ostendit* instead of *ostendat*; p. 274 *discant* instead of *discunt*; p. 277 *invenire* instead of *inveniri*; p. 278 *timere* instead of *timeri*; p. 180 *cultis* instead of *cultus*; p. 191 *respublica* instead of *respublicae*; p. 209 *sic* instead of *hic*; p. 217 *convenimus* instead of *conveniunt*; p. 249 *beneficia* instead of *beneficio*; p. 250 *vinæ* instead of *vineæ*; p. 279 *significationis* instead of *significationes*; p. 289 at *ftatt et*; p. 295 *στηῦέον* instead of *στηῦένω*; p. 303

dum instead of *tum*; p. 306 *vidi* instead of *vide*; p. 310 *ferre* instead of *fere*; p. 318 *defenderunt* instead of *defenderent*; p. 326 *impositio* instead of *imposito*; p. 329 *filios* instead of *filius*; p. 338 *praedicat* instead of *praecidat*; p. 349 *tamen*
mise

ricordiam instead of *tam misericordem*; p. 352 *ingratia* instead of *in gratia*; p. 377 *vocabula* instead of *vocabulo*; p. 400 *in* instead of *ita*; p. 10 *feri* instead of *seri*; p. 436 *in Jacobum ftatt in Jacob, cum etc.*; p. 445 *docet* instead of *docent*; p. 477 *queri* instead of *quaeri*; p. 504 *rectum* instead of *tectum*; p. 505 *ecclesia* instead of *ecclesiae*. The Hebrew, too, is several times erroneously given, e. g. pp. 395. 456, and 485. This register might be considerably enlarged, but it may be enough.

Now we turn to the Weimar edition and take from it the interpretation of the prophet Hosea according to the Zwickau manuscript, which is found there in Vol. XIII, p. 2 ff. The text of this is golden in comparison with that of the Erlangen, and there are only a few reading errors or false readings, so that we were glad to lay aside the Erlangen edition, after which we had edited the first pages, as soon as we had recognized the better quality of the Weimar edition. However, even when working on this edition, we had to struggle with great difficulties on several occasions. For as carefully as the manuscripts have been consulted in it, we still miss a due consideration of the Holy Scriptures (resp. the Vulgate). As a result, more than twenty errors have arisen in this One Scripture: the annotations have been drawn to the wrong biblical passages; here and there the necessary key words are missing; elsewhere words are emphasized as key words that are not; yes, even wrong key words have been given, which, of course, impairs the sense not a little. Now let us leave evidence of this to follow. P. 5, line 10 (Cap. 1, 7.) we find

"Non salvabo" as a keyword, whereas it should read (from the same verse) Et salvabo. The opening words of the interpretation immediately following, "With wonder-loving words all the prophets point to the kingdom of Christ," should surely have opened the editor's eyes to the fact that "Non salvabo" could not be the correct keyword, and if he had then searched the Bible he would have found Et salvabo. - P. 9, Z. 17 (Cap. 2, 14.) Loqui ad vor with its interpretation, which is designated by the verse number "15th," belongs to the 14th verse, and should have been placed before line 14. On the other hand, the verse number "15th" should have been placed before Vinitores in line 14. In the same line, with the Erlanger, the instead of hoc should have been read. - P. 19, line 1, should have been preceded by Sic melius, the first part of Cap. 4, 12. (according to the Vulgate) should have been placed as a key-word. But there is no cue, and the interpretation of v. 12. is appended to v. 11. without a new verse-number or other distinction. - P. 20, Z. 5 (Cap. 4, 13.) Ideo fornicabuntur is marked with the verse-number "14." denoted, though it still belongs to v. 13.; it is only in the following line that "14." should have been put, before: Non visitabo. - P. 21, line 3, lacks the keyword and verse-number before the interpretation (Israhel, etc.), which does not belong to Cap. 4, 15. where the Weimar edition has drawn it, but to v. 16. - S. 29, Z. 3 is Scientiam etc. drawn to Cap. 6, 7. while it belongs to v. 6. - P. 32, Z. 10 should be the whole line: [Cap. 7.] 5. Die regis etc. should be erased, for the whole exposition of lines 11 to 19 belongs to v. 4. not to v. 5. The verse number "5." should be placed before line 20, where Die regis etc. is properly placed as a cue. - P. 34, Z. 16 should have begun a new paragraph with the word Recedere, and the verse-number (Cap. 7,) "13." placed before it. But now it makes it seem as if the whole of the following interpretation still belonged to v. 12. - P. 35, line 18 (Cap. 7, 14.) a new paragraph is made with the words Sed ego laetor in corde, etc., and these words are emphasized as a key-word. Here it would be inconsistent to refer the words, "They worship the belly as their god, and forsake me," to the preceding words, "But I rejoice with all my heart," as to their keyword, and the Weimar edition should already have seen from this that the latter are not the correct keyword. A glance at the Bible would also have taught that the words Sed ego laetor in corde, etc., are not found here in the biblical text to be interpreted, and thus cannot be the keyword here at all. Rather, they are taken from Ps. 4, 7. freely according to the Vulgate, and belong to the preceding. That this has been overlooked is all the more surprising, because Psalm 4 is given in the text, and the Weimar has placed Ps. 4, 8. in the margin. - P. 37, Z. 14 should be placed before Invocant the cue in question with the verse-number (Cap. 8,) "2." - P. 37, Z. 15, the verse-number "3." is to be erased, for the note given there still belongs to

V. 2. In the same line, instead of *allegorate*, read: *Allegat*. - P. 38, Z. 1, the verse-number should be "3." - P. 38, Z. 11, the verse-number (Cap. 8,) "5." should be placed before *Projectus*, whereas in Z. 14 it should be erased. - On p. 38, line 21, a new paragraph should have begun with "*Ipse*," which is a new keyword and should be blocked (in our Bible: "the calf"; Vulg.: *ipse*), provided with the verse-number (Cap. 8,) "6." On the other hand, this number is to be erased p. 39, Z. 7. - On p. 40, line 12, the words: "*Sed et*" are to be deleted, but placed in the following line after the number of verses (Cap. 8,) "10." because they belong to the keyword. - The words p. 40, line 18: *conturbat terras* are to be changed, after Ps. 29, 9. into *conturbat cervas* (he arouses the hinds). The Erlanger reads *cerras*. - In the interpretation of Cap. 8, 12. we meet, p. 41, Z. 5, with the sentence, which seems to us senseless: *si do tanquam scriptum omnium eum, nihil tamen efficio*, etc. Instead of *omnium eum*, *nomen meum* is probably to be read, which also seems to be indicated by what the Basel edition offers: *aliud semper nomen induunt*. - P. 43, line 20, the verse-number (Cap. 9,) "8." is to be erased. The same is to be put p. 44, either before *speculatorem*, or z. 12, before *laqueum*. - On p. 49, line 20, the words: *Super faciem aquae* are emphasized as a keyword, but they are not, but belong to what precedes. On the other hand, immediately after the words just quoted, the verse-number (Cap. 10,) "8." Should have been placed with the keyword *Disperdentur*. In the following line the verse-number should then be deleted. - P. 51, line 26, at the beginning of the line, the verse-number (Cap. 10,) "13." is missing, and the key-word: *Arastis impietatem*, etc. - P. 56, line 21, the verse-number (Cap. 12,) "2. **" should be erased. The new verse-number "2." with the key-word: *Judicium ergo Domini* etc., which is missing in Weimar's, should have been placed already in line 18 before the word *Judas*. - P. 58, Z. 27 lacks the key-word *Idolum*, and the new verse-number (Cap. 12,) "8." The interpretation is drawn to the seventh verse in Weimar's. - P. 62, line 13, before *Servavi te*, is missing the key-word *In deserto*, and the verse-number (Cap. 13,) "5." - P. 62, Z. 14, before the words, "they have the fullness," the key-word *Juxta pascua* and the verse-number "6." are missing. - P. 64, line 12, should be preceded by *Pro ipse*, the verse-number (Cap. 13,) "15." not first line 13. - P. 65, line 18, should be preceded by *Perdetur*, the verse-number (Cap. 14,) "6." not first line 22. - In many other places than those here given we have had to overcome difficulties and make improvements.

Also in the old edition of Walch's we have not found everything smooth, but had to make many Höckerichte even during the revision. Of this we now also want to give an account. The following

*) The verse numbers in Cap. 12 are here according to the Vulgate lower by one than in our Bible.

148 News about the progress of the work on our Luther edition. The following examples are all taken from one scripture, namely the short interpretation of the prophet Isaiah, Vol. VI, 1 ff. There we read Col. 95, § 7 *) "justice" instead of injustice (*injustitiam*); 164, 22 "medici" instead of medicine (*medicina*); 184, 55 "in all places" instead of in all kinds (*omnimodis*); 185, 57 and likewise 400, 2 "power" instead of night (*nocte*); 221, 120 "propitiation" instead of propitiation (*praefinitionem*); 227, 129 "they" instead of themselves; 258, 169 "keep in check" instead of fence (*sepire*); 266, 184 "a son" instead of in the son (*in filio*); 269, 189 the word care is missing; 293, 228 we read: "although such qualities are not real persons (*propria personae*), as the Grammatici take the *nomina propria*," instead of: 'although they [names derived from offices and activities] are not proper names of the person, as the grammaticians call proper names (*etiamsi non sunt propria personae, sicut grammatici vocant propria*)'; 297, 232 "all" instead of thus (*sic*); 330, 1 "hunger for the word" instead of theure time, as to the word (*famem verbi*); 454, 16 "after times" instead of never (*nunquam*); 493, 11 "the words" instead of the word [of God] (*in usu verbi*); 532, 13 "heresies" instead of heretics (*haeretici*); 539, 26 "every animal" instead of everything that lives (*omne animal* [Ps. 145, 2.]); 559, 65 "has measured" instead of has been measured to (*mensuratus est*); 592, 7 "Hanes" instead of Tanis (*Thanes*); 761, 19 "idols" instead of blocks (*stipites*); 766, 28 "shameful" instead of harmful (*perniciosa*); 813, 15 "others" instead of all (*omnes*); 819, 30 "giant" instead of man of war (*bellator*); 821, 34 "a Manichaeen" instead of Manichaeus (*Manichaeus*); 835, 11 "strange" instead of ineffable (*inenarrabilem*); 865, 29 "That he call the LORD" instead of What the LORD saith (*Quod Dominus dicit*); 954, 2 "Ye that despise not the word, despair not, but seek that all things everywhere may be rightly done and ordered," instead of Ye that despise not the word, but would that all things everywhere might be rightly done and governed, despair not! (*Nolite desperare, vos, qui non contemnitis verbum, sed velletis, recte omnia ubique geri et administrari*); 974, 8 "teaching evil" instead of when not rightly taught (*male docere*); 1062, 39 "instead of the Jews who will be vexed, let not one people but many Gentiles be sprinkled in the likeness of the cross of Christ," instead of: instead of the Jews who will be vexed at the figure of the cross of Christ, not One people, but many Gentiles shall be sprinkled (*loco Judaeorum, qui offenduntur formis crucis Christi, non unus populus, sed multae gentes aspergentur*); 1068, 49 "the same" instead of Him (*eum* [Christum]); 1105, 120 "I, saith Satan, will make thee blessed," instead of I, saith He [Christ Jes. 49, 25.], will help thee (*Ego, inquit, te salvabo*); 1118, 143 "And.

*) In what now follows, the first number indicates the columnne, the second the paragraph.

nicht allein ist er genommen worden aus demjenigen Gericht", instead of Und er ist nicht allein durch dasjenige Gericht verdammt (illo iudicio sc. condemnatus); 1182, 23 "hässliche" instead of hassenswerthe (odiosi); 1187, 31 "ketzerische" instead of aufrührische (seditiosa). That in 1277, 24 robore and patrem eorum is given instead of the correct reading of the Vulgate: rubore and patriam suam, Walch is not alone to blame for this, but also the Latin editions, which have the same wrong reading, but he is certainly responsible in 1277, 23 for confessione instead of confusione. 1129, 160 Luther's translation has been regarded as that of the Vulgate. 1134, 167 the translator says that in the Latin translation the plural, in mortibus, stands, while this is the case only in the Hebrew. 803, 44, the translator continues, after "the superstition," "This is the queen and empress over all that is high in the world." Sometimes the translations given are not exactly wrong, but still not satisfactory, e. g. 1107, 126 "to heal the whole earth" start to make the whole world blessed; 1110, 130 cathedra [the chair or seat from Ps. 1, 1., "where the scoffers sit"] is rendered by: "the cathedra". Politia is almost invariably given by "policey," which here and there makes quite a comic impression, as, 738, 17: "so he [Hezekiah] complains here of having to leave the policey." This may be enough as an indication; a detailed statement of all errors and irregularities would fill a booklet.

Miscellany.

Bankerott. Under this heading the "Hermannsburg Free Church" writes: "Recently I heard the following story: Two were talking to each other about the church situation. One of them asks the other: 'Tell me a scripture that testifies against our doctrine, then I will give in. - The other replied, "If I tell you one word of Scripture, you will have another word of Scripture against it. God's word is always right. If you take it this way, it is right, - if you take it another way, it is also right.' That is the comfortable wisdom of the syncretists, the ecclesiastical bankrupt. Since this wisdom has now become established in certain circles, and is therefore of general importance, it will be well to examine its origin. First of all, it is undeniable that in the above speech of the syncretist there is a grave accusation against the Holy Scriptures. This will not always come to the clear consciousness of those concerned, but nevertheless the accusation against Holy Scripture is there. For that syncretist admits that his opponent can adduce Scriptural words for himself and his position, - but he claims, in the same way, to be able to adduce Scriptural words for his

The Bible would finally prove to be right for both of them. So the Bible would finally prove both to be right, and it would be utterly useless to try to discern from the Scriptures which of the two doctrines was right. Does not this mean accusing the Holy Spirit of having spoken unclearly and ambiguously in his words? Is not the eternal Wisdom then reproached for having spoken in such a way in the Bible that we cannot with certainty discern the real meaning? He who stands thus cannot possibly confess with our Concordia that the Holy Scriptures are the one true guide by which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged and judged. For if every teacher, both right and wrong, appeals to Scripture, and no one can decide who is right, it is impossible to judge and find the truth. This is nothing else than the bankruptcy of all truth. Yes, such as these give the lie to the Scriptures. For it saith: Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my paths,' and again: We have a sure word of prophecy, and ye do well to hearken unto it, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place. But if the Scriptures are a light, those who declare them to be dark, obscure, and ambiguous are lying. It is not the word of God that is to blame, that many cannot know the truth with certainty, and are always wandering about, but man. When the Lord Jesus, in healing a blind man, asked him if he saw anything, he answered: "I see men walking as if I saw trees"; but when Jesus asked him to see a second time, "he saw all things clearly". What was the reason that the first time the man saw everything only indistinctly, even wrongly? Was it because the sun was not shining, because it was night? Oh no, the sun shone just as brightly the first time, when he saw only indistinctly and wrongly, as it did the second time, when he saw everything clearly and correctly. The cause was in the man; his eyes were not yet completely healed. - So it is also with the holy scriptures. It always shines with the same clarity, but there are people who, in spite of the bright light, still do not see with their seeing eyes, or see everything wrongly. Instead of blaming themselves and asking for healing, they blame the Bible. It comes down to the heart position of the person. Some, as far as doctrine is concerned, go to the Scriptures with a preconceived notion. They have already made up their minds about the doctrine according to their reason, and now the Scriptures are merely to confirm them. Then the scripture must be twisted and turned until it fits. If someone else comes along and says, "Your doctrine is wrong, for it is written so," they become uncertain and uneasy, but they do not want to let go of the doctrine they had made up beforehand. What then? O very simple: 'If you take the Scriptures thus, it is right - if you take them otherwise, it is also right', is their answer. Others have decided to follow a certain

to take an ecclesiastical position. They came to this decision not on the basis of Scripture, but on the basis of sound reasoning. It is proved to them afterwards: The position you want to take is contrary to Scripture. They are troubled; but quickly a gentle pillow of rest is put under them again, and it is said: 'We will not argue about that; you adduce passages of Scripture which are against us; we have such as are for us; the Scripture is always right Who does not see that in these and similar cases the Scripture must be according to the position taken by man, but not man's position according to the Scripture? Scripture is clear, distinct, and bright in all cases, but the perverse heart resists the light. The natural man follows the light of reason, but he does not want to be enlightened and governed by the light of the divine Word. It is evident that such people are completely bankrupt. They are like ships that drift rudderless and aimless on the vast sea; and just at this time of great apostasy they are helpless, not knowing where to go. Sometimes they try here, sometimes there. Sometimes they blame their uncertainty and helplessness on the pastors, sometimes on the Scriptures, and so on. And when at last those come who know how to use their weaknesses, and become their leaders, they let themselves be led in their lack of counsel, their bankruptcy, wherever those leaders only want to go, and thus get deeper and deeper into error. This is the punishment for not wanting to be led by the bright light of the divine Word alone, the punishment for thinking the Scriptures dark and ambiguous, while only their heart is the 'dark place' where they do not want the light to shine. Let us ask the Lord to keep us from such counsellessness. Let us ask Him, when we cannot yet clearly discern this or that truth, when we are uncertain which way to walk, - that He may take away the clouds and mists from our hearts and minds, and heal us, that we may 'see all things clearly.'" So far the "Hermannsburg Free Church." It exposes with its remarks a deep harm to the church of our day. It has really become the custom in the midst of "Protestant" Christianity to treat the Bible as a dark, ambiguous book, even while professing with the mouth the clearness of Scripture. Hence also the modern efforts to unite ecclesiastically on the basis of human compromises, instead of making the revealed truth of Scripture, and indeed the whole revealed truth, the basis of the union. The latter, they say, is impossible. This is the practical despair of the clearness of Scripture.

F. P.

Literature.

Our position in doctrine and practice. Address delivered before the 1893 Synod of Delegates of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States by F. Pieper. St. Louis, Mo. concordia publishing house. 1896. 52 pp. Price. 15 cents.

This lecture, which was published three years ago in the "Lutheraner" and other periodicals, hardly needs a detailed recommendation within our Synod. Everyone who has heard or read it will gladly reach for it now that it has appeared in handy booklet form. The very special gifts of the author are well known among us. They can also be seen on every page of this little book: Clear, transparent exposition, compelling, convincing Scriptural proof, concise diction, going back to principles, etc. May God continue to bless this small but extremely important book. It will be of great service to everyone in teaching and defense. It is especially recommended to those who have hitherto only become acquainted with our position from the tendentious publications of our opponents. Here they have a brief but thorough and authentic account of it. There is no better book to give to foreign acquaintances and relatives here and there, learned and unlearned.

L. F.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Synod of Delegates of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, etc. met from April 29 to May 9 of this year at Fort Wayne, Ind. Vice-President Beyer preached, President H. C. Schwan gave the synodal address and presented the official report. The following particulars from the proceedings of the Synod are reported here, which may be of general interest. For the theological seminary in St. Louis, another, the sixth, professorship was created, and the construction of its own building, which is to cost no more than 820,000, was decided upon. The practical theological institution at Springfield should, as a rule, only admit young people between the ages of 17 and 25 and limit the number of students to about 175. This restriction was made in the interest of a thorough education. But also because it is hoped that the number of students in St. Louis will steadily increase. The intermediate high schools at Concordia, Mo., and Neperan, N. Y., pass into the possession and management of the General Synod. The institutions at St. Paul, Minn. and Seward, Nebr. remain in statu quo. - The Inner Mission is to be pursued with new and greater zeal. Specifically, the congregations are to be asked to collect, in addition to the mission festival collections, at least one congregational collection each year for the funds of the Inner Mission. The request of a number of Lutheran Christians in London, England, to send a pastor was granted and the work there was placed under the administration of the General Commission for Inner Mission. The work in Hamburg, Germany, was assigned to the Saxon "Free Church." - Among the Gentiles working in India are the missionaries Näther, Mohn, Kellerbauer. The mission in Japan (Midsuno) was also placed under the Commission of the General Synod.- The Synod newly took up the mission among the deaf-mutes of this country, of whom there are about 40,000 and who are largely unchurched.

are provided for. Four St. Louis students have learned sign language. - The "Homiletical Magazine" is to be expanded into a magazine for homiletics and pastoral theology. A theological quarterly in English is to be started. The "Concordia Magazine", an entertainment

The Synod has adopted the English-language business bulletin. In this latter sheet, but also in no other sheet of the Synod, business announcements can be included. - The short interpretation of the Small Lutheran Catechism, which was prepared by the Reverend General Praeses and examined by the individual Conferences and the respective Commission, was available to Synod in proof form. The Catechism was adopted as a Catechism of the Synod. - The old officers of the General Synod were all re-elected. The next assembly will meet, D. v., Wednesday before Cantate, 1899, at St. Louis.

F. P.

The Gown and the Uniform Headdress in the New York Ministry. In the "Herald" we find literally the following: "The next practical question" (at a pastoral conference of the New York Ministry) "is the one posed by Fr. Euchler: 'Man and where shall we wear the gown?' He introduced this by a brief historical survey of the origin and significance of the gown. Wherever a vestment is accepted, it should also be worn, not only during the services in the church, but also during official acts, such as baptism, marriage, communion with the sick, and burial. It is not appropriate to wear the robe in the streets, but it is advisable to have a robe that can be easily carried and quickly put on. In any case, it is the decision of the Conference that at the funeral of a brother minister, all pastors should wear the robe. Also, at the conference and synodal services, each of the officiating clergy shall wear a gown. Since a beret is little used in this country, the lack of a uniform head covering for the ministers at the laying of the foundation stone, church consecrations and funerals is very noticeable. (Could not a uniform headgear be brought about in the Ministerio? Note of the Secr.*)" So far the report in the "Herald". We "Missourians" have not yet brought about a "uniform head-covering in the Ministerio." God keep us united in the faith!

F. P.

Justification and sanctification. The "Lutheran Evangelist" says quite correctly, "A conversion that does not purify the heart and life is not a true conversion. A religion that makes men lie in their sins is not a true religion." But when the paper continues, "The apostle spoke not only a deeply philosophical" (!), "but also ethical truth, when he said: 'If one believes from the heart, he is justified,'" there is a misuse of Scripture on the part of the "Evangelist." In the passage of Scripture in question, Rom. 10:10, it is not righteousness of life that is spoken of, but righteousness of faith.

F. P.

Concerning the use of the German and English languages in one congregation, we find the following opinions expressed in the "Lutheran Herald": "As a rule, it is not beneficial, as can be proven from many examples; however, in the exception, as in rural congregations, it might be. Nevertheless, the use of two languages in one congregation is an absurdity. In the first place, the older members of the congregation are deprived of their services. Further, it imposes on the pastor twice the work, with confirmation classes and Sunday school; he must have twice the time for the production of his sermons, for only in one language, and consequently in one Bible, is one at home. When then the

congregations would 'English' so much and give double salary, one might approve it from that point of view." (?) "After all, however, it causes both a fragmentation of the pastor's labor, and consequently a diminution of speaking power, and a backlash in the congregation. The members become accustomed to attend the services irregularly. But then experience proves that those who most desire English worship make least use of the opportunity. If it is wrong for German pastors to refuse to release members who do not understand German to an English congregation of the same confession, it is doubly wrong for English ministers to take away members from their German brethren against all law and order. . . . For the sake of this luring away, German pastors are forced to hold English services, to the detriment of their own congregation and the English mission. Besides, it does not sound very flattering to the German youth that they would not have so much sense as to learn to understand the language of their parents so incidentally in 20 years, when their parents have learned to understand the English language in a few months without teachers! - The main thing is and remains the Lutheran faith, and if our English brethren lived more into the German" (?) "spirit of Luther, his theology and conscientiousness, they might be sure that in time every German Lutheran pastor would be ready to promote English Lutheran mission." So much for the debate in the "Herald." We communicate the same not because we thought it absolutely true, but to mark the state of affairs in Eastern Council circles.

F. P.

About the situation in the General Synod the "Herald" judges: "In the General Synod things are getting better bit by bit. It is true that one can apply to some of the old gentlemen the words of 1815: 'The old guard is dying, but not surrendering,' and the younger gentlemen, who swear by the Methodist 'Lutheran Evangelist,' are exercising themselves in shouting over the dead orthodox, but these as well as those are no longer strong enough to restrain the movement to the right. Rightward means toward the General Convention, which, strange to say, is more odious to the Radicals than Missouri. Attempts at unification have already been made several times; the honest intention exists to stand on brotherly footing against one another and to carry on the work of the external and internal mission together. Thus, on April 21 and 22, representatives of the General Council, the General Synod, and the United Synod of the South were in friendly consultation with each other in Washington. From our side Dr. Jacobs and Dr. Repass were there, men of whom" (? L. u. W.) "it is known that they are not compromisers. If, for the time being, nothing happens at such meetings but that one speaks and listens to each other and adjourns to meet again soon, it has not been in vain and in vain."

State Welfare in Relation to Theatres. The "Lutheran Evangelist" reports, "The Ohio Legislature distinguished itself last week by passing a law prohibiting the wearing of high and large hats in the theaters and playhouses of the state. The outrage is to be punished by ten dollars." The "Evangelist" justly adds, mockingly, "What important questions occupy our politicians and legislators!"

F. P.

Biographies of Luther. We take the following information from the "Lutherischer Herald": Prof. Dr. Jacobs is using his leisure hours to write a biography of Luther. Without a doubt, this new Luther book will be more than just a biography. The theological character and influence of the Reformer and the Church bearing his name will be mainly described. The

The book is to appear here and in England at the same time. There, several books about Luther have been published in recent years, which have fabricated a badly drawn and mutilated picture of Luther. - Another Luther biography is also in the making. The publication authority of the General Synod intends to print a series of nicely decorated volumes of historical content in order to give the people in the association of the General Synod a more exact knowledge of the development and nature of the Lutheran Church. One of these books contains a new description of Luther's life; the author is D. Charles Hay, who has also made a name for himself by publishing a larger work, Dr. Köstlin's "Luther's Theology," translated and edited by the old Dr. Hay. In terms of literary activity on the part of the Synod as such, the General Synod is superior to the General Council.

William Henry Green, Doctor of Theology and Professor in the Presbyterian Seminary at Princeton, N. J., celebrated his fiftieth anniversary as Docent of that institution on May 5. Green is not only a thorough connoisseur of the Hebrew language, respected at home and abroad, but also a meritorious apologist of the jrrthumlessness of the Holy Scriptures and the authenticity of the Old Testament writings, namely the unity of the Pentateuch, the "Hengstenberg of North America," as he has been called from Germany. With clarity, thoroughness, and comprehensive scholarship, he has for years opposed the "higher criticism" of our day in a series of writings and articles that have earned the respect of even the most refined opponents, and has thereby combated the Wellhausenian trend that is spreading in Germany, England, and America and tearing down all ground. Among them are: *Moses and the Prophets*," *"The Hebrew Feasts*," *"The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*," and his many excellent contributions to the former "Presbyterian" and present "Presbyterian and Reformed Review," to "Hebraica" and other periodicals. Even if one cannot accept many of Green's statements, his publications undoubtedly belong to the best writings in the field of isagogic criticism, and some of them have been translated into German. Green's apologetic activity is to be acknowledged all the more, as he is almost alone among the theological professors with his confession. In Germany, no Old Testament scholar has believed for a long time that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, and the "reformed" Pastor Dr. A. Zahn in Stuttgart and the Lutheran Pastor E. Rupprecht in Bavaria are almost the only ones who still publicly support the Old Testament. In England Driver, Cheyan, &c., are the champions of a negative criticism, and in America Harper, Briggs, Haupt, &c., seek to bring German unbelief among the people. Dr. Green's other dogmatic standpoint is not known to us in any detail. His position at Princeton, the institution of the conservative direction of the Presbyterians, as opposed to the liberal Union Seminary in New York, implies that he is a member of the reformed Westminster Confession.

L. F.

II. Abroad.

Hermannsburg Synod and the Saxon Free Church. The "Free Church" reports: The assembly of the Hermannsburg Synod, meeting in Uelzen on November 13 and 14, 1895, had, as reported in No. 2 of the "Ev.-luth. Hermannsburger Freikirche" of that year, among other things, made the following declaration: "We recognize the Missourians as our fellow believers, because we agree with

We wish that the Missourians, the respective Saxon Free Church, and our Hermannsburg Free Church be united in the doctrine of faith, and we wish that communion and pulpit fellowship be established between the Missourians, the respective Saxon Free Church, and our Hermannsburg Free Church, but not yet synodal fellowship. As a result of this declaration, which is also directly communicated to us, and which is a fruit of the colloquium held two years ago in Uelzen, on April 14 and 15 of this year the pastors Wöhling and Hermannburger Freieskirche met in Uelzen. the Pastors Wöhling, Meyer-Brunsbok and Wetje of the Hermannsburg Synod and the Pastors Hübener, Stallmann, Walter and Willkomm of our Synod met in Hanover for a conference in order to discuss several questions concerning church practice and the operation of the altar and pulpit fellowship to be concluded and to eliminate some ambiguities. The result of the conference, which took place in a thoroughly fraternal manner and at which four sessions were held, was complete agreement on the points discussed. As a result of this, the application of the venerable Hermannsburg Synod for the conclusion of communion and pulpit fellowship, as well as another application for the participation of our Synod in the heathen mission of the Hermannsburg Synod, will now be presented to the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church in Saxony and St. Petersburg, which will meet in Steeden on July 15 of this year, God willing, and it is hoped that the work of peace, which has progressed so far by the grace of God and whose beginnings go back to 1877, will then be concluded. For this we all want to thank God warmly and ask Him to continue to promote it for His glory and the betterment of the church.

Mecklenburg. The "M. N." announces the following decision of the Grand Duke: "To the manor owner Möller on Poelitz near Schlieffenberg and comrades. Friedrich Franz von Gottes Gnaden, Grand Duke of Mecklenburg etc.. Our most gracious greetings beforehand! Dearly beloved! After the required report on your complaint of February 24, concerning the refusal of Pastor Romberg in Warnkenhagen to grant the servant Kuschel, who had been in Lüningsdorf, a public church burial, we reply that we have no reason to give Pastor Romberg the reprimand and instruction requested by you. Even if it is certain, according to your report, that the heavy drunkenness of Father Kuschel was the direct or indirect cause of his death, and it is not proven that he regained his sobriety before his end, but rather that it must be assumed that he died in the sin of intoxication, which was not atoned for by repentance, Pastor Romberg (cfr. Revidirte mecklenburgische Kirchenordnung, fol. 242) was entitled to refuse the public participation of the church in the funeral of p. Kuschel. He did not make any inquiries in Lüningsdorf himself, but discussed the case with the representative of the Lüningsdorf estate authorities in a detailed conversation the day before the funeral, so that he cannot be accused of insufficient orientation about the facts of the case. We therefore expect from you that you will not interpret Pastor Romberg's procedure as brusqueness and arbitrariness, but that you will regard it as having arisen out of pastoral concern: and therefore not withdraw your love and respect for him. We remain graciously disposed toward you. Given Schwerin, March 9, 1896, Ad mandatum Serenissimi proprium. The Oberkirchenrath. (gez.) Giese." - The above is very gratifying. In this way, the Mecklenburg Regional Church and its church government distinguish themselves from others in a very advantageous way. If only one did not want to make a plaster for other gross church sins out of such things (which again happens so easily).
(Free Church.)

The novelistic doctrine of marriage finds expression in the following sentences by Pastor Rische-Warin, who defends it, in the "Meckl. K.- u. Zbl." of April 10 a very significant expression in the following sentences: "Two people, A and B, have shaken hands and say: we are now joined to each other. 'Yes,' says C, acknowledging it.' 'Certainly,' says D. 'you are joined, but you can also let go of each other at any moment; we want to tie another band around you; - so, now you are firm.' - The interpretation is simple: A and B are the bride and groom, C is the state, D the church." That is, in other words, the church alone makes the marriage, but the betrothal is dissolvable, and so is the civil marriage, for the "church" of Mr. Pastor Niche declares, "You can also let go of each other at any moment." And these people behave as if they were the appointed representatives of a so-called "Christian moral worldview." (Free church.)

Stöcker among the Social Democrats. The rosy views of Pf. Naumann and his friends about the inner character of Social Democracy receive a corresponding illumination from a meeting recently held in Berlin, which was organized by Social Democrats and atheists. The purpose was to call for resignation from the national church. Hofprediger a. D. Stöcker was expressly invited to attend. The meeting was attended by city missionary inspectors, and Stöcker was also present. He took the floor twice and admonished to consider the important step of leaving the Landeskirche carefully and not to act under the impression of this meeting. Then the Social Democrat Hoffmann answered and tried to examine Stöcker as to how it had been possible that Jonas had been swallowed by the whale. Mr. Stöcker should not come up with his stories in this century of X-rays. (Great merriment.) Finally, Hoffmann spoke of Stöcker's friend Hammerstein. (Loud applause.) Stöcker then defended himself against personal insults. It was a mistranslation to say that Jonas was swallowed by a whale; it should be shark. D. Red.) The hymn referred to by the previous speaker, "Ich bin ein rechtes Rabenaas," is certainly in bad taste, but a child of its time. (No, but a simple bad joke, written by a scandalous private teacher Wolf about 1840, who wanted to mock orthodoxy with it. D. Red.) But it can still bear comparison with your verse, where it says, "Tend your paunch, and then sleep on in your grave, where you can digest quietly." Herr Hoffmann had spoken vulgarly. Chairman: There are more clergymen here. Speak up and free your sheep from the wolves! Comrade Rettich professes to be a spiritualist. He had left the Christian Church because he had never felt Christian love, not even from his fathers, for he was a Jesuit student. He prophesied that in two years one would be able to photograph the thoughts of man, as one can photograph the money in one's wallet today. Then the host of the local, Zubeil, gave a longer speech, which concluded with this: Mr. Stoecker, stop building churches. The workers do not go to church from January 1 to December 31! A young man from Kreuzbergstrasse is very angry about having to work in the food stations. (!) This should definitely be abolished, because now even the Christian institutions only serve to fill the money bag. (Shouting: Stop. But briefly.) Shut up! (Great merriment.) Comrade Hoffmann says he did not insult Stoecker; but he was beaten through in a Stoecker meeting in 1884. (Great continued merriment.) That was when you, Mr. Stoecker, uttered the famous word: German social democracy and Russian nihilism are the-

the same. They just have different armpits. (Very good. Stöcker: That was really the case!) Mr. Stöcker, if there is an Almighty, then we can calmly disarm. We don't need to be afraid of Russia. Our God, in whom we believe, will help us - so let's get rid of the armaments. (Shouting: You don't believe in God!) Mr Stöcker, if you have a faith that can move mountains, why don't you kneel down and pray into the sea for Vesuvius, which has already caused so much misfortune? (Loud laughter.) It's cheaper than your city mission. Yes, you see, it can't be done. But science can move mountains. Look at the Gotthard tunnel and the Kaiser Wilhelm Canal! Science has moved mountains there. To this we will add a sample from a Social Democratic pamphlet: "There (in hell) I will lie and wait and rest until other times have come, until the Germans have taken their fate into their own hands with vigorous action! Till with holy fury they smite the thrones in shreds, and they carry all the tyrant brood to the guillotine. Until the polluted German swamp of executioners and hypocrites and thugs is uprooted to the last stump with clubs and knives and daggers.

"Winning Back the Masses for the Gospel." The "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" writes: "The evangelistic preacher Schrenk from Barmen is now again touring Württemberg, where he is already making his fourth visit to individual cities. The purpose of his lectures, as of all so-called evangelistic efforts, is to win the masses back to the Gospel. This purpose has not yet been achieved in any way there, as everywhere else where this evangelism is carried on. It is always only small circles that are more than temporarily touched by it." A whimsical remark! Neither Christ nor the apostles nor the church of later times won "the masses" to the gospel. But well has a church been gathered out of "the masses" by the preaching of the gospel. This will happen in our day also, and we are not to expect anything else. The winning back of "the masses" to the gospel is a delusion that haunts country church minds to the great detriment of the church. F. P.

Luxembourg. The British Foreign Bible Society, in spite of all its efforts, has not obtained permission for its colporteurs to pass freely and unhindered in Luxembourg. Thus Luxembourg shares with Austria the doubtful honor that both countries are the only ones in Europe in which the colportage of the Holy Scriptures is and remains forbidden. (D. E. K.)

From the Wuerttemberg State Church. The verdict of dismissal against Pastor Steudel, published in the "Staatsanzeiger für Württemberg" (State Gazette for Wuerttemberg), also contains the following passage: "On the other hand, a direct attack on the superior authority is contained in the sentence under number 4: that there are members of the consistory who persuade even such a person, who professes nothing at all upon taking office, to serve in the church instead of advising him against it, proof of this will soon be published. In the absence of such proof, the allegation made by the accused is undoubtedly an accusation which must appear to be intended for that purpose, but which is in any case capable not only of making all the members of the authority who are not individually named suspicious of that conduct, but also of degrading the public reputation of the authority itself as the authority which allows such things to happen from among its members. The "high" authority, in its supposed infallibility, judged very hastily. For now Steudel, in a large assembly, has called the name of the pre-

laten called. It is Prelate von Wittich. In an explanation intended to serve as an apology, he had to admit the possibility of the fact of which he was accused, by saying: "To such a one, who told me of his perhaps far-reaching theoretical doubts and misgivings, and who thought he had to base the confession of his incapacity for church service on them, I could have said that he should try for once to leave all theories (!) aside and to place himself purely on the practical standpoint in such a way that he first adheres to the moral teaching of Jesus and takes his preaching thoughts from it, but he should also make an effort to conscientiously apply the requirements of this teaching to his own will and life, then I hope he will also arrive at a different standpoint with his views on the person of Christ and on the existence and being of God. Should this counsel really be so pernicious and reprehensible? If so, then also the word of Christ Ev. Joh. 7, 17 falls under the same judgment." (So when the Lord Christ touches the conscience of his enemies and says, "If any man will do his will, he shall know whether this doctrine be of God, or whether I speak of myself," it is said to be the same as when a prelate seeks to persuade an outspoken atheist, who declares Christianity to be an "error of reasoning," to assume the sacred office of preaching in the Christian church, in spite of his own well-founded misgivings). Furthermore, the Prelate has also had to admit that he "now and then gave someone who thought he could take it lightly to resign from the church ministry because of his current 'scientific standpoint' and to take up another subject, after he had finished his theological studies and had passed his exams, to consider what hardship and worry he would thereby bring upon himself and his parents," etc. Now the candidate in question has already come forward. It is the Gymnasialvicar Hertlein in Stuttgart. He has published a statement in the "Stuttgarter Beobachter" in which he gives the following information about the conversation with the prelate von Wittich: "I expressed the opinion that what is called 'religion' is based on a fundamentally wrong world view or an 'error in thinking'. Now Herr von Wittich said that I must accept the moral doctrine of Christianity and could therefore recite it from the pulpit. I replied that I considered the Christian moral doctrine to be correct on the whole, but that this was quite irrelevant in my case, since I would have to present the moral doctrine in church not in and of itself, but with its foundation in a religion, namely the Christian religion. Herr von Wittich, on the other hand, expressed the opinion that I could quite well present a moral doctrine from the pulpit. I remember the expression of the Oberconsistorialrath: I could preach 'morals' in the pulpit..... I now made the request that I be granted a leave of absence, at least for some time, by the church authorities, into whose service I had already been accepted without wanting it, because I was not in a position to enter the pulpit and the altar as I now think. Mr. von Wittich explained that he could not grant me a leave of absence, since the newly examined candidates were all necessary for the church service..... In his friendly effort to make me understand why I should enter the church ministry, Mr. von Wittich pointed out that I would have to take my parents into consideration, and that I would certainly cause them grief if I left the theological career. After this, or at least not far from it, he said: "And then I would like to point out to you that your external advancement would be best taken care of if you remained in the theological career."

From this I said: But, Herr Oberconsistorialrath, one should not put forward such a reason in this matter. Mr. von Wittich was visibly taken aback and said: "I only mentioned that in passing. Whereupon I said, "Herr Oberconsistorialrath, in a matter of this kind what you have mentioned must not even be considered in passing." ... In a nutshell: the atheist proved to be more honest than the Herr Oberconsistorialrath, in that he did not want to be seduced by the latter into gross hypocrisy. The entire "high" church authority, however, has been affected by its verdict of dismissal on Pastor Steudel, and has come to a dead end from which, since the only Christian way of repentance seems impassable for popes of all kinds, it will be difficult to find any other way out than to let the matter come to nothing. Nor will anything else come of it, and the crying and lamenting of the "positives," as of the "Reichsbote," etc., will avail nothing, so long as the Christian faith is treated like a "theory," and theology like a "science," but the dogma is held by the national church to be infallible. But the bankruptcy of the present national churches, and especially of the so-called "Lutheran" ones, is plain to see. The hypocrisy of the "high" church regiments and the manifest unbelief of the universities, that is, Pharisaism and Sadduceism, these are the two millstones between which they are ground.

Nothing else helps here but the word of God: "Pull not at the strange yoke with the unbelievers. For what enjoyment has righteousness with unrighteousness? What fellowship hath light with darkness? How does Christ agree with Belial? Or what part hath the believer with the unbeliever? What likeness hath the temple of God to idols? But ye are the temple of the living God: as God saith, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and will be their God, and they shall be my people. Therefore come out from among them, and separate yourselves, saith the LORD, and touch no unclean thing: and I will receive you, and be your Father, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the LORD Almighty." 2 Cor. 6, 14-17. - Addendum. Gymnasialvicar Hertlein has been removed from office in consequence of his declaration. Whether also the Oberconsistorialrath von Wittich, about this nothing has been announced up to now. (Free Church.)

The "Free University" of the Dutch Reformed Church. The "Deutsche Ev. Kirchenzeitung" reports about this institution: "The 'Free University' of the Dutch Reformed Church, which 15 years ago, under scorn and derision, opened its doors to the public.

The Dutch church owns in this 'free university' an institution which educates future preachers to become capable men of faith in the Scriptures. Enjoys to the Die reformirte in which their become. From What spirit the Collegium of the Docents is filled with, shows the speech, which the professor of jurisprudence, Dr. Fobius, held at the change of Rectorate. The subject was: 'Sin and Law.' The speaker concluded with the following words: 'One day everything will be different. Then all earthly law will fill up. The state is not the highest. Then the human fencing of God's orders will no longer be necessary, the mind will no longer be darkened, the will will no longer incline to injustice. The right will shine without compulsion. God's law will be the object of love and praise, the law in which there is room for the justification of the sinner through the Lamb who was slain. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, and behold, all was very good. But iniquity crept in. But the LORD will make new heavens and a new earth, in which righteousness dwells.'"

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42.

June 1896.

No. 6.

Frank's Theology.

(Continued.)

The doctrine of redemption, or the acquisition of salvation, is followed by the other, in Frank's usual dogmatic order, of the acquisition of salvation. What belongs here, Frank grasps under the point of view of "the effect of the elevated mediator of salvation in the Holy Spirit through the means of grace".

The way in which the natural man becomes a believing Christian or "a man of God," which we commonly call conversion, Frank first characterizes in general with the following main propositions: "All acts of the beginning of subjective becoming, in so far as they come into consideration as divinely ordained, and not already as self-ordained, we sum up under the term vocation." System of Christian Truth II. P. 310. "The acts of calling grace, in which man at first behaves in a living way, aim at and want to be regarded as granting to the called one, by virtue of the spiritual gift thereby conferred, the possibility of deciding self-willingly for the salvation offered. This volitional turning of the called to the mediator of salvation, as a spontaneous activity subsequent to the bodily act of repentance, is faith." "We call that condition of the beginning of life, which at the same time introduces a continuous process of reception, regeneration; on the other hand, that condition of self, in which that reception comes to its God-ordained goal, but which likewise entails a continuous process of free self-determination for God, conversion." System of Christian Morality I. p. 186. This is Frank's fundamental view. God makes the beginning here. The acts set by God precede. By the acts of calling grace, in which man at first behaves in a leident manner, God works regeneration. With regeneration, however, conversion, faith, is not yet established and given, but only made possible. It depends

The human being must make correct use of the strength given to him by God, he must freely decide in favour of God, he must voluntarily choose the offered salvation, he must willingly turn to the mediator of salvation. This is then conversion, this is how man comes to faith.

We will now look at the individual stages of the process that a man has to go through according to this system until he is converted to Christ. The first stage, then, is the calling, with its effect of regeneration. The System of Christian Truth I. pp. 315-317 speaks of this as follows: "The offer of the salvation procured in Christ, the cry: 'Come to me, all of you' (Matth. 11, 28.), 'Come, for all things are ready' (Luc. 14, 17.), wants to . The call is a word of power, comparable to that of Christ, when he said to the gout-ridden man: "Arise" (Marc. 2, 9.)! The Word of God, through which we must first of all think of vocation as imparted, for we must for the moment abstract from infant baptism, is by its very nature an effective, procreative seed, which, being cast into the heart of man, communicates to him the powers of redemption and brings forth in him the beginning of a new spiritual life. If we take this energy of the calling word in general from such passages as Act. 2, 37. and Act. 16, 14. the former of which testifies to a painful piercing in the heart, the other to an opening of the heart in consequence of the preached word, yet the expression is still more significant which speaks of the *ἐμφυτος λόγος* (Jac. 1, 21.), in accordance with

That God 'according to His Father's will, hath begotten us of Himself by a word of truth' (Jac. 1, 18.); or with reference to the word proclaimed among the Christians of Asia Minor (1 Petr. 1, 25.), that they 'were born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by a living word, that is, of God, and abiding' (1 Petr. 1, 23.). For here that initial effect, as it takes place through the calling Word, is characterized in a significant way on two sides, first, inasmuch as the begetting, giving birth activity at first only sets passivity of the one to be begotten, and second, inasmuch as the effect of it is a self-living human existence, as such active, seeking for its continuance its nourishment the same place from whence it became: *ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη το λογικόν αἶμα γάλα ἵπιποθήσατε* (1 Petr. 2, 2.), And still more: *ᾤξασθε τον ἐμφυτον λόγον, τον δυνάμενον σώσαι τὰς ψυχὰς υμῶν*

(Jac. 1, 21.). If this indicates that he who enters into spiritual life was previously resolved in the God of salvation, as the child is in the womb, and then by virtue of a birth out of God was set forth from him, the expression *σπέρμα θεοῦ*, of which John says that it abides in him who is born again (1 John 3:9), indicates that by virtue of the transfer of a God-potency, a life-creating one, into the natural man, such a birth and such a new life come to pass. 3, 9.), that by virtue of the transfer of a God-potency, a life-creating one, into the natural man, such birth and such new life come to.

The one and the other are to be taken as a matter of course in the spiritual sense. That we are to take the one as well as the other, only in the spiritual sense, needs no proof, and is, moreover, put beyond doubt by John 3:5 ff, where Christ strictly and unyieldingly upholds the requirement of regeneration against the objection of its possibility. And basically it is only another expression for the same thing, if the effect by virtue of which a man of God comes into existence is connected with this as $\chi\alpha\iota\omicron\iota\chi\tau\iota\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (Eph. 2, 10. 2 Cor. 5, 17. Gal. 6, 15. Eph. 4, 24.

Col. 3, 10.) is designated." If one takes this passage out of context, one might think that the common Christian belief in the power and effect of the divine word, in the divine miracle of rebirth, is expressed here. For through the procreative word of God a new beginning of life is really wrought in man, man is born anew, a new creature. But the connection, as briefly sketched above, proves that Frank understands the new birth quite differently from what we are accustomed to. He who is born again is, in his opinion, not yet converted, not yet a believer. Even all unconverted and unbelieving men, in so far as they have only come into contact with the word, are, according to this theory, born again, new creatures, to all of whom, like Lydia, the heart is opened. For through the calling Word, with irresistible force, powers of redemption, new spiritual powers, are "thrown into" the heart of man, a life-creating God-potency is inevitably transferred into the natural man. "The active, healing energy, which is inherent in the universal vocation, and for which reason it has been called serious from time immemorial, involves at the same time that other moment, according to which the called one experiences the first movements of enlightening and enlivening grace without being able to hinder its entrance. So in every man who only hears or has heard God's word, whether he still lives in sins and is enslaved to sin and Satan, a new spiritual life is found, which is also called the new spiritual self.

In this first stage of regeneration, man at first behaves "passively. But this passivity is only relative. The remnants of the good in the natural man also exert their influence here. "What is to be said about the communicative vocation in this place we take up from our earlier discussion of the natural man's ability to redeem himself. That at first unconscious intercourse in which the fallen man stands with the spirit of God, and which is expressed in the conscious experiences and acts of conscience, this most inward sphere of life, in which a flowing over and over of the divine and the human still exists even in the natural man, is the most important thing.

The place where the regenerating forces of vocation, by virtue of the means of grace, penetrate and awaken the human being, who is at first only passive toward them, to an activity and spontaneity made possible by them, is to be regarded as the place where the natural human being takes place." S. 319.

Frank subsumes enlightenment, of which the apostle speaks, e. g., 2 Cor. 4, 4-6, Eph. 1, 18, under the calling grace, and allows the enlightenment to bring about the recognition of sin or repentance, a living conduct. "By repentance we understand that sensation of pain which the calling and especially the enlightening grace produces in the man who, on account of it, recognizes himself as being in a state of lostness."

The second stage in "the becoming of the man of God" describes the system of Christian morality! P. 200. 201 as follows: "We are fasting, namely, in order to introduce immediately the main point, conversion in the special sense that with it that entire spiritual self-movement is embraced and comprehended, whereby, on the basis of and in virtue of the reception taking place at the new birth, the spontaneous spiritual I actualizes itself as determining man now supremely for God. If, in the case of regeneration, we place the emphasis on reception, both initial and permanent, without prejudice to the intention of personal formation and self-determination, which exists and is realized in all respects, then here we turn our gaze unreservedly to the reception that takes place in the course of regeneration. If, in the case of regeneration, we emphasize the first reception as well as the continuous reception, then our gaze turns, irrespective of the continuing determination and acquisition of spiritual powers in Christian life, to the side of the self-empowerment to be received and exercised with it, so that we follow this self-empowerment from its first beginning to the point where the transformation of the human being, gravitating outside of God, toward the living and reproducing God takes place." Further, p. 205, 206: "Wherever conversion comes about, it takes place on the basis of the divine gift, with the powers received from the God of salvation, in such a way that a new spiritual self, in spite of the natural sinful powers still resisting it, moves the gravitational point of man away from the creature and into God, in order to find its final satisfaction, its blessedness, in God. But in the struggle, as it immediately arises with the entrance of the spiritual potencies, with the germ-like setting of the new I in the midst of the natural-sinful life between these opposing powers, the most diverse vicissitudes can be observed." Thus, after man has received new, spiritual potencies in the new birth, the new spiritual I set in the new birth begins to move freely on its own, and expresses and exercises its self-empowerment until it has finally shifted its center of gravity to God. This then is conversion. This self-movement of the new self is a constant struggle with the resisting powers of the natural sinful life. But it does not always come after

of regeneration also to conversion. "It is in the choice of the man who experiences and has experienced the regenerating grace, how far he will affirm it or also deny it." P. 206. If man denies the spiritual gift he has received, "if such a life-germ is not correspondingly nurtured," the divine seed, for instance, "remains long hidden and dormant," and may at last entirely "die." S. 207. 208. "In the other case," when a man affirms the grace of regeneration, and faithfully uses the powers he has received, "a struggle develops, which for a time is the antitype of that which, as will be shown hereafter, characterizes the life of the converted Christian, namely, in so far as the natural ego resists the attacks of the spiritual impulses of life, The natural ego, as will be shown later, characterizes the life of the converted Christian, namely, inasmuch as the natural ego for the time being, often for a long time to come, victoriously rejects the attacks of the spiritual life impulses, of the strengthening new ego, and asserts itself in its dominion, whereby, however, again and again the consciousness asserts itself that it not only ought but also could be different, and thus leaves a thorn in the man, which becomes the cause of new struggles. p. 207. 208. In the born-again but still unconverted man, in this case, the new ego fights against the old ego, which still asserts dominion, and struggles through until it has finally gained the victory, until the man is converted to God. "In conversion faith is at the same time implied." P. 224. "He that is converted is a believer; and conversely, he that believeth, the same converts." P. 227. "The conversion to God in Christ, made possible by the effects of the Spirit, and on account of them put by the human subject, is in fact the faith which takes hold of the righteousness acquired in Christ." S. 227.

The way in which Frank deals with "synergism" is significant. "One sees, then, that synergism is to be asserted just as definitely on the one hand as it is to be rejected on the other, as, indeed, the judgment of our church and ecclesiastical theology was essentially unanimous about it after the rejection of the Roman and Melancthonian error. While here the "cooperation" of man, in addition to the divine "effect," was by no means to be imagined "as when two horses draw a chariot together," but human cooperation was always to occur only on account of the divine effect, we shall have to tighten up and define more closely this perfectly correct thought in accordance with our previous presuppositions. The idea of human cooperation in any sense whatsoever is misleading: just as there is neither effect nor cooperation on the part of man when the regenerating grace casts into him the germ of new spiritual life, so the activity of the called, which arises from this gift and is constantly based on it, is not both a cooperating and an acting one; it is man who now employs his power, the power bestowed by God, in order that the offered and recognized gift may be given to him.

It is entirely human activity, irrespective of the fact that it is entirely due to divine action. The thus enabled and accomplished turning of the called subject to the salvation which the calling offered, the willing appropriation of the same, is the faith to which justification corresponds." System of Christian Truth. II. p. 331, 332. As man is essentially a sufferer in vocation and regeneration, so in conversion, when he becomes a believer, he is merely active in the appropriation of salvation. It is man who uses the power given him by God, and now himself spontaneously works conversion and faith. It is only very badly done that Frank, for this view of his, appeals to ecclesiastical theology and to the Lutheran confession. When the Concordia formula speaks of man's participation in the divine work, it describes the state of man after his conversion, while in conversion it leaves man merely passive.

As Scripture evidence Frank here adduces passages, as Act. 14, 15.; 15, 13.'; 26, 18.; 1 Thess. 1:9. in which the activ *ἐπιστρέφειν* is used so the "self-repentance" of the sinner, the "self-turning to God" is taught. Other scriptural statements that attribute repentance to God, like Ezech. 16, 53. ff. Jer. 31, 18. he interprets them to mean that conversion is made possible by the preceding calling and regeneration, these acts set by God. As to the spontaneity of faith, he remarks: "It would be the most senseless thing in the world to assert that a man should come to faith unwillingly, a denial of the human personality, which can only be saved by self-establishment. For those who have heard the word and whose hearts have been affected by it (Act. 16, 30. 2, 37.), it is not merely a matter of letting oneself be drawn in, of yielding to the divine train of grace, but of gathering together all one's strength, of doing violence and snatching at oneself (*βιάσασθαι* and *ἀρᾷζειν* Matth. 11, 12.)." S. 330.

From what has been said it is clear that Frank is a synergist of the purest water. His theory is only a new edition of Latermann's synergism. He teaches a self-conversion, a self-decision of man, only not from natural forces, but by means of given forces, and thereby loses himself in all the inconsistencies that characterize the synergism of the seventeenth century. He lets the unconverted man, who is still dominated by sin, operate with spiritual powers, resist sin, until he has brought the struggle to victory. The state in which man finds himself after his calling and regeneration, and before his conversion, a man who, on the one hand, has been reborn, a

The fact that a man has become a new creature, but whose innermost being is still turned away from God and Christ and devoted to sin, is a true monstrosity. The newer theologians use to call the alleged middle stage between the state under sin and the state under grace the state of revival. Frank goes further and substitutes in place of the concept of revival the other of regeneration. The reproach that the newer ones raise against the orthodox doctrine, that it must be assumed that conversion, this ethical process, is conceived externally as a magical-mechanical process, falls back to a greater extent on Frank and his associates. While he otherwise urges the free self-determination of the free personality, here he denies its principle and makes of reincarnation a rather crude materialistic conception. He actually teaches a forced rebirth. The new spiritual life, the divine seed, is "thrown into the heart" of man through the Word - that is a favorite expression of his - and man cannot escape it. He who hears only the Word is *nnolens volens* born again, a new creature. And now this seed, this spiritual potency, like a dead mass, remains lying at the bottom of the soul, lying for a long time, perhaps until death, even if man denies the calling grace and continues to resist God. But the new birth is not a process that alters the substance of man, that sinks a new substance into him, but a change in the moral determination of man, a change in the direction of his heart and will. God, through Word and Spirit, awakens *novos motus spirituales*, movements in the heart and will of man, which are directed toward God, the first little sparks of faith, of the fear of the Lord, of love, of trust in God. What, on the other hand, is to be imagined by a "spiritual life" which at first leaves the mind and will of man quite untouched? It is cruel how Frank deals with the Scriptures here. It is positively hair-raising when he understands the well-known passages he cites concerning the new birth and the new creature to mean that all men to whom only the word has come to their ears, and who never come to faith, are stamped as born-again. When the apostle addresses the Christians to whom he writes as born-again, and reminds them that God had made them alive when they were dead in sins, that they were now God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus, he reminds them of what they and they alone had experienced and experienced in their hearts, of their being Christians, which distinguishes them from unbelievers, and of the beginning of their being Christians. Everything is turned upside down, if one assumes that God, just like Lydia, had the heart of the Jews, who contradicted and blasphemed Paul's gospel.

I have opened. The scripture testifies that man can resist the grace of God on every point, that he can also resist the calling grace, so that it does not work on him what it wants to work, as it was the case with the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Matth. 23, 37. According to the Scriptures, regeneration and conversion are identical. The great change that occurred in those who are now Christians, the apostle calls one time regeneration, e. g. 1 Petr. 1, 23. the other time conversion, e. g. 1 Petr. 2, 25. According to Scripture, faith, the beginning of faith, coincides with regeneration. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." 1 John 5:1. By faith a man is born again. Faith is a new light and life in man. He who is born again is also converted, he is also a believer. It is a gross misrepresentation of Scripture, when Frank names as the effect of enlightenment, of which St. Paul writes in 2 Cor. 4:6, "God, who caused light to shine out of darkness, has given a bright light to our hearts," etc., repentance or the sensation of pain, according to which "man recognizes himself as being in a state of lostness," while St. Paul, in this very place, allows the knowledge of Jesus Christ to be wrought by enlightenment. And it is finally just the contradiction of what Scripture teaches, when Frank presents conversion, like faith, as the product of man, of the free self-determination of the self-empowered new self. Scripture attributes both to God as the author, not in the sense that God, by any previous effect, makes it possible for man to convert himself and decide for salvation in Christ, but in such a way that God Himself works conversion, faith. It is Jer. 31:18, "Convert thou me, and I shall be converted." In this way a man is converted, a man is converted, that God converts him. Phil. 1, 29. we read: "It is given unto you ... to believe on him (Christ)"; and Col. 2, 12.: *διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ & εὐ,* "by the faith which God works". Faith itself, that we believe, not only the ability to believe, is God's work and gift. Certainly, man converts, turns from his way of sin, back to God, man believes. Conversion, faith, is a doing, a conduct of man, an act of the will. But it is God who works this volition, who produces this act of the will in man by word and spirit. One sees that this part of Frank's system, too, which develops "the becoming of the man of God," is in every part contrary to Scripture, and therefore certainly not derived from the Christian ego, but is the outflow of the self-opinionated ego, "which can only be saved by self-establishment," that is, which wants to save itself and therefore takes the glory from God.

Frank is not clean on the doctrine of justification either.

He does speak in places, e. g., in *System of Christian Truth II*. p. 338, he speaks quite beautifully and orthodoxly of the *justitia extra nos posita*; he remarks, p. 344, 345: "The less the repentant sinner, in this act of faith, sets out to accomplish something, the more he, in turning to Christ, confines himself to receiving, the purer, more in accordance with the idea, justifying faith is formed; it grasps the grace offered the more firmly and lastingly, the less it wants to grasp anything else than it." But it does not grasp justifying faith exclusively, as Scripture and our Scriptural confession do, as the medium of *ληκτικόν*, by which man also grasps justification itself, or the grace that is offered.

accepts the forgiveness of sins. On the other hand, he emphasizes that "no one should imagine . . . to have forgiveness of sins with God, unless in and with faith he has accomplished that turning to God, that gravitation of personality toward God, without which even God cannot save man, because he does not want to save him as a thing, but as a personality. P. 345. So, according to Frank, faith in justification also comes into consideration qua conduct of man, as an act of free self-determination. Thus Dorner, who for his part does not want justification to be conditioned by any conduct of man, rightly counters him that such discussions include in themselves "a whole series of conditions of justification." Frank, p. 310, expressly calls justification "conditioned by the self-establishment of faith".

Finally, the self-empowering I also comes to the fore in Frank's discussion of sanctification and preservation. While the Church confesses on the basis of Scripture that God sustains us in *JEsu Christo* in right, united faith, Frank speaks throughout of "a self-preservation of the Christian." Cf. *System of Christian Morality*. I. p. 253 ff. By giving room to the powers of grace that continually flow into him, the Christian constantly performs those acts by which he has entered into the state of grace and righteousness; when he has once fallen, even fallen away, he repents and believes anew; he rises again from the fall by virtue of his "spiritual self-empowerment," since even in a fallen David and Peter there are still sufficient spiritual powers. To sum up: man obtains and acquires his own salvation, and what God does for him is of value and importance only in so far as it becomes a cause for him to set up for himself all that serves his salvation. Man is a free personality and becomes blessed only through self-settlement. We say: He who ever becomes blessed becomes blessed in just the opposite way, by confessing: "Not of myself! It is God's gift. Therefore to God alone be the glory!"

G. St.

(To be continued.)

Modern theologians' attacks on God's Word.

4. Means of shaking the authority of Scripture.

Everything worked to undermine the authority of the Holy Scriptures among the people. The holy awe with which the Christian people regarded their Bible was made ridiculous; for in Semler's opinion every book should be considered divine, so far as it is witty and has moral content. It was only superstition that the Bible should be declared to be the open source of divine truth. They wanted to uproot Christianity and bring forth a piety which, according to Lessing's demand, treated the Bible as an elementary book for children, beyond which time had passed. They also brought it about that history must testify: "The venerable gothic portal had fallen, through which one once entered the miraculous building of the Holy Scriptures; it had fallen; for the poor dwelling house of Galilean fishermen also needed no portal, but only an ordinary house door." (Tholuck: Verm. Schr. II, 93.) Even this was too much for dogs and sows; for they did not even show the holy scripture the respect that is due to every respectable book. How is it, asked the Oberconsistorialrath Teller in Berlin of the theatre director Iceland, that the churches are becoming ever emptier and the theatres ever more crowded? "That makes," replied the latter, "you give truth as poetry, and we give poetry as truth." The theologians brought up a new language by which not only the eternal truth in the sanctuary was made out to be poetry, but which made the old Bible language positively incomprehensible to the learned and unlearned. The godly old books of sermons, prayers and edification were sought to be driven out of the homes. Christians were to learn to pray rationalistically from Witschel's "Morning and Evening Sacrifice" and to lose God's Spirit and Word in this puffed-up "sacrifice." The place of Scriver's *Seelenschatz* or Arndt's *Wahrem Christenthum* was coveted by Zschoche's "Stunden der Andacht," a work of eight volumes, which praises Islam as a "gift of the Godhead" for the lands of the Orient, blasphemed by Christians with great injustice, and places Muhammad on a level with Moses and Christ, nor can it praise enough how much Islam has done for "ennobling the spirit through science and the arts." Very frankly these hours of devotion are expressed in the words, "We Christians owe much of our present insight and enlightenment to the insight and enlightenment of the Arab kingdoms." Thus the Turk is recognized as a Church Father of Rationalism. In Henke's "Archiv für neueste Kirchengeschichte" Vol. II, one nevertheless still complained that with the "deification of Christ and the Bible" still

-The church, however, gave itself over to the hope that soon "the benevolent revolution in religion could proceed. Catechisms were created in which the belief in the infallibility of reason and in the power of man to make himself blessed was openly taught. A witness, who compared the catechism of the Bavarian Church Councillor Dr. Stephani with Luther's catechism, had to say that he was reminded of the rabbinical fable of the origin of the baboons. According to this, they are said to have come into being when Satan also wanted to create human beings. (Corr.-Bl. 1830. p. 716.) The Confirmation lessons included instruction on natural history, the causes of thaw, the use of earwax, etc. (Kzt. 1858. p. 512.) In the Confirmation examination, a Bavarian pastor told the children that they had been "taught that one should live righteously and that there is a God; but it is especially important to know what is useful and beneficial in the world. On this, arithmetical problems were set in the church. (Corr.-Bl. 1829. p. 577 f.) Is it to be wondered at, when the children of a village school in the Mark of Brandenburg, in answer to the superintendent's question, whether they had already heard something of the Son of God, "answered in solemn chorus with Ne"? (Ztsch. f. Prot. 3, 111.) Rationalism banished the Gospel from church and school, and everywhere prepared troughs filled with Träberkost. He removed the biblical language from the agendas everywhere. Some preachers even abolished baptism by baptizing against their own agendas "in the name of the Father and on the delightful doctrine and exalted example of Jesus Christ and on the spirit and sense of Christian righteousness and virtue. (Ibid. 11, 248.) Where they defaced the faith, a Christian witness to baptism could only answer in the negative to the question, "Wilt thou be baptized into this faith? In the case of Confirmation, the Schoßkinde of rationalism, which was almost pushed into the place of baptism, a paraphrase of the apostolic symbol came into use, which more often amounted to the sentences: I believe in no Creator of heaven and earth; I believe in no Son of God; I believe in no Holy Spirit. In 1817 the preachers in Geneva were directly forbidden to teach the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and of Christ's divinity, with the remark that they were not allowed to go beyond the expressions of Holy Scripture. (Corr.-Bl. 1830. p.635.) Thus unbelief could pretend to respect the Scriptures, because only a few still knew them. In the new hymnals, of the 50,000 sacred songs of which the German Lutheran Church boasted, scarcely one remained free from deformity. In addition to the drivel about cleanliness, personal hygiene, love of animals, fruit tree cultivation, etc., they offered real Träberkost for the Gergesen herds, such as Busse's hymnal for the Russian Baltic provinces, in which it says: "The Godhead created the sense-

lust in the breast of men themselves, to enjoy their life, to sweeten their existence"; or the Mühlhäuser Gesangbuch, which teaches in No. 620 to sing: "The smallest animal enters the world with me in the same way; it feels its existence and also sustains itself with drink and food; has a heart just as I do, has sensory power, feels pleasure and pain, leaves life just as I do." Of the old hymns none remained without deformity. The old liturgies were abolished. The brother orator in the pulpit babbled about the "Godhead" so that at times a peasant asked him, "Does He mean our HErrgod?" With the cabbage soup of rationalistic morality one was not sparing at the trough either, but the free-minded Professor Gaß had to write in 1805: "One's heart would break when one looks at the greater part of the clergy of the country," and a public paper brought an article "about the freedom of preachers to preach as badly as they want." (Kzt. 1853. p. 369. - 1829. p. 356.) Christian doctrine was banished from the sermons. As the devil's patron, the rationalistic priest usually began his polemic against ancient Christianity, to continue to the denial of God. "Just as that donkey-driver was surprised that his gray horse had friends and patrons even at court, when a royalist took the most donkey-friendly care of the beaten animal, so one must almost be surprised how many patrons and patrons the devil now has, who in all seriousness demand that he should now be left alone and no longer be tormented, after he has been persecuted for so long; should observe a discreet silence about his existence, and call him no more by name than a masked friend who wishes to remain unrecognized." (Corr.-Bl. 1828. p. 179.) The rationalistic model preacher was praised for knowing how to use the biblical text "as a harmless means of inculcating useful truths"; for he was "constantly eager to preach to his peasants that they should rise early, maintain their cattle diligently, work their fields and gardens to the best of their ability, all with the express intention that they should become prosperous, that they should acquire wealth, that they should become rich." (Hagenb. V, 310 f.) A Bavarian city pastor preached Sunday after Sunday the Natural History according to Linné, and on Confirmation Day one liked to preach, like Rev. C. A. Valentiner, "of the love of good men for trees" (on Ps. 1, 3:!), instructing the confirmands to plant trees. (Corr.-Bl. 1829. p. 124. 796 ff.) As a curiosity, it was reported in vol. 2 of Henke's "Archiv für neueste Kirchengeschichte" that in 1794 a candidate was still found who, before his ordination, said an old prayer of penance and confession, for which reason the ordinator also considered him almost unworthy of the office. A Prussian church light regretted that one still had to preach on Bible texts. If only a few men "like Jesus, Luther, and Teller" would still appear, it would be helpful, it was said in the coroner's report.

speech to the Oberconsistorialrath Teller. The Englishman Taylor Coleridge wrote: "When I was in Germany (1799), I found the religious condition there most deplorable. Nowhere did I meet a clergyman who was a Christian; but in the universities I met professors who disputed in their lectures the most important truths of the gospel, and whoever followed this course was sure of promotion." (Corr.-Bl. 1837. p. 70.) The merchant Apitz, in Berlin, undertook to unite the names of all the preachers of Germany who still preached the Bible faith, on one pedigree sheet. (Kzt. 1845. p. 351.) When a court requested an expert opinion from the church government as to whether a blasphemer could still be considered a Lutheran preacher who publicly taught that the Holy Scriptures were not the Word of God, that Moses was a deceiver, that Christ was the greatest naturalist, that his resurrection did not belong to his doctrine, and that morality differed from religion by a great deal, the Prussian High Consistory declared that he was to be considered a Christian preacher, even if not a Lutheran. (Tholuck, op. cit. p. 125.)

How much God's Word has been pushed out of the pulpits and the church has become an aase, the reader can best see when I compile a number of sermon themes from rationalist sermon collections and homiletical journals, on the gospels of the church year. Baur recommended for 1st Advent the theme, The best means of obtaining good servants. Others preached on tree crime; on garden and wood thievery; on the use of animals; on the value of domestic happiness; on sleep; on the virtue of economy. - Advent 3: By asking questions one becomes wise. - Christmas: Why are humans born weaker than animals? Or: About the good deed that humans are born through humans; about the happiness of having a tender mother; about the superstition of ghostly apparitions. - Sunday after Christmas: How even old age can still work to prolong life in a fruitful way. - Sunday after New Year's Day: On names of abuse. - 2nd after Epiphany: Marriage as a means of preserving health and life. - 3rd after Epiphany: On cleanliness of the body and skin. - 4th after Epiphany: The Benefit of Sleep for Health and Life. - 6th after Epiphany: The Influence of Pure Air, Country Life, and Garden Life on Health. - Septuagesimä: How good it is for a day laborer to be able to do more than one job. - Quinquagesimä: Of the goodness of the face. - Invocavit: Of the variety of food. - Reminiscere: Good men also take care of their cattle. - Oculi: The sense of honor an effective facilitator of virtue. - For the Annunciation, Hildebrand's Repertory recommended as an introduction an "examination of the flattering conversation" of Gabriel and

Mary's, and as a theme, Flattering mouth, wicked heart. - Lätare: Of the love of order. - Judica: The Ridiculous and Most Harmful of Ancestral Pride. - Palm Sunday: On the Value of Honour. - Char Friday: The good posthumous fame of a Christian in death. Or: Of the value of a gentle character; of the value of public funerals. - 1st day of Easter: Of the apparent death. Or: Wise use of the morning hours. - 2nd day of Easter: Of going for a walk. - Quasimodogeniti: The Value of Greetings. - Misericordias Domini: On Suicide. Steinbrenner's "Rathgeber" recommended: God as a good shepherd, or his care for the unreasonable animals, 1. their dwelling, 2. clothing, 3. food, 4. protection (e. g. for electric eel, skunk, dink, etc.). - Cantate: Habit of asking about everything. - Ascension (epistle): Uplifting view from high mountains. Or: With what the Christian calms himself, who, dying, leaves behind his helpless family. - Pentecost (Epistle): Refinement of speech. Or: The shattering splendor of terrible natural events. - Trinitatis: On night sins. - 5th after Trinity: Duty of Christian parents to make their children safe against the dangerous smallpox by inoculating them with smallpox. - 7th after Trinity: Of good behavior at table. - 8th after Trinity: Fruit tree cultivation. - 9th after Trinity: Benevolence in the art of writing. - 12th after Trinity: Duties in regard to our faculty of speech. Or, How wise and beneficial it is that God has provided us with a double instrument of hearing, or with two ears. - 14th after Trinity: JEsus as the model of a truly honorable citizen. - 15. after Trinity: The beneficent sojourn in the country. Or: Preferences of man before his fellow creatures on earth. - 17th after Trinity: Rules for the hospitality of our friends. - 23rd after Trinity: Duty of the Christian in regard to stamps. - 25th after Trinity: Why has our public administration not yet become more perfect?

From the universities, the hothouses of unbelief, rationalism had thus spread so far that the whole church had been devastated. Wherever a religion invented by men has been attacked, its priests have always tried their utmost to save it. The religion given to us by God Himself, on the other hand, has experienced what no superstition has yet encountered, that its theologians almost unanimously wanted to spill its source. Just as the Papist periodical "Der Katholik" wrote in 1824: "When it comes to the point that all read the Bible, the world will only be a place of residence for wild animals," so the rationalist leader Röhr called the biblical faith a kind of "religious bestiality". (Kzt. 1830, p. 812.) Like the Pabst, these Protestants were zealous against dissemination of the Bible. Prof. Gabler reported it in 1798 as.

something strange that the otherwise so clever English threw away their money to send missionaries to Tahiti, and also in East Frisia an association had formed to make heathens Christians, which foolishness could only be explained by the fact that the theological education had not yet reached this coastal country. (Kzt. 1845, p. 351. Corr.-Bl. 1829, p. 137.) Rationalism was just a further development of Islam among the once Christian peoples. The rationalist Bretschneider wrote: "The unity of faith underlying all monotheistic religions is the belief in one God; the specific difference between them, however, is the belief that the founder of their religious community was a messenger of God and possessed of divine revelations. Thus with the Jews the foundation of their religious community is: there is one God, and Moses is his messenger, and his law is divine; with the Christians: there is one God, and Jesus is his messenger, and his teachings are divine; with the Muhammedans: there is one God, and Muhammed is his prophet." (Erl. Ztsch. 2, 173.) Jehovah, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Father of our Lord JEsu Christ, and the present idol of the Jews and Turks, were one to this people, and Muhammed stood for them on the shoulders of Mosiah and Christ. Nor could they bear to have Muhammed called "the false prophet," but praised him as a noble instrument of Providence. (Corr.-Bl. 1832, p. 80.) The true God, after all, they had no more. They spoke only of "heaven," which was favorable or unfavorable to them, or of "destiny," which directed their lives, at most of a watchful "providence," which they knew not. They also considered it superfluous to enter into a closer relationship with God, even if they still had their forms of prayer as a matter of habit. They preferred to imitate the canonization of the pope in the funeral orations and to address the deceased in a pagan manner. This was also praying. Blind fate, the "causal nexus," that is, the accidental concatenation of natural causes and circumstances, on which they made everything in life depend, was a dreary Turk-god. Of the almighty God whose hand intervenes in that concatenation, and of the wonderful Christian faith which, as Claudius (III, 91) says, lifts up the nexus rerum (the connection of natural things) and carries it aloft in prayer, as Samson did the gates of the Philistines,-of this such new-fangled Turks knew nothing. Of historical faith the old Muhammedans had more like them. Of the miracles of Jesus their "unprejudiced science" thought, as the freethinker H. Lange writes: "These stories all happened; but the reporters, uneducated and credulous as they were, richer in imagination than in critical judgment, overlooked the natural causes that were active in them, and applied their miracle lever. Of course Jesus fed five thousand with five loaves of bread.

after he had replenished what was lacking from the supplies of a passing caravan. Of course, Jesus, walking upright, saved Peter who had jumped into the lake, but this had happened on the shore where Jesus was walking, and only the twilight had given his disciples the illusion that Jesus was walking in the middle of the sea. He did indeed awaken from death the young man of Nain and the chief's maid, but they were fortunately only in apparent death. Thus the whole history of Jesus and the apostles was rationalized piece by piece, and one does not know whose agony was greater, that of the poor history that endured these ordeals, or that of the historian who imposed this unnaturalness upon himself anew at each piece. What arbitrariness!" (Leben Jesu, 1872, p. 44 f.) These contortions are too weak even for such a blasphemer as Lange; he would rather come out at once and say that he considers everything a lie. Even an E. M. Arndt, too, had to say that what was too big for the reasoning mind to grasp, was cut up and reduced, and "so it happened that the foolishness of these people became their idol, but God and nature and faith and every exuberant and inexpressible life were turned into a cold and desolate nothingness". (Views and Prospects of German History, 1814, p. 445.) Desolate, therefore, the desolate man went away from the pastor and said: "Our pastor himself does not believe in the Bible; he speaks of the Gospel like a blind man of paint; when he speaks of birds and flowers, of the kingdom of animals, the kingdom of plants, the kingdom of stones, yes, it flows out like water; but when he speaks of the kingdom of God, yes, the pastor is like a dried-up brook; what can he advise me in my distress of soul!" Even the dying man, who did not wish to hear of any Muhammadan heaven, had to remind the chatterer: "Father, I wish to die as a Christian, and not as a Jew, Muhammadan, or heathen." (Corr.-Bl. 1834, p. 356.) In such times it could quietly happen that Napoleon I. had it proclaimed in Egypt, as he did in 1798, that the doctrine of the Trinity, so offensive to the Muhammedans, was now abandoned in all Christendom, and that every Christian also held the Koran to be a divine book. "Ye Kadis, Sheiks, and Imams, tell the people that we too are true Muselmen." "Should anyone be so faithless as to doubt that everything in this great universe is under the power of doom? Teach the people, as it has been written of me since the world was, that after the extermination of the enemies of Islam and the overthrow of the crosses, I would come from the distant West to fulfill my destiny." (Napoleon I's Testimonies, 1864, p. 3.)

Darkness covered the land that was once full of the knowledge of the Lord. The men of light led the people to the prince of darkness, the father of lies, the murderer from the beginning.

niß more than the light. When the Irvingians in Hamburg spoke of "casting out the prince of this world," they easily came into contact with the police as dangerous Democrats. (Kzt. 1857, p. 972.) So blind was the people still, when the light of the Gospel had already sent some rays back into the land, as only in the time of the unconditional rule of rationalism. The apostolic symbol was touched because it spoke of a "communion of saints"; for that was catholic, and led to the service of saints. (Ztsch. f. Prot. 8, 55.) Dr. Kögel mentions in his writing: "Die Unwissenheit in christlichen Dingen" (Hambg. 1863), that it has become downright fashionable to blaspheme the doctrine of the atonement as Moloch service, of justification by grace through faith as Pabst doctrine. What ignorance-must have been possible there! The Bible critic Schwegler did not even know that the Proverbs of Solomon are counted among the canon! (Kzt. 1846, p. 465.) A highly respected church member rejoiced over the decision of the London Bible Society to no longer distribute the Apocrypha; for "the miracle stories and the reports of brutal events in the books of Moses, Joshua, Judges," etc., could not satisfy the educated taste. The learned man also wanted to boast of this discovery, that John could not possibly have written his Gospel and Epistles because Herod had beheaded him. Another wanted to know from theological opinions that Luther had made the Bible. (Ibid. 1830, p. 817 f.) How much such nonsense could be gathered from the learned writings of that time! Prof. Gaß himself wrote in 1805 that lack of character was the character of all theological literature, the latest being still more wretched than the new. (Ibid. 1853, p. 369 f.) It would take us too far to describe the devastation of the church in detail, the moral degradation that resulted from it, and the spread of barbaric conditions among the people. Enough; the free spirits became a disgust to themselves. The rationalist Dassel in Hanover wrote in 1818: "It is a fact that the reputation of the church, together with that of the preaching profession, has declined and is still declining. The churches are becoming more and more empty, and only a few are still to be seen sitting scattered about in them here and there. ... In very many communities the majority has renounced the public cult of religion. The number of communicants is even smaller. The communions of the sick are becoming more and more rare. Most parents have become indifferent to baptism, and those who have no relatives find it more and more difficult to find godparents. The same sentiment prevails against copulation. ... The religious lecture is more and more supplanted by the political and aesthetic. Praying before and after meals is no longer the custom, and in the evening as well as in the morning

a so-called benediction is now read by very few Christians. Never was the decay of churchmanship so rapid and so general. . . . " (Ibid. 1845, p. 790 f.) In one parish of Holstein the service could be suspended 40 times in one year for want of hearers, and in three other parishes of another country 25-30 times. (Kögel: *Die Unwissenh.* p. 15.) In churches which numbered 10-14,000 souls, there were often not more than three hearers, often none, (Kzt. 1829, p. 361.) Berlin was already called the enlightened Babel in Hamann's time. (Ibid. 1838, p. 763 ff.) But if the world was sick of rationalistic doctrine, it was not capable of any longing for the gospel of Christ, but spiritual darkness was one with bitter enmity against the true light. Even the rationalistic de Wette considered a rebirth of the church necessary, but not the old gospel. (Hagenbach VI, 347 f.)

5. The Christians retreated to the defensive.

Was there then no more ointment in Gilead, and was there no more physician to be found anywhere? The ten virgins had all become drowsy and fallen asleep with the advent of rationalism. The unionist and chiliastic ravings and reveries of the pietists had drawn hearts away from the center of salvation and from the source of the Spirit and power. The testimony was missing: "My people, thy comforters deceive thee." Isa. 3:12: The enemy was allowed to gain ground and still hoped for good things, for the serpent did not say that he would bring evil; the wolves often offered peace to the sheep on condition that the dogs would be killed. One wanted at least to retreat to the defensive, and so an apologetic or instruction for the defense of the besieged castle of God came into being. From the beginning it bore the character of its time, and was often arranged only for wailing women, who secretly crept together from all sects to pray the 137th Psalm together. Zion's war band had been drafted. Wherever the blasphemers were resisted, it was with blunt weapons, and, as Hamann (II, 58) says, "with perfumed powder and lead," with tedious disputations, among many compliments against the learned and profound devil. Even the best apologetic writings of the second half of the last century, such as Lilienthal's voluminous work: "The Good Cause of Divine Revelation," have not seen the spirit of joyful faith and power that walks courageously in on the heads of the young lions and dragons, however much excellent material they contain for the salvation of human, historical faith. This historical faith is good, but in itself it is only a stage of unbelief. He who takes it for the whole Christian faith is still far from the kingdom of God, and is standing on his own feet.

The reason is slippery and already has the worms of doubt in it. Only faith, which is itself a miracle of the Spirit of God, has the divine testimony of the word with it, and sees the sun in its own light. "But must it first be proved that something is possible, if it is real? Then it is strange that people put out their night light at sunrise before astronomers have demonstrated the possibility of sunrise." (Corr.-Bl. 1828, p. 582.)

Nay, O Lord, in thy light we see the light, and thence comes to us all divine certainty, which mocks the enemies. The many apologetic sermons, with their addiction to convince the flesh of the truth of the Bible accounts, have still undermined the ground of faith. It is casting pearls before swine to pre-demonstrate the faith, and to dispute with uncritical critics, who, filled with Pilati sense, are already reaching for the hat when they ask, "What is truth?" God's law, which finds its point of contact in every conscience, must here only be witnessed to with force, and it will already strike wounds, to which the gospel can approach in its own time to perform its Samaritan services. If God's word had been witnessed as God's word, it would already have proved from whence it came; but a sleep had been poured out by God as in Elijah's day, and the watchmen of Zion, who finished their apologies in the study rooms and not on the battlefield, were also under the hood of sleep. They were growing weaker and weaker. The Church had bad luck with her apologists, and the worst of all with the theological ones; for what laymen like Hamann, Claudius, A. v. Halter wrote had much more witnessing power. Ah, those womanish priests, such as Frau Philosophia gives birth to, in whom is neither spirit nor manly courage in Christ! we exclaim with Luther. They could not speak German well. Their language, adorned with so many foreign words, screwed and fearful, was stamped throughout with the words: "This is really bad. There we must see how we salvirate ourselves." (Tholuck: Verm. Schr. I, 163.)

One danced around the golden calf of "science"; for one wanted to keep up with the times and did not dare to appear as unscientific, as a fool, for the sake of Christ. One testified one's appreciation to the unbelieving scholars and retreated from the pompous devil. The defense often became a mere apology for Scripture. God's word was abandoned, the divine doctrine diluted, the confession of the fathers denied. Because the apologists were too cowardly to fire into the devil's fortress, they had to allow themselves to be mocked by their enemies. Lessing reproached them with having deprived him of all faith in the first place, with their dull apologies, although he had none before. "They make us, under the pretext of making us reasonable Christians, into most unreasonable philo-

sophen," he sneered. (Kzt. 1828, p. 594. f.) The impudent knave I. Chr. Edelmann wrote: "The best thing for these poor people is that they have still hidden their confounded thoughts in the Babylonian or Latin language.... For where they had but presented the mere matters of dispute in their German dear woman's mother tongue, there would long ago have died away and evaporated all the plunder of their letters." (Lilienthal: *Die gute Sache*. Bd. III, Vorr.) A. v. Haller has rightly reminded us of the heavy responsibility which one takes upon oneself when one attacks the heroes of unbelief with too weak forces (*Briefe über einiger Freigeister Einwürfe*, 1778, Bd. I, pp. 3-9.); for when these notice nothing of spirit and strength, they immediately exult, drunk with victory, that they see the pillars of the church tottering, and carry about as a sign of victory every straw which they snatch from the knee-weak apologists. Lessing was right when he compared the manner of these theological weathervanes "to a general who loses his men before the frontier fortresses, and the Christian, on the other hand, to a bold conqueror who immediately takes possession of the country without caring for the fortresses, which must then fall of their own accord." (*Aufkommen und Sinken des Rationalismus*, 1829, p. 88.) Of the very sapless and feeble Apologies translated from English, which were set against his *Wolfenbüttel* Fragments, Lessing judged that, according to them, faith was also nothing more than reason confirmed by miracles and signs, and reason a *räsonnirender Glaube*. (Zisch. f. Protest. 41, 297. Tholuck: *Verm. Schr.* H, 27 ff.) Thus the reformed spirit, which wants to mediate between Christ and Belial, between truth and lies, is well marked. The apologists have been guided by this spirit since the days of Pietism, when they began to place subjective feelings and experiences above the infallible word of God. From this uncertain standpoint all divine certainty fell away; for as the worm on the rotten tree, so the subjectivist spirit with its doubts gnawed at all that was objectively fixed. The apologists who had given in to the worldview did not openly agree with the "Enlightenment," but neither could they joyfully, fully, and completely confess the word of Scripture. One lost the sword of the Spirit. On the slippery slope on which one had fallen, there was no longer any staying power. A translator of an English Apology must himself mention that light and darkness were united in it; for "it is almost the general disease of the Reformed, but especially of the English divine scholars, that they confound reason itself and the knowledge of man, wisdom from God and the wisdom of this world, the supernatural mysteries and the natural sciences with one another. . . . They make up the articles of faith on natural grounds, and first form a certain system for themselves, according to which the explanation of the Scriptures is afterwards to be directed, instead of

should make the beginning from the Scriptures, explain the Scriptures by themselves". Nevertheless, this false spirit was introduced and the apologetic writings were brought from England, to which a Tholuck also remarks: "If a bad defense is worse than none at all, one cannot rejoice over the majority of these defense writings. Most English apologists are similar to that mad householder who cries murder and bitch about thieves while he throws his best household goods out the window himself." (Vol. I, 163. 165. f.) We had just entered upon the last period of the history of the Church, to which John pointed with his Epistle to the church at Laodicea, which was neither cold nor hot, Revelation 3:14. ff., and is therefore the emblem of the Church of the last time, in which the virgins grow drowsy, and the elect are scarcely preserved. The tepid airs of Laodicean unionism, which had polluted the life-water of salutary doctrine even before the advent of rationalism, paralyzed all power of faith. In Prussia, Hanover, and Württemberg, from the middle of the eighteenth century onward, a "liberal conduct against dissenters" had been specially demanded of those to be hired, that is, in state churches an indifference to the truth and fraternal intercourse with all Christ-killers. Nowhere could it be emphasized strongly enough that one had nothing in common with the polemics of the fathers against the reformed sect. Thus all testimony was killed. The apologies against the grossest unbelief were of such a kind that they must wound a Christian soul. Soon after the fruits were revealed, Dr. Heubner wrote: "I used to think much of apologetics, but now I have become somewhat doubtful. Zinzendorf says, with these things one gives oneself up in Laodicea. I know only one starting point, and that is this: You are a sinner. As long as man does not learn to believe this, there is not much to be done with him." (Kzt. 1827, p. 386.) So then it was said of the Christians, "We hoped we should be made whole, but behold, there is more harm." Jer. 14:19.

In Prussia, in 1788, the intention was to again fight gross rationalism with a religious edict, after the godless King Frederick II, who had promoted it so much, had already commanded in his last days: "Bring religion back into the country! The appointed religious commission had to learn, however, that it could not be helped by edicts. One of its members confessed that they could not depose a blaspheming village priest, for everything worked against them, and that the so-called believers were only "negative enlighteners," quietists who quietly had one piece of furniture after another carried away from the house of God. Prof. Marezo II openly explained to them that the lamentation was not that too much, but that too little of Christianity had been thrown away. Accordingly, such a state commission could not

The people say that the judgment which Napoleon I soon after led over the German lands and the political uprising of the people brought the fear of God back into the country. It is said that the judgment which Napoleon I. soon after brought upon the German lands, and the political uprising of the people, restored the fear of God to the land. Well, the world became as pious as it could make itself under the leadership of an E. M. Arndt, M. Schenkendorf, Th. Körner, and the like; but it was not sent to the kingdom of God, for it needed no repentance and spurned the true light. In 1815, at the suggestion of Russia, the princes of Europe (with the exception of the King of England, the Pope, and the Sultan) entered into a holy union for the purpose of "making the law of Christianity the supreme law of the life of nations, apart from the dichotomy of the churches as one great Christian family. (Hare: Kgesch. p. 595.) Did not the power of God then come with new life? If in the kingdom of heaven little children were not to be held for the greatest, if the church of God might ever hold flesh for her arm, then indeed this holy alliance of princes would have been something great after such a time of desolation. "But the LORD said unto Gideon, The people are too many with thee, that I should deliver Midian into their hand. Israel would boast against me, and say, My hand hath redeemed me." Not. 7, 2. The holy alliance remained without fruit. No light of life shone to the blind who groped about seeking something firm and certain. No breath of life from God touched the new church builders either, who spoke of a return to the faith of the fathers, but only wanted to unite "the essentials of the faith" to the exclusion of all confessional differences with the spirit of the age. A union between Lutherans and Reformed, which had been worked toward for a hundred years, was to be the beginning of the extension of Laodicea. God had to raise up a witness for Himself if the church was not soon to be finished.

G. G.

(To be continued.)

Miscellany.

German Book Criticism. In the literary supplement of the "Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" (German Protestant Church Newspaper), the content of a book by C. Götze, "Die Sonne ist bewohnt" (The Sun is Inhabited), is reported as follows: "The author assumes that a nebulous spot, which can be recognized by means of the spiritual eye, contains the original substance, matter. Into its glowing centre the atoms fall. Thanks to gravity and centrifugal force, celestial bodies come into being. The author believes that also on other bodies than on the earth very favourable living conditions for men and animals exist.

He is convinced that he has found the latter on the dark suns as well as on the flaming ones. He attributes the fact that the world was created in an orderly fashion to a God who acts through his breath as a force. To a creation by God, of course, the author does not profess. Man came into being, and he came into being everywhere; proof of this is the fact that one found native men everywhere. That man has worked his way from an invertebrate worm to a vertebrate, to an ape, and finally to his own being, is rejected by the author. Rather, he is said to have originated in the warm mud from two germs, and then worked his way out, much as the young chicken does from its shell." To this nonsense the "theological" critic only remarks: "Besides many bold hypotheses put forward as assertions, the book also has some representations of facts carefully observed and described." Such lame critics are to blame for the fact that the "scholars" get courage again and again to appear before the public with their nonsensical fantasies. F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Bishops and Presbyters. The Lutheran Observer, in its June 5 issue, opposes Episcopalians who claim that "bishops" are above "presbyters" by divine right. He says, among other things, "In view of the light which exegetical studies of the New Testament have lately thrown on apostolic history, the assertion of the divine authority and 'apostolic succession' of bishops is really a curious thing (presents quite a spectacle) among scholars." This remark shifts the whole state of affairs. It is not only through the exegetical studies of modern times or even of recent years that the Episcopalian error has been recognized. Every simple-minded Christian who reads Apost. 20, 17-28. can recognize without "exegetical studies" that the apostle had called the same people whom he called v. 17. "elders" (*πρεσβύτεροι*),

V. 28. calls "bishops" (*ἐπίσκοποι*), and that thus the "bishops" are not a higher class of people than the "Aeltesten" are. Remarks like those made by the Observer are very harmful. They create the impression that the questions of controversy, which after all concern every Christian, can only be judged and decided by the "scholars" who are engaged in "exegetical studies". F. P.

The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopalians. During the past month the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopalians met for four full weeks, from the 1st to the 28th of May, in Cleveland, O. The General Conference meets every four years, and from the very beginning this meeting has attracted a great deal of attention in our country. The "Christliche Apologete," the organ of the German Methodists, from which we take the following report, had already said before the beginning of the General Conference: "Without doubt it will be one of the most memorable in the history of our church. Profound questions of principle will come to a decision, and since 1844 the Church has not had a General Conference of this kind."

with more excitement." It was to be borne in mind that this assembly had to exercise immense, almost unlimited power. According to the Methodist Church Order, the General Conference possesses legislative, judicial, and executive power, makes the laws, is responsible for the execution of them, and is at the same time the supreme court of the Church, interpreting the law. In it is laid down the whole and supreme authority of the church, to which all pastors, congregations, and church members must submit. One of her own bishops, Merrill, fearing abuses of this authority, once said: "The most dangerous time for the church is the four weeks when the General Conference is in session." In particular, the "women's question," i.e., the question of whether women should henceforth be allowed to sit and vote as delegates at the conferences, had already aroused Methodist circles before the meeting, and had often been discussed in affirmative and negative terms in the various church journals. After the annual conferences, to which the question had been referred four years before, had pronounced themselves in favor of the admission of women by a narrow majority, although some foreign assemblies were not involved, a final decision was expected from the General Conference. - The conference was opened by the oldest bishop, Bowman, as it was generally under the direction of the bishops of their church. In attendance were 537 delegates from all parts of the world, 34 from Germany alone, representing over 2½ million members of the congregation. In their official address, the bishops spoke on various subjects: the work of the bishops, constitutional improvements, the success of the church (it has grown by 386,000 members within the last four years, has large missions, many teaching institutions and students therein, etc.), the work of the deaconesses, the church building society, the Epworth League, the city mission, church unity, the church constitution, conferences, worldly pleasures, intoxicating drinks, earthly possessions, capital and work, etc.). Concerning "Christian Unity," the bishops said they had "always adhered to the following four great elements of Christian unity:" 1. Recognition and reception of the members of every evangelical church on the basis of a membership certificate, and recommendation of our own members to other churches. 2. cordially welcoming members of other churches to partake of Holy Communion as we administer it, and sharing in the enjoyment of it according to their use. 3. free and cordial exchange of pulpits. 4. practical cooperation with other churches in all Christian undertakings." They spoke serious words against the worldly addiction to pleasure, which was penetrating the church more and more, and exhorted them to hold fast to the fundamental law of their church, which demanded that "no pleasures be allowed which cannot be enjoyed in the name of the Lord Jesus". In regard to "capital and labor" they laid down the following principles, which "should be taught from the pulpit in a manner not to be misunderstood: 1. Everyone has a right to acquire property by lawful means, whether by activity, prudence, invention, or inheritance. (2) No one has the right to use his possessions for the oppression of his fellow-men and neighbors. (3) Every man has a right to make a profit from his own labor. In this respect he is a capitalist. (4) No one has the right to use his labor for the oppression of his fellow-men and neighboring men. (5) Every free man has a right to refuse to work for another. 006 No man hath a right to keep another from labouring, whosoever he may labour for. (7) Every man is accountable to God for the use of his time and labor and the results thereof. - Right in the first session the

Fight over the women's question, since four female delegates were seconded from individual conferences, of whom, however, only one insisted on her right. After many days of debate and strange arguments, in which (as later with the election of bishops and other agitations) the Methodist doctrine of "perfect sanctification" went thoroughly to pieces, nothing was asked about the Word of God, but only about constitutional law, namely whether the term "lay delegate" excluded women or not, finally - a compromise committee report was adopted, which actually referred the whole question again to the annual conferences for a vote. Thus the final decision is once again postponed. But the opponents of the admission of women do not conceal the fact that they are fighting for a lost cause. The chief spokesman for them, the editor of the "Christian Advocate," Dr. J. M. Buckley, who was almost the most prominent at the Conference, said in his closing address: "I am an opponent of the admission of women from the Scriptural standpoint, as well as for other reasons. It is impossible for me to advocate the same in any way. I see clearly, however, that the great majority of the Church does not share my views in this matter. I see just as clearly that there are two ways to bring them in: in a dangerous, agitational, and temporary way by interpreting the Constitution-or by changing the Constitution." And by altering their Constitution, the Methodists will probably soon permit that which the Apostle has forbidden. An amendment to the Constitution permitting this will be submitted to the annual Conferences for a vote. It is true that the German party resisted to the last any concession, but it has too little influence and too few votes against the radical elements, at the head of which was Dr. Leonard. - Of the remaining proceedings we mention that two bishops, Bowman and Forster, were retired, so that the college of bishops, with the newly elected, consists of the following men: Merrill, Andrews, Warren, Foss, Hurst, Ninde, Walden, Mallaliuu, Fowler, Vincent, FitzGerald, Joyce, Newman, Goodsell, McCabe, and Cranston. Among the editors of the twelve church periodicals, some of whom have been re-elected, is the son of the founder of German Methodism in America, Dr. Albert Nast, as editor of the Apologist.

L. F.

The American McAll Association, which recently held its annual meeting at Elizabeth, N. J., has contributed to the McAll Mission in France during the past year the sum of \$32,436.

A protest against the doctrine of perfect holiness was recently published by the Baptist paper, Religious Herald. This paper recently wrote, according to the report of the Theological Herald, among other things, the following: "The man who deceives himself with the idea that he is doing nothing wrong is a danger to society. It makes no practical difference to him whether he merely thinks he can do no wrong, or whether he actually does no wrong. It is merely a difference of expression. Of course, in a man who has this idea, there is a danger that all moral distinctions will disappear from his mind. It is, in fact, a fixed idea, and where it is unchecked, it renders its victim incapable of moral judgment. Let it be understood rightly; we do not mean to say that all who accept this doctrine, that it is possible to become sinless, are immoral people. We would never think of asserting such a thing. We do not doubt at all that some of them are among the best on earth." (?) "What we assert is this: as soon as the idea,

The theory that the line of danger, where being subject to evil ceases, is crossed, fully accepted, and acted upon, blurs the distinction between good and evil. What thus appears to be a correct theory has actually proved to be true in reality. The societies of 'saints' which have met from time to time in various places, and have carried this doctrine to its limit, have unmistakably shown the danger which lurks behind it, namely, that religion and morality may be torn asunder. We want to sincerely warn people of simple hearts against this deception. Their history does not show that those who claim to have reached this extraordinary height have distinguished themselves before their fellow Christians by the gifts and virtues which adorn the Christian personality. The opposite is often the case. This teaching is not harmless; it is decidedly dangerous."

The "Theologische Zeitschrift" reports on the **debts of the American missionary societies**: The reports of the American missionary societies show quite a number of deficits, all of which exceed one hundred thousand. The mission debt of the Methodist Episcopal Church is \$238,000, and it has been openly stated that the General Conference will have to intervene in this critical condition, although it is difficult to say how it can effectually remedy the situation, for the continual reduction of appropriations necessarily leads to the abandonment of some mission fields. The Baptists report a debt of \$198,958; the Presbyterians have a debt of \$174,830 for heathen missions, although they have reduced their expenditures by about \$200,000; for native missions they have a debt of \$258,000. The American Missionary Society gives its deficit as 114,630, and the Congregationalists theirs as \$179,000. The Wesleyan Methodists in England also have a mission debt of \$150,000. The total of these debts is a little over \$1,500,000. This, of course, is far from giving the total of all mission debts in America, as the amounts falling under one hundred thousand must also be quite numerous.

The Prohibitionists have split into two parties. Some want only Prohibition; others want "dual currency" and other "reforms" along with it. At the head of the latter is the well-known St. John.

F. P.

The activity of the Swedenborgians is truly magnificent. For years they have been distributing their writings in millions of copies - free of charge. Would that Christians were so zealous in the preaching of the gospel! F. P.

The profanity of prayer at the opening of political meetings was illustrated anew at the Republican National Convention recently held in St. Louis. The politicians who presided over the convention, for some reason or other, did not like the idea of a Protestant or Catholic "praying" at the opening of the meeting. So they made a compromise and engaged as "prayer leader" the Jew Dr. Sale.

F. P.

ReligiousParliament. Dr. J. H. Barrows, for a number of years the preacher of a Presbyterian church in Chicago, known by name as the chairman of the Parliament of Religion in 1893, resigned his office a few months ago in order to devote himself for several years to the study of world religions. First he will study in Göttingen and then he will travel to the Orient and give lectures on his favourite subject. This will be made possible by the proceeds of a fund made available to the University of Chicago for the purpose of study.

The "Lutheran Church Friend" of Dr. Severinghaus, who belonged to the General Synod, praised Barrows. The "Lutheran Church Friend" of Dr. Severinghaus, who belonged to the General Synod, praised Barrows for being very suitable "for such a world mission, which is to emphasize the good in all religions and to initiate a friendly relationship among the peoples of the earth". (!) - At the same time the proposal comes from Paris to hold a second religious parliament there in 1900 in connection with the world exhibition planned for that time. A Papist, the Abbe Charbonnel, has already published an appeal in an influential French magazine and is in contact with Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, who opened the Congress of Religion in Chicago with prayer. Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul expects great success from the carrying out of the plan. Of course, the Pabst Church is then to stand out especially and reap glory, and according to the opinion of its supporters, the future Parliament of Religion, this mockery of Christianity, must finally serve *ad majorem gloriam antichrist*.

L. F.

II. Abroad.

From Pomerania. Since April 1894 a circle of men has come together to form a "Bible Union" in order to strengthen themselves in their faith in God's Word. For the time being, this association has summarized the main features of its endeavors: The members profess the belief that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, according to their testimony concerning themselves, are the completely inerrant Word of God and therefore the only guide of our faith and life. They unite in the common work of researching the biblical books in detail and as a whole, of defending the standing due to the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God in the face of their opponents, and thereby helping that their saving and sanctifying power may unfold in all circles of the congregation. The publications of the Bibelbund are therefore a. scientific works of linguistic research, interpretation of Scripture, biblical history, description of the earth, study of antiquity, etc.; b. especially criticism of criticism; c. works of common understanding in the aforementioned fields. The members, as far as they are willing and their strength and office permit, each choose one or more books of Holy Scripture, which they make the special subject of their study and work. In the same way, the auxiliary sciences are distributed. Up to now they have worked in silence, but now they are at least thinking of doing something in public. The Federation holds meetings in the spring and fall of each year. Sup. Kölling in Pleß and Prof. Beyer in Neu-Stettin are probably its most publicly known members. In the previous autumn, Sup. Vogel in Wollin gave a lecture on "The Bible and God's Word in Luther's Small Catechism," and Pastor Quistorp in Schwerinsburg on "The Attacks of Modern Theology against the Holy Scriptures in the Light of God's Word." On April 14 there was another meeting in Stettin, in which Pastor Steinmeyer from Zarben spoke on "Luther's Position on Holy Scripture," and Pastor Dieckmann from Beggerow on "The God-manhood of JEsu and the God-manhood of Holy Scripture in Parallel and Connection."

(A. E. L. K.)

From the Prussian Regional Church. The Profesoren question gave rise to a lively debate at the Berlin-Cölln District Synod. Hofprediger (ret.) Stöcker had submitted the following motion: "The District Synod should resolve to submit the following motion to the next Provincial Synod: Provincial Synod be resolved: a. Outstanding academically qualified and at the same time firmly in the church confession

to request the clergy of the Province of Brandenburg to devote themselves to the academic teaching ministry, in accordance with the principle of free participation in academic teaching which underlies the organization of the University. - b. To pay the necessary expenses. - c. To request the Minister of Culture to appoint the persons considered in accordance with resolution a, after having examined their qualifications, as extraordinary professors of the University. professors of the local university." Prof. Dr. Weber declared himself sharply against the motion, and called the concluding sentence downright demagogic. The synodal provost D. Freiherr v. d. Goltz admits that the academic teachers should also learn about practice, and that in the last decade the educational administration has favoured too much the "breeding of pure scholars". However, an improvement could not be expected in the way suggested by Stöcker. It would be "hopeless" if such teachers with the *missio canonica* were to be placed next to the professional professors. The proposal is the idea of someone who does not understand anything about things. Therefore, "away with it, there is nothing to be done with it! An institution proposed in the motion would bring discord to the teaching community, discord and distrust to the student body. The students would ascribe a certain tendency to the synodical professor and a certain tendency to the ministerial professor." Finally, the motion was defeated. (A. E. L. K.)

Protestant Association. On the Wednesday after Easter, the 19th German Protestant Day met in Berlin, of course pompously announced in an appeal by the chairman, Kammergerichtsrath Schröder, and in the related liberal mood organs. Its activities since the last meeting in Gotha in 1890 included: 1. a petition to the Reichstag against the admission of the Jesuits, 2. a rally against Zedlitz's draft law on elementary schools, 3. an omission on the preservation of the right of Protestant freedom of conscience against the Apoftolicumeraß of the Prussian Oberkirchenrath, likewise one against the new Agende. In protesting, then, admittedly in a completely different way than once happened in Speier, he achieved something remarkable. Otherwise there is not much to report from the meeting. The "Steudel case" in Wuerttemberg was exploited to the utmost, and bitter complaints were made about the appalling intolerance of the regional churches. The strange thing is that no association is more intolerant than this one. If five large Protestant churches stand empty in Heidelberg, because no one has any desire for the sermons of the Protestant Association, while the positive-minded must assemble there in a small chapel, this is a loud-speaking testimony to the fact that he knows forbearance only for spirits of his own persuasion, or only knows how to speak of forbearance. The equal rights of all directions, which he has written on his banner, is, by the way, an impossibility in a church. Finally, one has preachers who deny the first article in the pulpit. The Protestant members of the Protestant Association lack any understanding of this. Complaints were made at the meeting that everywhere, except in Bremen, Hamburg and Darmstadt, the number of members is decreasing. Thus also the lectures, which the association had held in Offenbach, were very poorly attended. This was attributed to the concurrence of the Evangelical Federation. Whether this is praise or blame for the Federation, who can say? (Sächs. Kirchen- und Schulblatt.)

The State and the Old Catholics. The "Pilgrim a. S." writes: The manner in which the former Vicar General, Professor Dr. Theodor Weber, who had been elected successor to Bishop Reinkens by the Old Catholic Synod at Bonn, was, as a result of a royal commission, arrested by the Chief President of the Rhine Province.

The fact that the bishop was sworn in gives pause for thought. The certificate of recognition, dated April 16, declares the sworn-in bishop to be a "Catholic bishop" with no other denomination. This is a repudiation in the best form of the Centre Party, which in the last Cultus debate used the occasion of the death of Bishop Reinkens to persuade the Government to denounce the Catholic character of the Old Catholics, only that the Cultus Minister admitted that the Old Catholics no longer regarded themselves as Roman Catholics. The oath of the Old Catholic bishop was taken, omitting the passage referring to the pope, in accordance with the Royal Decree of February 13, 1887. The Ultramontanes will have to get used to the fact that there are other Catholics in Prussia and Germany besides the Roman Catholics. From Coblenz Bishop Weber went to Darmstadt and Karlsruhe, in order to be sworn in as Catholic Bishop also for Hesse and Baden, whose governments recognized him under the 21st and 23rd of March respectively.

Bavaria and the Romans. If the so-called "particularism" has recently been stirred up in Bavaria, it is none of the business of an ecclesiastical journal. Whether and to what extent "particularism" is justified and compatible with the imperial constitution is a political question. And yet every Christian who knows some data of recent ecclesiastical history will involuntarily ask: What is the attitude of the Clerisy of the Pope toward this latest political movement?" Experience shows that the Ultramontanes of Bavaria sweep out "patriotism" when they want to cause trouble for the German Kaiserthum, which they now regard as a "Protestant" one. In this respect the latest political occurrences in Bavaria are also of great interest from the ecclesiastical point of view. Rome seeks to destroy all states that will not submit to her. So long as the German Empire has a "Protestant top," the Ultramontanes will remain enemies of the Empire in the full sense of the word. The fact that the Pabst Church is accommodated in the friendliest way and treated in many respects even better than parity will not change this. The mere "Protestant point" is a standing irritant to the right-wing Pabst servants. The Pabst Church, so far as its position to the State is concerned, is much worse than its reputation. F. P.

Iceland. The "D. E. K." writes: A recent observer judges that in Iceland spiritual and moral (Christian? L. u. W.) education is universal, that in this respect the Icelanders surpass all the other peoples of Europe. In the 9th century Iceland had been peopled. About the year 1000 Christianity found its way into Iceland; in 1080 a bishop's see was established at Holar, and in 1105 one at Skalholt. In the course of the Middle Ages Iceland fell to Norway, especially because it was weakened by internal disputes, then with all of Norway to Denmark, and under the Danish King Christian III. from 1540 to 1551 the church reformation was set in motion. Since Bishop Jon Arason had already introduced the printing press in 1530, a translation of the New Testament was published in 1540 (by Odd Gottskalkson, d. 1556). In 1584, Bishop Gudbrand Thorlaksson completed the translation of the entire Bible (from Luther's German text). In the 17th century Hallgrímur Pjetursson (1614-1674) excelled as a poet of 50 psalms. In them, above all, the story of Christ's suffering is sung about. They are still the most appreciated hymnbook in Iceland. At present, the island has 72,000 inhabitants (all of them Lutheran), who, despite the harsh climate and poor conditions, are a pious, serious and thoroughly honest people. Only exceptionally do they grow grain; bread is a delicacy outside the port cities. The ecclesiastical organization

According to Iceland forms a bishopric; under the same stand 20 provostries and about 350 churches. Most of the places of worship are built of wood, only 12 of stone, 29 are peat churches, built of sod and individual loose blocks of stone. Ornamentation is usually also completely lacking in the interior; the walls are bare. Only 51 churches have a harmonium, not even the cathedral in Reykjavik has an organ. But the best is not missing, the loud word of God; also the most beautiful decoration of a house of worship is found, the numerous assembly of the believing congregation. To this corresponds a beautiful family life. The Bible is diligently read. Not in schools, but through the parents under the supervision of the pastors, the children receive their instruction; thus every Icelander can read and write. In this country the Romans now want to do missionary work again. Two missionaries learn the Icelandic language in Copenhagen. In this language they want to publish catechism, prayer and hymn books. Hopefully, knowledge of the Bible and a living faith will prevent the Icelanders from being seduced by Roman errors.

Methodism in Switzerland. The "D. E. K." reports: Methodism is flourishing in Switzerland. In the past year it was able to record an increase of 200 members. Spread over the whole of Switzerland, it is especially active in the building of chapels. In Zurich, known to be the center of Swiss Methodism, a new preacher was once again hired.

The Baptists in Vienna. The Baptists have only 117 members in Vienna after 25 years of work. Special obstacles are placed in their way by the police. The "Truth Witness" writes: "According to this, the clergy has a power reminiscent of the Middle Ages. Thus, according to a decree of the Minister of Culture, our meetings may only be attended by a limited number of invited guests, who must be in possession of an invitation card in their name. It is not permitted to publicly distribute Christian writings. School-age children of a legally recognized church, even if they are children of our members, are not allowed to hear the sermon." (D. E. K.)

Salaries of pastors in Hungary. The "D. E. K." writes: "The parliament will soon deal with the economic situation of the Protestant clergy, which is a very depressed one. In more than 1000 parishes the clergy receive less than 600 florins" (1 florin about 45 cents), "in 200 parishes in Transylvania even less than 300 florins annually. Since the new laws came into force, this low income has been reduced by 1/3 through the abolition of the stipend. An attempt is now to be made to fix the income of the clergy at 6-700 florins as the minimum by means of state aid."

The Methodists and Luther. On the day of the dedication of the great new Methodist Church in Rome, September 20, the Italian Methodists sent the following telegram to the mayor of Wittenberg: "Fraternal greetings and expressions of appreciation for the glorious Wittenberg, home of the great reformer Martin Luther

Wonderful fight against Freemasonry. In France, a world league against Freemasonry has been founded; it bears the name Labarum (after Constantine's flag of the cross) and already has many Catholic members, both secular and clerical. In order to reach their goal sooner, the Labarists decided to fight the Freemasons with their own weapons; they therefore created an organization that is similar to the Masonic one and, moreover, has a military character. The head of the League bears the title of "Grand-

Chancellor" and "Secretary General". A well-known French writer is said to have been chosen for this, who took the combat name Br. Paul de Régis.

(D. E. K.)

From the Baltic Provinces. The once flourishing German University of Dorpat has become a Jewish university. The Russian press of its time advocated with the greatest zeal that Dorpat should become a stronghold of Russian intelligence and a cornerstone of the Orthodox faith. Even the name Dorpat was to be eradicated and replaced by the Russian name Jurjew. The Russification, however, has now almost been carried out; but instead of being a cornerstone of the Russian faith, Dorpat has been visited from within Russia by 347 Jews among 588 students; 241 come from the Christian churches, but among them only 98 from the Greek Orthodox Church. And for these 98 the Rector has had a special university church built.

(D. E. K.)

From Russia. To characterize the Orthodox priesthood in Russia, we give the following drastic descriptions from the "Memoirs of a Russian Village Priest," one of which sheds light on the method of conversion against sectarians, the other on the examination of priestly assistants. The deceased provost in the town of K. was a missionary. He always made the journeys for the conversion of sectirians in the summer at working time. Once he came with the Jsprawnik to a large village inhabited by sectirians and called all the peasants to a religious entertainment. The house in which he had stayed consisted of two rooms separated by a common door. The first room was occupied by the jsprawnik, the other by the provost. The Jsprawnik then let every peasant and every woman come to him and beat him. When he has had enough of this, he sends them to the provost for admonition. He says: "You have been offended, my friend, as it seems to me. I am sorry for you, very sorry! Sign here that you want to be orthodox, then you may live in God's name as you wish, the authorities will not bother you any further. But for the protection I will give thee, give me a ruble." So he did with this, with that-with eight hundred people. The sectirians raised no objection, either about the signature or about the rubles. Thereupon the Jsprawnik took three rubles from each stray sheep, whereupon the gentlemen missionaries continued their journey. - The local clergyman later reported that his sectarians did not think of being orthodox either, but continued their former life. Then the provost came to him: "In three days I have been able to make the people understand their error, but you have been living here for years and do not understand your cause. I will report to the bishop that you are harmful here, so that he may transfer you to a worse parish." And the unhappy clergyman gives the missionary a ten-ruble note, only that he may not become a beggar by his report. After a year the provost comes again to the village with the Jsprawnik, and now they no longer treat the peasants as sectarians, but as apostates from orthodoxy; the unfortunates are flayed by the skin and purse in an even more unscrupulous manner. One of these missionaries was also at the same time examiner of the priestly flock. Once a psalm singer, Fedor Jrgisow, from the village of G. on the other side of the Volga, came 400 versts to take his exam. The examiner asked him a question and said: "Bad, bad! Keep studying and come back after a year." Yrgizov takes a silver ruble and puts it on the table. The examiner, without putting much down, slips the coin under the tablecloth and goes into the other room, muttering, "There is still learning to be done. It is not enough."

By leaving, he gave Yrgizov the opportunity to take another ruble from the bag. But the latter approached the table on tiptoe and pulled his ruble out from under the cloth. When the examiner re-entered the room, Jrgizov said, "Your Reverence, have mercy!" At the same time he puts the ruble back on the table. The Examiner hides it as before and repeats, "It still has to be learned, it is not enough!" And so it went on several times, until the examiner said, "Give me the act, I feel sorry for you, you have a long way to go," and then gave him a good report card.

(A. E. L. K.)

Transvaal. The "D. E. K." gives the following enthusiastic description of President Krüger: "The shameful rape of the Dutch by Dr. Jameson and his backers has turned the attention of Europe to the Boers and their bold leader, President Krüger. Of the story of his life many will be ignorant. From the smallest circumstances he has gradually risen to the heights by his vigorous personality, and the shepherd's crook which his father placed in his hand has become his sceptre; he who has now wielded it with firmness and sagacity for fifteen years freely confesses before all the world that it was not by his own strength, but by God's grace alone, that he succeeded in attaining the high position. A simple, intrepid and heartily pious nature, he has won great respect and love among the Boers. He has not studied and has not learned diplomacy. His diplomatic art is called honesty, and his strength rests on the ground of right. From his ninth year he has grazed his father's sheep and herds of oxen, and has slain many a lion with his bullet. In this life, rich in dangers, which demanded a sure eye, a strong hand, and resolute courage, he underwent a school of experience which paved his way to the highest position among his people. To his common sense was added an innate diplomatic talent, which proved its worth amidst all the intrigues and intrigues with which the English have persecuted the Boer people for eight years, who, though powerful, are small in number. The people also know what they have in their President. When asked how it came about that the English were so brilliantly defeated in 1880, the Boers usually answered: "God alone did that, and our Kruger with his prayers." The President is not only a great statesman, but a great praying man. All his affairs of state he undertakes looking up to God. He is afraid of no one to profess his faith. One-third of the inhabitants of Johannesburg are Jews. More than once he proved their unbelief to them from the Bible. When, after the great swindles, the crash and unemployment came to Johannesburg, the swindlers stirred up the people against the government. 20-30,000 people gathered in front of the President's apartment, ranting, shouting to annoy him, singing English songs. Kruger appeared on the balcony and looked at the raging mob in the greatest calm. At last he called into the crowd, "If you talk, I cannot talk." A deep silence fell; he was able to develop the government programme. After five minutes the scandal broke out anew. Then he turned his back on the company and cried, "Whoever wants anything more from me, come forward later." Not a hair was turned on the brave man's head. With so vigorous and pious a President at its head, who has a clear consciousness of his right and an unshaken confidence in God, and behind whom stands a people unconditionally devoted to him, the Boer Republic can feel secure in its clod. Luther's great song of defiance, which has also been translated into their language, resounds through the country and is now sung with raised head.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42. July and August 1896.

No. 7. and 8.

Are political pastors an aberration?

In the German ecclesiastical journals, the question is currently being discussed whether pastors may and should also be politically active. The discussion of this question is prompted by the well-known imperial telegram in which the political activity of the former court preacher Stöcker is condemned. The telegram reads as follows: "Berlin, Schloß, II. 28, 96. Stöcker has ended, as I predicted years ago. Political pastors are an absurdity. He who is a Christian is also 'social'; Christian-social is nonsense and leads to self-conceit and intolerance, both of which run directly counter to Christianity. The pastors should take care of the souls of their congregations, cultivate charity, but leave politics out of it, because it is none of their business. William I. R."-This is rough and plain. The pastors hit by the Emperor's criticism are quite dejected about it. They believed that with their "Christian social" or political activity they were not only doing a service to the fatherland, but were also acting in the Emperor's interests. Now all at once they hear from the pen of the Emperor: "Political pastors are an absurdity." "Let the gentlemen pastors take care of the souls of their congregations, but leave politics out of it, because it is none of their business." The "Emperor's Telegram," then, is pretty generally "deplored" and factually objected to, especially by the "positive" ecclesiastical press of Germany. Stöcker himself, who publishes the telegram in his "Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenzeitung," does say: "Reverence prevents us from discoursing with his Majesty on the words uttered." But he does take the liberty of pointing out several "facts," e. g., the fact that "the present reigning monarch himself, as Prince William, has called Christian social activity the means of overcoming social democracy."

The "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung," an organ of the Lutherans within the Union, wishes to distinguish between the Emperor when he expresses a private opinion and the Emperor when he speaks *ex cathedra*. "We cannot believe," she writes, "that our Emperor, if he had spoken from the throne instead of in telegraphic style, and in confidential telegraphic style at that, would have said flatly that Christian-social was nonsense, and that politics did not concern the pastors at all." On the merits, she says that the views expressed in Telegram "are opposed by the views of many arch-kingly Christians in the country." Even American political newspapers have taken sides with Stöcker and expressed the view that pastors should not be forbidden all political activity.

What is the position of a Christian who judges only according to God's Word? In the German ecclesiastical journals the discussion of this question is rather wildly mixed up. While some are fully in favor of the political activity of the pastor, in so far as it concerns "social reform," others seek to gain and establish certain limits for this activity. But there is no clear principled controversy. And this is not to be wondered at. With the clear recognition of the Gospel, there has also been lost the recognition of the difference between Church and State, as it is set forth, e. g., in the sixteenth and twenty-eighth articles of the Augsburg Confession and in the sixteenth article of the Apology. One knows neither what the church nor what the state is. Thus one cannot properly distinguish between ecclesiastical and state or political activity. Nor can it be assumed that the Emperor spoke from the right understanding when he said in his telegram that political pastors were unacceptable. Where would remain, if he wanted to assert the difference between state and church, the Prussian state church together with him, the *summus episcopus*? If it was clear to the Emperor in principle that pastors engaged in politics were an absurdity, it could hardly remain hidden from him that princes who wanted to govern the church were likewise an absurdity, "because it is none of their business. Now the Emperor has not yet indicated that he is thinking of resigning his episcopate, as was the case with King Frederick William IV. Thus, his energetic rejection of the political activity of the pastors will unfortunately have other reasons than the recognition of the difference between state and church.

But be that as it may! Let us now proceed to a brief discussion in principle of the question whether pastors practicing politics are a normal, God-ordained phenomenon or an absurdity. The subject is of the greatest importance for our local circumstances. Probably in no other country are pastors more involved in politics than in the

United States. Political issues are hardly the exception with many sect preachers, but the rule.

In order to avoid ambiguity, it will be useful to agree beforehand on the expressions to be used and to determine exactly what is in dispute. The word "politics" is nowadays often used in the sense of craftiness, cunning, unscrupulous partisanship, etc. "He is a politician" often means something like "He is an unscrupulous man who subordinates truth and right to the interest of the party and to his own interest". That with politics in this sense the pastor, and in general the Christian, has nothing to do, goes without saying. Politics in this sense should be abhorred even by the respectable man of the world. By politics and political activity we understand an honest business, the activity that has to do with the affairs of the state or of civil life. This naturally includes legislation in the civic sphere and the administration of the laws. What we call politics is called by Luther and our old theologians for the most part "secular government. By this they understood not merely the secular ruler and his activity, but the whole order of civil life with its laws and the administration of these laws. Cf. Article 16 of the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, as well as Article 28 of the Augsburg Confession.

If the word "politics" is taken in this sense, does the pastor have political activity? Does the pastor also have to do with the order of state or civil life? Before answering in the affirmative or in the negative, it is useful to make another distinction. We distinguish between the pastor as pastor or servant of the church and the pastor as citizen or private person. The pastor, like every Christian, is a citizen in two realms, the state and the church. Inasmuch as he is a citizen, the affairs of state or civil life concern him. He takes notice of them and forms a judgment about them. The pastor may and will have a conviction also in civic matters. As a citizen, he will also make use of his right to vote and thus participate in the ordering of civic affairs. This is his right, and under certain circumstances also his duty as a citizen. Whether it is advisable that the political opinion of the pastor as well as the use of the right to vote in support of a certain political party be made known is another question. Dr. Walther used to advise pastors not to make their political opinions known in their congregations. In times of political agitation, this could create obstacles for the pastor in his office. For our part, we consider this advice worthy of heeding. The pastor's ministry should be everything to him.

that he most carefully avoids what could be an obstacle to his office. But this remains certain: The pastor as a citizen or private person may and will have a political conviction. He may and will make use of his right to vote and thus participate in the order and management of civic affairs.

The question at issue here, and which remains for us to answer, is whether the pastor, as pastor, has political activity. Whether it belongs to the office of the pastor to intervene in civil legislation. And since the office of preaching does not belong to the pastor personally, but to the Christian congregation, to the church, the question is synonymous with the question whether the church has the task of establishing the civil order and legislation according to its, the church's, laws. This question has been answered by the orthodox Church with a decided "no", and we wholeheartedly endorse this "no". This no is based on the distinction between state and church, or between secular and spiritual government, as taught in Scripture.

If we look into the Scriptures, we can find nothing else in all passages that deal with the purpose and task of the Christian church than that the church has to preach the gospel and make people blessed. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," Marc. 16:15, 16. To preach the gospel, to awaken faith, to save-this is the business of the Christian church here on earth. Through the activity of the Christian church, or rather the Christian preaching ministry, a mighty gathering takes place in the world. But it is not a bodily gathering to one or more earthly kingdoms, but a spiritual gathering of hearts and consciences to God, to Christ; a gathering in the Holy Spirit and faith in the gospel. "Be ye reconciled to God" is what the Christian Church calls out to men through the preaching ministry. Nowhere in Scripture do we find it stated as the task of the Christian Church, wherever it goes, to constitute itself a separate secular kingdom, or, what is the same thing, to take the order of the civil polity into its own hands and to transform it by so-called Christian legislation. On the contrary, Christians are inculcated to be subject to the existing civil order: "Let every man be subject to the authority that has power over him," to recognize the existing civil order as divine order before all "Christian transformation": "There is no authority without from God; but where there is authority, it is ordained by God," Rom. 13:1, to pray for the existing civil order as a good order of God, 1 Tim. 2:1-3, and to do honor to the Christian name by being subject to "all human order."

1 Petr. 3, 13-17. God has, says Luther, "ordained two regiments" here in the world, "the spiritual one, which makes Christians and pious people through the Holy Spirit under Christ; and the secular one, which prevents unbelievers and the wicked, so that they have to keep peace outwardly", 1) That these two regiments, state and church, are both God's order, but essentially different kingdoms with different laws, has been clearly brought to light by Luther's Reformation. The pope had blended the two kingdoms into one another. And the pagans made a sincere effort to do the same. Therefore the church of the Reformation declares in its confession: the article "concerning the difference between the spiritual kingdom of Christ and the temporal kingdom" is "a very important and necessary article. 2) "Christ's kingdom is spiritual, in that he rules by word and preaching, works by the Holy Spirit, and increases in us faith, godliness, love, patience inwardly in the heart, and here on earth sows in us God's kingdom and eternal life." 3) The worldly government, on the other hand, "deals with many other things than the gospel"; it "protects not souls, but body and goods against outward violence with the sword and bodily spears." 4) By the power of the keys, or by the operation of the spiritual kingdom, "are given, not corporeal, but eternal things and goods, namely, eternal righteousness, the Holy Ghost, and eternal life." 5) On the basis of this difference of nature and purpose between the state and the church, the confession then repeatedly insists that the church is not to legislate for the state or for civil life. The church "shall not lay down the law to secular authority or legislate on secular matters," *non praescribat leges magistratibus de forma reipublicae*. Dirs justifies the confession thus: "As Christ himself said, John 18:36, 'My kingdom is not of this world.'" Item, Luc. 12, 14.: 'Who hath set me to be a judge between you?*' And St. Paul to the Philippians, 3, 1.: 'Our citizenship is in heaven.' And in the second to Corinthians 10:4: "The weapons of our knighthood are not carnal, but mighty for God to destroy the temptation and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God. "6) Still further in the Confession it is said in reference to this point: "The gospel suffereth not outward police, worldly government, and order, to abide alone; but also that we should be obedient to such." 7) Christ instructed the apostles, and thus all preachers, "that their office was to preach of the spiritual kingdom, not to change some worldly government" (*non mutare civilem sta-*

1) E. A. 22, p. 68.

3) A. a

5) A.

7) Apology, art. 16, p. 216.

2) Apology, Art. 16, p. 215.

. O. 4) Augsb. Conf. art. 28, p. 63.

I. O. 6) A. I. O. p. 63. 64.

tum). "The gospel teaches how to be saved for God and in conscience from sin, hell, the devil, and by heart leaves the world its rule in outward things." 1) The gospel or the Christian church "bringeth not new laws in the government of the world (non fert evangelium novas leges de statu *civili*), but giveth and willeth that we should be obedient to the laws, and to the government under which we dwell, whether Gentiles or Christians." 2) Yes, that which belongs to the domain of the temporal government, "is of no concern to the ministry of the gospel." 3)

Here one interjects: Should Christianity have no influence at all on "social life"? Does not Christianity make everything new (2 Cor. 5, 17.)? Does not Christianity therefore also have a great influence on politics? Indeed! Christianity also makes everything new in politics, exerts the most tremendous influence also on politics, in so far as it makes honest, conscientious politicians. Christianity makes honest and conscientious politicians, as it makes honest and conscientious shoemakers, merchants, etc. But let us stop for a moment at the example of the shoemaker. What effect does Christianity have on shoemaking? That the shoemakers first of all regard and practice their whole activity as a service to God, then do not deceive in their craft, do not lie and deceive, do not pass off shoes made of bad leather for good ones, but serve all their customers honestly. This is certainly a tremendous influence of the Church on "social life". Here is also the point where the pastor, or rather the church, has a say in the shoemaker's dealings from God's Word, and the pastor must not allow himself to be misled by the plea that shoemaking is a worldly, earthly thing, a business, and none of the pastor's business. What is none of the pastor's business, or the church's business, in making shoes, are the rules of the shoemaker's art, the last, the cut of the shoes, etc. These things are not determined by God's revealed Word, but by reason and experience, since shoemaking is a worldly thing. So it is with politics. Politics is a purely worldly thing. Thus, while the church inculcates in the Christian politician that he should not lie and deceive in his political activity, it does not prescribe the last for him, that is, it does not claim that public, civic life is to be ordered or the secular regiment to be appointed according to church laws. This is what our Confession repeatedly states when it says of the church or the ecclesiastical power that it "shall not make laws for secular power and set up secular affairs. One had, as be-

1) op. cit.

2) op. cit. p. 215.

3) Augsb. Conf. art. 28, p. 64.

As already indicated, at the time of the Reformation there was also reason to address this point inasmuch as Carlstadt and the enthusiasts wanted to replace the existing bourgeois order with a supposedly Christian one and thus supplement Luther's Reformation.

"Christian" legislation in the state and civil spheres is what Stöcker and many of those who want the pastors to be politically active with him are actually striving for. In order not to do them injustice, it must be emphasized that they call many things "social-political" or even briefly "political" that are not. Stöcker, for example, quotes Prof. von Nathusius, who writes: "I must say that a pastor into whose congregation the Social Democrats break in for the first time, where for the first time the cry is heard: 'We want to free you from the lords and clergy!' - that if he does not go into these meetings to oppose the agitations and lies, he deserves the name of a dumb dog. If they say he does not feel equal to the task, he is just insufficiently prepared for his office." In this Prof. Nathusius will be found to be right. He sets the case that Social Democrats break into the congregation, also hold meetings with members of the congregation to incite them against church and state. When the pastor goes into these meetings and says the right thing there, he only takes care of the souls he is commanded to take care of. He does not engage in political activity, but in pastoral activity. This, too, is by no means political, but only ecclesiastical activity, when pastors from the pulpit, in private pastoral care, and also in writings, "address the social question" in such a way that they place everything in the light of the Word of God. This is not only their right, but also their duty. They should also show how the church "has a heart for social need," how it punishes injustice against high and low, and how it possesses the means to eliminate conflict, namely, by accepting God's word. But Stoecker and those who want to pursue Christian Socialism with him - though not in complete agreement - go further. They have the "Christian State" in mind. They want to see "the Christian principles" which are to put an end to the conflict secured by state legislation. There is no other way to understand it when, for example, Stöcker's Kirchenzeitung says: "Christian-social activity is therefore just as much the work of the statesman who judges the social spheres in a Christian way and orders them according to divine commandment, as the activity of the philanthropist or clergyman who applies to the social tasks the standard of divine commandments as well as Christian principles and insists that this standard be applied" (namely, in the ordering of things by civil legislation). In this sense, Stöcker also says that Christianity does not only preach "personal social virtues" but also "certain social orders".

to represent. He means the state order according to "Christian principles". In this sense, Stöcker also raises an accusation against Luther. He had initially "intervened with a mighty hand in social life", but later, for the sake of certain dangers, "abandoned the social". As a result, "the popular character of the Reformation thought suffered damage. The church had not exercised the proper influence on the state. In short, Stöcker blames Luther for not having enforced the reorganization of public, civic life according to "Christian principles". And he thinks that the church of the Reformation will suffer damage for the second time in our time if it does not emphatically bring this "overlooked side of Christianity" to bear. Stöcker wants to make up for what Luther overlooked or left undone. With this, Stöcker proves that he did not understand one of the main truths of the Reformation, the difference between church and state. If he had recognized this difference, he would speak with Luther: "It is to be noted that the two parts of Adam's children, one of which is in God's kingdom under Christ, the other in the world's kingdom under authority, have two different laws; for every kingdom must have its laws and rights, and without law neither kingdom nor government can exist, as daily experience sufficiently shows. The temporal government has laws which extend no further than over body and goods, and what is external on earth." 1)

In order to emphasize that the kingdoms of this world cannot be governed according to "Christian principles", Luther even says of the words Matth. 5, 39: ("But I say to you that you should not resist evil") that they are "none of the business" of unbelievers. 2) Luther, of course, does not mean to deny that every tittle of the divine law, and especially this commandment of non-smoking, binds all men, Christians and unbelievers, before God, but he speaks here of the difference between the spiritual and the temporal government. He wants to inculcate that the world must be governed by other means and according to other principles than the church. Thus he explains himself when he states: "If all the world were Christians, they would all accept these words, and do thus. But now that it is unchristian, the words do not concern it, nor does it do so; but it belongs under the other regime, where unchristians are outwardly compelled and urged to peace and good." Shortly before, Luther declared: "Give the world first full of right Christians, before you rule it Christian and evangelical. But this you will never do. For the world and the multitude is and remains unchristian, even though they are all baptized and called Christians. . . . Therefore it is not expedient in the world that a Christian government should be common over all the world, nor over one country, nor over all the nations.

1) E. A. 22, 82.

2) E. A. 22, 70.

great multitude, for the wicked are always many more than the pious. ... Therefore one must diligently separate these two regiments, and let both remain. One that makes righteous, the other that makes peace outwardly and prevents evil works; neither is sufficient in the world without the other. For without Christ's spiritual government no one can become righteous before God through worldly government. So Christ's rule is not over all men, but is always least among Christians."

F. P.

(Conclusion follows.)

Frank's Theology.

(Continued.)

We continue to visualize Frank's view of the means of grace, not forgetting that in his case it is only ever a primary effect of grace, which makes possible the free, independent decision of man.

Concerning the means of grace of the Word, Frank says: "In accordance with the God-human character of Christ and the destiny of His redeeming body for mankind, the efficacy of the Holy Spirit in communicating Himself to the Redeemer is primarily accomplished through the means of grace of the Word, as the Spirit-filled testimony of Christ. "This word does not coincide with the sacred Scriptures of the New Testament, which can only be spoken of later, following the doctrine of the Church." System of Christian Truth. II. p. 243. "We may, on the other hand, take it for granted that the living testimony of Christ in the church does not possess generative power merely in so far as words of Scripture are repeated in it. Christ dwelling in his church, which he begets of himself, fills it continually with the fullness of salvation, which is first decided in him: wherever out of this possession the testimony of Christ resounds in the church and through the church, there one hears the Spirit-filled word of God, which has the power to call men of God into existence." The means of grace of the word, according to Frank, is the testimony of the church concerning Christ. This testimony, which proceeds from the spiritual possession of the church, in which the knowledge and experience of the believers are expressed, is regarded by him as a Spirit-filled word of God, which as such, even apart from Scripture, with which it does not coincide, possesses the power to call men of God into existence. We recall here what we noted earlier about Frank's theory of Scripture. It is a false coinage if the Word, which comes from within man, even if from the enlightened man, should be

is stamped as "God's word". "The Word of God" can only be called that Word which proceeds from the heart of God, that Word which God has spoken, whether directly or indirectly, through the mouth of the prophets and apostles. In no other sense does Scripture ever speak of God's word. This Word of God, which is really what it is called, is laid down for us now, who have no more direct revelation, in the writings of the prophets and apostles. Apart from the Scriptures there is no word of God for us. When men, Christians, Christian preachers, proclaim God's Word, they do nothing else than present, interpret, and make intelligible the Word of Scripture to those who hear it. And this very Word of God, the Word of Scripture, which also resounds in Christian preaching, is the means of grace and, precisely because God Himself speaks to men here, has the power to awaken a new spiritual life in the hearts of men. The testimony of the congregation, the Christian sermon, is "generative," works a new birth, only because and in so far as it brings the word of Scripture in its right sense and understanding to the understanding and consciousness of men. "So faith cometh by preaching, but preaching by the word of God." Rom. 10, 17. That which works in preaching, works faith, is God's Word alone, which is brought to men by the very preaching. - Frank also comes in this section, pp. 255-258, to speak of the difference between law and gospel. But when he remarks: "Where the word of God is preached as it should be, the preaching of the law is permeated with the breath of the Holy Spirit, which proceeds from the fulfiller of the law," he proves that he has not learned the art of a theologian to distinguish between law and gospel.

Concerning the sacrament of baptism, Frank deduces from all sorts of premises the right and duty of infant baptism, emphasizing that "with that institution word of Christ there is not given a certain mandate concerning infant baptism." P. 274. How? Does not the expression "all nations" Matth. 28, 19. embrace all men, great and small? There can be no question of infant faith in this system. It says, "We know baptism to be the sacrament of regeneration, which, by its very nature, does not require any responsive or cooperative action," but it immediately adds, "that the real and lasting salvation of man is not possible without the personal appropriation and affirmation of that which is appropriated and received. And such appropriation and affirmation, according to the system, is always based on free, self-authorized self-decision. Accordingly, in baptism, the sacrament of regeneration, a divine seed is cast into the child's heart, but from it faith develops only later, when the child is capable of free-will action, and only when the latter has happened is

the baptized person is "truly and permanently" saved. Woe then to the poor children who die in their immaturity!

It is characteristic how Frank treats the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He correctly interprets the words of institution as a whole, "that those who partake of the bread and wine at this act, this memorial meal, actually partake of the body and blood of the Lord, as always. P. 287. However, he does not care so much for this exegesis. He writes: "If we proceed from baptism to the Lord's Supper, as the other means of grace, in which Christ has made an outwardly visible substance the bearer and mediator of his fullness of salvation, we shall have to recognize the similarity of this other sacrament with the former, first of all, in the fact that a real impartation of the gift of salvation, and indeed of this gift of salvation as more uniform in its essence, takes place through it. For if the institution of the Lord's Supper as an act to be continued in the church on the part of the mediator of salvation is at least as certain a historical fact as the institution of baptism, then it follows without further ado, according to the presuppositions established for us, even before the exegetical examination of the words of the testament, that a merely symbolic, figurative or prescriptive act could not have been instituted here, but at any rate, in accordance with the nature of the new covenant, one that is at the same time and first communicative, that conveys salvation. The Church, too, from the beginning, with all its diversity of conception and in spite of its insufficient consciousness of the non-legal character of the new covenant, has held fast to the fact of faith that a real gift of salvation, in whatever modality, is connected with the partaking of the Lord's Supper; and in the Reformed Church, too, this, so to speak, instinctive trait of faith has overcome the initial complete emptying of the sacrament. One must keep this state of affairs present, in order to be rid from the outset of the delusion, as if Christian faith with respect to this sacrament depended only on the possible failure of the exegetical-logical exercises about the words of the testament, specifically about the possible or necessary meaning of the *ἰβρίν*. It would then be necessary that the dogmatic statement of the faith at all should consist in a mosaic of exegetical results obtained about this or that point of doctrine from the code of Scripture." P. 279. 280. further, p. 285: "We have already recalled above, and do not wish to leave it unsaid here, how little, viewed in the historical development of the faith of the Church, it has been conditioned by the most careful grammatical-logical interpretation of the words of institution. Otherwise, the relationship between the faith of the church and theological knowledge would be reversed; and while the simple layman, who would not be able to go through the painstaking investigations on the logical relation between subject and predicate, would lose his faith in the rea-

If the church had to let the virtuosos of grammatical exegesis convey its faith to it, today in this way, tomorrow in that way, it would not be able to be certain of the validity of the means of grace. In contrast to this, then, we say that the believing congregation, which knows about the mediator of salvation in the sense hitherto discussed, can from the outset take no other direction in understanding those words of the Testament than this, that it is a question of a real communication of the good of salvation thus or differently conceived; and a difference of opinion within the Christian congregation can basically only emerge on this common basis."

Frank here bases the Lord's Supper on the certain historical fact of the institution on the part of the mediator of salvation and on the words of institution, as he also points out in *System von der christlichen Gewissheit II.* p. 102, that "only through the efficacious word of the mediator of salvation are the sacraments constituted what they are and what they are for the Christian. But he denies that Christian faith in regard to this sacrament depends on the exact grammatical understanding of the words of Christ. It is sufficient for him if one only holds and understands the words of the testament to mean that a real gift of salvation is connected in some modality with the reception of the Lord's Supper. Thus the sacramental concept seems to him to be perfectly preserved. Even within the Reformed Church, which has overcome the initial complete emptying of the sacrament, i.e. the Zwinglian conception, the general Christian belief in the Lord's Supper has, according to Frank's view, been preserved or reestablished, in that even devout Reformed Christians who are more Calvinistically minded, for example, believe in all seriousness that by partaking of the Lord's Supper they in some way become partakers of the New Testament's gift of salvation, the forgiveness of sins. On this common basis all differences concerning the meaning of the individual words of the testament appear to be quite insignificant, so also the difference whether in the Lord's Supper under bread and wine the true body and the true blood of Christ are distributed, eaten and drunk, or whether bread and wine only signify the body and blood of the Lord, or whether there the believing soul rises into heaven and spiritually enjoys the transfigured body of the Lord.

This is a blatant reversal of the facts. While in general a sacrament may be defined in such a way that God's gift and grace are communicated and guaranteed to us through external, sensual means, in the case of the Lord's Supper the visible elements, bread and wine, "as bearers of the fullness of salvation," may never be separated from the specific heavenly goods for which the Lord has ordained them as media, from the body and blood of the Lord. The founder of Holy Communion, in his foundation, has not only decided on the purpose and use, which is essentially the forgiveness of sins, but also on the essence.

of this sacrament has been pronounced. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the testament of the Lord, is essentially the true body and blood of Christ, under which bread and wine we Christians eat and drink. The body and blood of Christ belong to the substance of the Sacrament. Not the mere partaking of bread and wine, but that we eat and drink Christ's body and blood under the bread and wine, is the proper partaking of the Lord's Supper, and only this partaking of the Lord's Supper is a means of grace, conveys to us a real gift of salvation. The Lord has linked the forgiveness of sins precisely to the consumption of his body and blood. Therefore, whoever separates the body and blood of the Lord from the bread and wine, as the reformers of all tendencies and shades do, takes the core out of the Lord's endowment, destroys the sacrament, the substance of the sacrament, and for him also the blessing of the sacrament is lost. The Reformed have no supper at all, and receive no blessing when they eat bread and drink wine. And when Frank, nevertheless, ascribes to the Reformed the common Christian belief in the Lord's Supper, he thereby proves that in this matter, too, he is no longer on Lutheran ground, that the mystery of the Sacrament is closed to him. By tearing down this main dividing wall between the Lutheran and Reformed churches, he shows himself to be a true man of union.

And what should we say to the fact that Frank ironically describes all careful grammatical discussions about the true meaning of the individual words of the Testament as exegetical-logical exercises, as embarrassing examinations that the simple layman could not go along with? This also condemns Luther's powerful and striking polemic against the Sacramentarians as worthless for the faith of the church, as mere verbal wrangling. We are not intimidated by such sneering remarks. No, the Christian faith in regard to the Sacrament, the whole doctrine of the Lord's Supper, depends solely on the exact interpretation of the words of institution, without which there would be no Lord's Supper at all, especially the words: "This is my body." "This is my blood." The general reflection that the Lord's Supper is instituted by the mediator of salvation, and consequently must communicate a real gift of salvation, does nothing here; it does not meet the actual content of the dogma, the essence of the Lord's Supper. And those words of the Lord's testament are in reality not so disputable as Frank makes them out to be; they belong to the clear, sunlit passages of Scripture. Only the false spirits, whose proud reason would not bow to the simple word of Christ, have darkened them. Whether orthodox theologians have understood it differently, either synecdochically or as referring to bread and wine, this difference does not in the least affect the meaning of that double sentence. The opinion is and always remains the same, namely, that what the Lord gives us in the

Sacrament, and that which we eat and drink is not only bread and wine, but at the same time the body and blood of the Lord, that is, his true body, which was given up to death for us, and his true blood, which was shed for us. And this every simple Christian, every Christian confirmand, can well understand. Even if the specific theological terms and distinctions with which the Lutheran theologians operated in the controversies over the Lord's Supper, and which were prompted by the artifices of their opponents, are not readily comprehensible to a simple-minded layman, one can nevertheless understand what the scholars have agreed among themselves, What the scholars discuss among themselves in scholarly terms can, in essence, also be made clear to unlearned people in their manner and language, and convince every honest Christian who is practiced in reading the Scriptures of the Scriptural basis of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper and of the untenability of the Reformed doctrine. If Frank on this occasion generally remarks that the dogmatic statement of faith does not consist in a mosaic of exegetical results taken from the scriptural codex, that the church does not need to have its faith imparted to it by the virtuosos of exegesis, this is a mockery and derision of Scripture and all true theology. To be sure, all Christian doctrine, all Christian as well as theological knowledge, is derived solely and exclusively from Scripture, which expresses itself clearly and distinctly on all points of doctrine, especially in the so-called *sedibus doctrinae*, and every dogmatic statement that is not derived from Scripture is error and a lie. Scripture-believing exegesis, however, is of service to the church in that it sheds light on the right meaning and understanding of Scripture and exposes and rejects the misinterpretation and misrepresentation of Scripture on the part of the false spirits.

Concerning the effect of the Lord's Supper, Frank, pp. 290, 291, comments as follows: "We understand perfectly from the historical general direction of our older evangelical theology that it laid the emphasis also in this part of the doctrine on that main point of the forgiveness of sins, which was the central point of their faith: but we are at the same time mindful of the fact that in the confession itself (*Sol. Decl.* VII, 63, cf. 81 ff.) the further effect is implied, and is expressly taught by the Lutheran theology of the same time, that in the Lord's Supper the Lord Christ would not only feed and water the soul, but also the body and our flesh and blood with his body and blood, that this feeding and watering is a sure testimony of the high and incomprehensible union between him as the head and his members, so that the immortal body of Christ transforms the mortality and nothingness of our body into its nature, that is, into immortality, life, and glory, and in sum, that we are hereby strengthened in the faith of the resurrection of our flesh to eternal life. *Theol. d. C. F.* 3, 162). Such life awakening in the spiritual sense

We have not only a factually well-founded right to regard the body of Christ which we receive as the fruit of the Lord's Supper in general, but especially in relation to the future bodily resurrection, inasmuch as the body of Christ which we receive is indeed the body which has passed away, but at the same time the body which has passed through death, and which contains within itself the powers of eternal life, but moreover we have a special reason in view of the discourse of Christ, John 6. 6, in which eternal life and resurrection at the last day are ascribed to the manducation of the flesh and blood of Christ." Frank, like most recent theologians, also ascribes to the Lord's Supper an influence on bodily life, a life effect with reference to the future bodily resurrection, by which, therefore, the future resurrection of the flesh is somehow prepared and initiated. This is also a little human feeling. Scripture knows nothing of this. The passage to which Frank refers, John 6, is not about the Lord's Supper at all, but about the spiritual eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ, about faith. Similarly, the Lutheran Confession does not indicate in a single syllable any such effect of the Sacrament. The paragraphs of the Formula of Concord, which Frank cites, speak of the oral or sacramental eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, and this is quite a different thing from what Frank speaks of here. It mocks all criticism how he exploits the confession of the church for himself. Even what he brings from the older theology, that the communion is a testimony of the intimate union between Christ, the head, and his members, a guarantee of our future resurrection and transfiguration, does not in the least imply the assumption of such a "life effect" that would stand in real relation to our future bodily resurrection.

In the doctrine of the church, Frank, too, follows the Romanizing course of modern "confessional" theologians. He defines the church as "the humanity of God" or "as the congregation of believers, which, by virtue of an inner, spiritual and moral necessity, has become and is constantly using the means of grace for the purpose of its intensive and extensive self-perfection. He adds, "According to this, all the institution of the church is founded in the nature of the community which constitutes it." *System of Christian Truth* II. p. 369. Although he declares *primo loco* the church to be the community of believers, yet he includes the institutional, the constant use of the means of grace, in the concept and in the essence of the church. And therefore the essential church is not invisible to him, but visible. "But though the church, according to its nature, consists only of living members of the body of Christ, and never at the same time of dead and only apparent members, yet it would be foolish to call this essential church the invisible church, even in the sense that from this invisible church the visible one now arises. How then should

What is the nature of the Church, which is to use the means of grace for its intensive and extensive growth, to be invisible? (p. 385) This is a great confusion of ideas. The *ecclesia*, of which Scripture says, is an assembly, a union of men, and that the communion of believers, of saints. This exhausts the term. The fact that this congregation has become and is made by the influence of the means of grace, and that by virtue of inner necessity it constantly uses the means of grace, does not, however, make the means of grace and their use the essential part of the church. On the contrary, they appear only as marks, and indeed unmistakable marks, of the church. If all the factors by whose influence the congregation of believers has been and is formed were part of the essence of the church, then God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit would also have to be considered part of the essence of the church. For the church is a creation of God, a work of Christ, a foundation of the Holy Spirit. No, the church consists of persons, of men, not at the same time of things and actions. The church is, in its essence, *communio sanctorum*, nothing more. However, we will give Frank credit for rejecting a conclusion which this false definition of the church strongly suggests and which other theologians of modern times have actually drawn. If one counts the means of grace and the handling of the means of grace as part of the essence of the church, one easily comes to the conclusion that all those persons who somehow, even outwardly, have contact with the means of grace or have once had contact with them, that is, all the baptized, the entire *coetus vocatorum*, even the many who do not believe, are included in the church, and indeed in the *ecclesia proprie dicta*. For common sense is driven, to speak with Frank, "by an instinctive trait," always to imagine under the Church a heap of men, not a complex of things. In the quotation last quoted, Frank rejects the view that the Church consisted at the same time also of the dead and only apparent members. And on p. 389 he remarks: "We reject the consequence that the church in its essence consists of the entirety of the called or also of the baptized, and that the dead members belong to the body of Christ just as much as the living ones."

As to the office of the church, we refer only to a passage in the "System of Truth," in which the so-called doctrine of transmission is criticized. "As certainly as these individuals entrusted with offices have to maintain their office on behalf of the whole, the congregation, even if the commission was bestowed upon them by individuals, apostles or disciples of apostles or presbyters, etc., the idea of a 'transfer' of that which at first competed with the congregation is skewed and misleading for its own sake, because it thereby gains the appearance, for once, as if all individuals had from the outset an equal right to assume it.

The church is not a church, it is a church, but it is a church, and it is a church, and it is a church, and it is a church, and it is a church, and it is a church, and it is a church, and it is a church, and it is a church. But according to the will of the Lord, only those have the right to teach in the church whom he gives to the church for this purpose by virtue of their singular gifts, and whom the church recognizes and acknowledges as qualified for this purpose: and no Christian, by virtue of this 'conferral,' relieves himself of the duty of using for himself the factors of salvation." This statement shows how little Frank is inclined to do justice to the doctrinal position of his opponents, especially of those who stand decidedly on Scripture and confession, or even to refer to it objectively. No one has ever taught about the conferring of the office in the way Frank presents it. We Missourians - for no doubt Frank has the Misfourians in mind here - teach and confess, in harmony with Luther and the old Lutheran theologians, on the basis of the Scriptures, Matth. 18, 17-20. Matth. 28, 18-20. 1 Petr. 2, 9. 10., etc., that Christ has given all church authority to his church, that all believing Christians have the right and duty to preach the gospel, to baptize, to absolve, etc., and that they have the right to do so. Besides this we acknowledge, likewise on the ground of Scripture, Apost. 20, 28. 1 Cor. 12, 28. Eph. 4, 11. that God Himself has ordained the public ministry of preaching, and that according to His intention it is not to be administered by every Christian man, but by persons especially qualified for this purpose, whom the Lord Himself gives to His church. And when we speak of a conferring of the office, we understand it to mean that the congregation, in appointing a preacher, confers upon him the rights and duties of its spiritual priesthood, in so far as and for the purpose that he may publicly, in the name and for the good of all, minister the Word and Sacrament. We have no need to defend this doctrine of ours against Frank's insinuations, since it only combats a self-fabricated bogeyman, and only remark that whoever denies that all ecclesiastical functions are originally rooted in the congregation contradicts the clear scriptural words first quoted.

With his presentation of Christian hope, with his view of the last things, Frank also sails entirely in the waters of the newer theology. He is a chiliast, and his chiliasm is truly not only a species of the finer chiliasm. He distinguishes "a preliminary goal" and "a final goal." "Such a preliminary goal is, for the individual believer, the home of the departed soul with the Lord, mediated by bodily death; for the church of Jesus, an inner-worldly, temporally limited transfiguration and reign, distinct from the final goal, which is preceded by the universal preaching of the gospel, the conversion of the people of Israel, the appearance of the Antichrist, the return of Christ, and the first resurrection.

If both prove to be impossible, be it to insert the Millennium together with the first resurrection into the process of development that lies behind us or into the one that lies like it before us, be it to equate the period of time designated by it, as little as it can be measured literally, with blessed eternity, then it follows from this, The fact that this effect of the idea of redemption and of the work of redemption, however certainly it may be classified with the moments of the end, is, on the other hand, set apart for the definite final goal, the complete and finished realization of God's thought of salvation, and only from this point of view does it open itself to some extent to dogmatic understanding." The provisional goal of God's humanity leads with inner necessity to the final goal, with the attainment of which the previous temporal and material development is concluded. The solution of Satan, which, according to prophecy, follows the expiration of the Millennium, will be combined, as a not accidental fact, with the necessary intensive increase and maturation of sin within that circle of mankind which cannot be inwardly overcome even during that conclusive period of grace. And just as understandable is now the last powerful onslaught of the unbelieving nations against the church of God, but which will soon be put to an end by a miraculous work of power from above. This is immediately followed by the general raising of the dead and the Last Judgment, in which the result of what has come to pass is established and determined by the definitive verdict of the World Saviour, who now shows Himself to be the Judge of the World. The handing over of the dominion of the Son to the Father corresponds to the now accomplished effect of the conclusion of the Council of Salvation realized in him. Henceforth God is All in All," etc. S. 474. 475.

As for the provisional goal of the church, the millennial kingdom with all that supposedly immediately precedes and follows it, Frank, like the other chiliasts, refers especially to such passages of Scripture as Rom. 11, 26. 1 Cor. 15, 25. 2 Thess. 2, 1. ff. Revelation 20, 1-10. Revelation 20:1-10. But here he has made so short an exegetical investigation, and has paid so little attention to the orthodox version in opposition to it, that we have no occasion to repeat and reaffirm what we have elsewhere remarked concerning the right understanding of those scriptural passages. Here, too, for Frank, the decisive authority is not Scripture, but "Christian experience," which demands "a resolution of the present disharmony also in the world of objects," within the present state of the world. System of Christian Certainty. I. p. 204 ff. Of course, in reality it is not Christian experience that makes such a demand. The true Christian consciousness rather resists with all its might the adventurous idea of a "reign of the church under its transfigured head opposite and in the midst of a sinful world." (S. d. W. II. p. 473.) The chiliastic reveries of a transfiguration and reign of the church in this world-time are carnal.

The first disciples of the Lord, before they had received the Spirit of Pentecost, were already stirred from time to time by the desire for carnal domination.

Frank himself admits that the Scriptures put a number of difficulties in the way of his view of the course of the last things, but he easily overcomes these difficulties. He writes: "For us ... already solved, or at least lessened, the main difficulty which tends to be raised against the setting of a provisional goal for the church. This difficulty consists in the fact that in a number of scriptural passages ... the goal is presented as definite, as a uniform final tableau on the horizon of the transition from temporality into eternity, whereupon it seemed as if this were contradicted by the successive displacement of the uniformly connected moments which there fall under one aspect. The invalidity of this instance must, in general, follow from what has been said before; for it is essentially the same shifting together of moments that then diverge in time that we see already in the messianic hope of the Old Testament and then again in the New Testament, e. g., in the connection of the final judgment with the judgment on Jerusalem. He who, for the sake of this uniformity of the final view, denies the possibility of a separation and succession, must take the same offence at the facts of prophecy and fulfillment that already lie behind us in the Old and New Testament. II, pp. 449. 450. Further, "The only seemingly important objection to the reality of a preliminary consummation of the church, as distinguished from the final goal, the reference to the summary of the Lord's return with the general resurrection of the dead, the general and last judgment (comp. Joh. 5, 28. 29 with Matth. 25, 31 ff.) has already been examined by us at the beginning of this section, and recognized in its nullity. Let not this objection be further invoked as an obedience to Scripture-it is, after all, only an obedience to Scripture misinterpreted and misunderstood." (p. 463) What Frank calls the misinterpretation and misunderstanding of Scripture is in truth the right interpretation and right understanding of Scripture. The reference to the fact that the prophecy often combines events that are separated in time into an overall picture is not suitable to somehow invalidate the unambiguous testimony of Scripture to the end of all things. We only remind you of the most famous scriptures, like Joh. 5, 28. 29. 6, 40. 44. Matth. 24, 27-31. 37-39. 25, 31. ff. Apost. 17, 30. 31. 1 Cor. 15, 23-26. 51. 52. 1 Thess. 4, 15-17. 2 Thess. 1, 6-10. 1 Pet. 4, 5. 2 Pet. 3, 7-10. Rev. 20, 11-15. What the Scriptures clearly teach here, viewed in brief on the main moments, is as follows. On the last day, that is, on the last day of the great series of days that make up this age.

(Matth. 24, 36. 42.), the great change of things will happen, which the Christians hope for. Then their suffering will be turned into glory. Until that day the Church is and remains subject to the cross and tribulation. On that day, no sooner, will Christ visibly return in the clouds of heaven. And then shall all that are in the graves hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment. Christ will also raise up all believers on the last day. When the Son of Man comes in his glory, then at the same time he will sit on the throne of his glory to judge all the nations of the earth. He is already prepared to judge the living and the dead. The connection in time, which, according to Scripture, exists between the return of Christ, the general raising of the dead, and the last judgment, is so evident, that all simple-minded Christians, from the beginning, have believed and confessed nothing else in this matter than what the Catechism puts in the words, "From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead." "And at the last day he shall raise me and all that are dead, and shall give me eternal life with all them that believe in Christ." Whoever dreams of a transfiguration and glory and reign of the church before the last day, whoever interposes a long period of time between "the first resurrection" and "the general raising of the dead," which then is no longer a general one, between the return of Christ and the last judgment, gives the lie to Scripture. And so Frank's system, as it began and according to its whole design and development, closes with a strong contradiction and protest against the truth of Scripture.

(Conclusion follows.)

G. St.

The position of Lutheran symbols in relation to Scripture - proof that our confession represents literal inspiration.

(Continued.)

From the days of the apostles until the Reformation, the prevailing doctrine of the Holy Scriptures in Christendom was that of Niceneism, namely, that the Holy Spirit spoke through the prophets and apostles, that the sacred writers were therefore only instruments of the Holy Spirit, and that, consequently, the Scriptures were inerrant, infallible, in all that they reported. The Roman Antichrist in particular had to confirm this fact, even if against his will, when he felt compelled to cite the Holy Scriptures for his usurpations of power in the church and his ungodly teachings, in order to create the appearance,

as if what he taught were well founded in God's word. It is only in more recent times, when the Holy Scriptures have been distributed in millions of copies, and are in innumerable hands and houses, and when Satan can no longer, through his servant the pope at Rome, snatch the book of the Bible from the hands of Christians and consign it to the flames, the devil has sought to destroy the effect of the Word of God by touching the divine dignity of the Holy Scriptures themselves, and, in the name of higher criticism, declaring the Bible to be a human book, which came into being in a purely natural way, and was therefore also afflicted with human defects and infirmities. If, however, there were no statements in the writings of our Reformer and our Confession concerning the origin, authority, divinity, inspiration, and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures, this silence would still be no proof that Luther and our Lutheran Confession are not the same, that Luther and our Lutheran Confession reject the doctrine of Niceneism and of all Christendom concerning the sacred Scriptures, or that they leave it in abeyance; rather, considered in the light of the given circumstances, it would be an *argumentum e silentio* for the fact that in this matter our Church shares the faith of the ancient Church, for *qui tacet, consentire videtur*. Only then does modern theology have a right to claim Luther and the Lutheran confession in the fight against the inspiration of the Word, when it has proved that they have rejected the doctrine of inspiration handed down by the ancient church and replaced it with a more lax view of Scripture. But instead of declaring himself against the doctrine of the church concerning the inspiration of holy Scripture, as, for example, against the authority of the pope, the fathers, the conciliarities, the statutes of men, and pretended direct revelations, or even of passing over the whole question with silence, Luther, as well as our Lutheran Confession, advocates the same with many mighty testimonies. From the Augustana, the Apology, Luther's two catechisms, and the Schmalkaldic Articles, we have already seen that our Lutheran Confession holds that Scripture is inspired by the Holy Spirit, is the inerrant, infallible word of God, and is therefore the divine and pure source of truth and the infallible guide of faith and life. Although the Formula of Concord does not include a special article on sacred Scripture in general and inspiration in particular, it does not lack many powerful testimonies to the authority of sacred Scripture, as well as to its divine origin and infallibility. In particular, it is the Preface to the Book of Concord and the Declaration of Principles of the Formula of Concord, "Of the Summary Concept, Rule, and Guide," etc., which clearly express the doctrine of sacred Scripture.

As the Augustana rejects the cry of the enemies that the Lutherans are bringing up new doctrines and introducing them into the church, so it ver-

214 The Position of Lutheran Symbols on Scripture- a Proof,
the Concordia Formula also resolutely defends itself against this accusation, which has been raised in many quarters. To her, the Church is given everything in Scripture that she has to believe. The Christian Church of the present day has no more and no different doctrines of faith than the Church of the first three centuries. And the striving of theologians, praised in modern theology, to get beyond the sum of Scriptural truths by their own searching and thinking, is not something praiseworthy in the eyes of the Concordia formula, but something thoroughly reprehensible and exceedingly terrible. To them, the calling of the Church is not to develop doctrines, but to be guided by those given in Scripture. Truly new doctrines in the church are nothing but annoying and false doctrines to our confession. By the fact that the Lutheran princes in Naumburg in Thuringia once again unanimously signed the Augustana, they would have "testified and demonstrated to the Emperor and everyone that our mind and opinion would not be to accept, defend or spread any other or new doctrine, but to persevere and remain with the truth once recognized and confessed in Augsburg in 1530 by means of divine granting, of confidence and hope, not only should the opponents of the pure evangelical doctrine have thereby ceased their fictitious blasphemy and slander against us, and other good-hearted people should have been reminded and stimulated by such our repeated and repeated confession to investigate with all the more earnestness the truth of the only saving divine word, to agree and to remain and persevere Christian for the salvation and eternal welfare of their souls without any further disputation and bickering. Accordingly, the purpose of the Concordia Formula was not to "introduce, embellish, confirm, or deviate in the least from some new, false, or erroneous doctrine" from the Augsburg Confession of 1530, but rather to give the "further execution" reserved and commanded in Naumburg. S. 11. 12. On pp. 20 and 21 it is said: "For we, again finally and at last to repeat, by this Concordia work nothing new to make, nor of the divine truth once known and known by our godly forefathers and us, as founded in prophetic and apostolic Scripture and delivered in three Symbolis, also of the Augsburg Confession Anno 1530 Emperor Carolo the Fifth highly mild mem, the Apologia made thereupon, in the Schmalkaldic Articles and the large and small Catechism of the highly enlightened man Doctor Luther, is further understood, not to deviate at all, neither in rebus nor phrasibus, but rather, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, to persevere and remain unanimously in it, and also to regulate all religious disputes and their declarations according to it." Nothing is therefore more wrong than

to speak of a doctrinal development or change in the Formula of Concord. From a careful consideration and comparison of the Formula of Concord with the other confessional writings, the reader will rather find that "what was known of each article in the summary concept of our religion and faith at the beginning, subsequently explained at different times, and repeated by us in this writing, is by no means contrary to one another, but the simple, unchanging truth, We therefore do not fall from one doctrine to another, as our opponents falsely claim, but desire to be found in the Augsburg Confession once delivered, and in the unanimous, Christian understanding of it, and to persevere in it by God's grace steadfastly and continually against all falsifications that have come in. 573, 20. Just at the end, so that everyone could convince himself that especially in the much disputed doctrine of Christ's person and majesty "the book reported does not introduce new, strange, self-imagined, unheard paradoxes and speeches into the church of God," the *Catalogus Testimoniorum* with fine testimonies of Scripture and the church was added to the Concordia formula. 737. 737. In the preface to the same it is said p. 733: "Since, especially in the article on the person of Christ, some have alleged with unreason that in the book of Concordia the *phrasibus* and *modis loquendi*, that is, the manner and way of speaking of the ancient pure churches and fathers, have been departed from, and in their place new, strange, self-conceived, unused, and unheard-of *phrasibus* and *modis loquendi*, and the testimonies of the old churches and fathers, on which this book is based, would be a bit too long to include, which afterwards have been handed over to several princes and rulers, distinguished with diligence: For the Christian reader's true and thorough report, a good number of these have been printed at the end of this book on various points, in which he can see and immediately find that in this book there is nothing new, neither in *rebus* nor *phrasibus*, that is, neither in doctrine nor in the way of speaking, but that this mystery is taught and spoken of in the same way as the holy Scriptures first and then the ancient pure church." The pious Lutheran princes and theologians were animated and controlled not by a desire for development and innovation, but only by the one desire to bring the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, *sincera doctrina verbi Dei*, to clear expression and practical validity. This was their wish and prayer "that our churches and schools may be preserved in the teaching of God's Word, also in lovely, Christian unity, and that, as in Luther's lifetime, they may be established and propagated Christianly and well according to the instruction of God's Word, and that especially the youth, raised up for church service and holy ministry, may be instructed in such with faithfulness and diligence, so that also among our descendants the

216 The Position of Lutheran Symbols on Scripture - Evidence,
 The Concordia Formula only confesses the ecumenical and specific Lutheran symbols because it has found in them the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, or because it has found in them the specific Lutheran symbols the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, or because it has found in them the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. 5:18 The Concordia Formula professes the ecumenical and specifically Lutheran symbols only because it has found in them the teaching of Holy Scripture, or as it says, for example, especially of Luther's catechisms: "As to the lay Bible, in which is comprehended all that is widely dealt with in Holy Scripture, and is necessary for a Christian man to know for his salvation." 518, 5. See also 568, 1. 2.

According to the Concordia formula, every question in the church must be explained, expounded, and decided from the holy Scriptures. Luther explained and purified the noblest articles of faith "again from God's Word. 565:1 In his writings against the papacy he argued "from God's word. 570, 9. The confessions have such great value "because they are taken from God's word. 571:10 The ecumenical symbols contain the true Christian doctrine "drawn together from God's word. 569:4 And the Lutherans at Augsburg had the Augustana "drawn up as a Christian confession from the word of God," 565:3, "drawn together from and according to the word of God." 569, 5. The authors of the Formula of Concord also profess the same "not because it was drawn up by our theologians, but because it is taken from God's Word and is firmly and well founded in it. 569, 5. Further, as to the Apology, it is and ought to be nothing else than the proof that the doctrines of the Augustana are taken from Scripture. 570, 6. In the Schmalkaldic Articles only some of the doctrines of Augustana are "further explained from God's Word." In the two Catechisms, finally, "the Christian doctrine is comprehended from God's Word in the most correct and simple way for the simple laymen. 570:8 And as for the Formula of Concord, it too is "drawn together from God's Word." 568, 1. In it, the articles that became controversial after Luther's death are explained "from God's word. 567, 10. From the beginning .From the beginning, it was clear to the pious theologians of the Concordia Formula "that the religious disputes, which break out daily, could better not be met, because the divisions that have arisen would be thoroughly and actually explained from God's Word, and false doctrine would be exposed and rejected, But the divine truth would be confessed, so that the mouths of the adversaries would be shut with constant reason, and the right explanation and instruction would be given to the simple and pious hearts, how they might be able to handle themselves in such disputes, and how they might be preserved from false teaching in the future by the grace of God. (8) Accordingly, the way which these theologians took was that they "by detailed writings from God's Word

that our confession represents literal inspiration. 217

The Concordia formula expresses its principle for the judgment of all doctrines in the words: "The articles of faith are to be judged solely from God's Word. (8) The Concordia Formula expresses its principle for the judgment of all doctrines in the words: "The articles of faith are to be judged from God's Word alone. 589, 8. It wants to "report from God's word, e verbo Dei docere," 600, 48, and declare "by virtue of God's word." 611, 8. Without Scriptural authority it does not want to make any theological statement. It is a matter of nothing but *mysteria fidei*, which no reason knows and knows, and which are taught and believed from Scripture revelation alone, *ex scripturae patefactione*. 575, 8. By reflection independent of Scripture, the Concordia formula has not come to any doctrinal statement in any article of faith. Especially concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, it is said in 544, 42: "*Hoc enim mysterium in solo Dei verbo revelatur et sola fide comprehenditur.*" The much disputed doctrine of the divine majesty communicated to the human nature of Christ did not come about through the development of doctrine, nor was it taken from reason, but "from the good ground of holy Scripture," 687, 61, and the Concordia formula only took up that which the old orthodox Church had already "explained from Scripture" in this matter, 688, 64. 688, 64. Only what they "know from the revelation of holy Scripture" do the theologians of the Formula of Concord believe and confess of the communicated divine majesty of Christ. 736 That the right understanding of a doctrine of faith must be explained only on the basis of Scripture, and must be led from and after the example of divine truth, is especially emphasized in the exposition of the doctrine of the election of grace. 704:2, 712:36: Such as have fallen into false doctrines must therefore be taught and reprov'd "from the word of God. 17.

As, therefore, every doctrine which claims to be justified in the church, must be taken from God's word, so, according to the Concordia formula, it must also be well founded in divine Scripture, *solidis scripturae testimoniis suffulta*, 4, *verbo Dei fundata*, 18, *e verbo Dei exstructa*. 19. 21. "God's word-it is said, page 571, 13-we lay to rest as eternal truth, *verbum Dei tamquam immotam veritatem pro fundamento ponimus.*" 581, 13. This is precisely the purpose of the Concordia formula, to guard the Christian confession "against all kinds of dangerous misunderstanding with God's word, *contra corruptelas ac depravationes sacrarum literarum testimoniis munire et confirmare.*" (10) Concerning the doctrine of election by grace, Concordia 704:2 emphasizes: "Right understanding must be declared on the basis of Scripture." Concerning the person of Christ, it only repeats what the ancient orthodox Church had taught "on the basis of the Scriptures.

has taught. This is enough for her, if she can proclaim of her doctrine of original sin: "The Scriptures bear mighty witness," 582:43, or: "This doctrine is founded in the Word of God," 595:28. The princes expressly declare that "in the transaction of the Lord's Supper, Christians are to be pointed to no other but this one ground and foundation, namely, to the word of the foundation of Christ's testament, which is almighty and true, and therefore able to procure, 14. 15. "Not by reason, but by the word of the foundation of Christ's will, which is almighty and true, and therefore able to provide what he hath ordained and promised in his word; and remaining unchallenged on this ground, not disputing on other grounds, but persevering with simple faith in the simple words of Christ, which is most certain, and edifying also in the common layman, who cannot take hold of this disputation. 14. 15. Accordingly, not with reason, but "with Christ's words," even the faithful Lutherans have urged their opponents to confess that the body of Christ is present in the Lord's Supper. (647:5) Symbols may confess and approve a doctrine, but only Scripture can establish it. (4) The confession itself is Christian only because it is "founded on the testimony of the unchangeable truth of the divine word. 6.

Just as everything in theology must be taken from Scripture and founded in Scripture, so also the faith and life of Christians must be in accordance with Holy Scripture. The Lutheran princes, therefore, have had their churches "reformed Christianly according to the word of God. 565, 3. And what was important to them in a confession *imprimis* was the answer to the question whether the confession was also according to Scripture. It is said of the Lutheran princes that "after they had found the explanation of the incumbent divisions to be first of all according to the word of God and then also according to and conformable to the Augsburg Confession ... with a pleased mind and heartfelt thanksgiving to God Almighty, they voluntarily and with well-considered courage accepted, approved and signed this Book of Concord for the right Christian understanding of the Augsburg Confession and publicly testified to it with heart, mouth and hand". This was also the reason why the Lutherans held so firmly to Luther's teaching, especially concerning the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ, because it was according to the word of God. 675, 4. And as for the Formula of Concord itself, it did not intend to restore the lost doctrinal unity in any other way than "according to the instruction of God's word, *secundum regulam verbi Dei*. 5 The Concordia Formula expresses this right on its title page. This is to be established from the beginning, that all articles are to be declared Christian "according to the instruction of God's word, *secundum verbi Dei praescriptum*," 515, or as the title-page to the *Solida Declaratio* reads 563: "According to the instruction of God's word, *ad normam et analogiam verbi Dei*." In the summary term, reason, rule, and guide, the-

The same emphasizes that "all doctrine is to be judged according to God's Word, and the errors that have arisen are to be explained and decided in a Christian manner. The Concordia formula also endeavors to follow the Scriptures as far as the individual words and phrases are concerned. 584, 50. It rejects propositions that are not in accord with sound doctrine and the Word. 624, 1. 2. On the other hand, it rejects such ways of speaking as are in accord with Scripture, as that: "627, 14. In the *Catalogus Testimoniorum*, the Concordia Formula proves that it has not departed from Scripture and the ancient Church, either in *rebus* or in *phrasibus*. 733. 733 It also demands that theological concepts, such as that of original sin, be determined only from Scripture, and not from philosophy. 586:60 The Concordia formula is intended only to help the attentive reader to discern "what, in virtue of God's word, the prophets' and apostles' writings, he should hold to be right and true and accept, and what he should reject as false and wrong, flee and avoid. 572, 16. In the individual articles it expresses this again and again, that every doctrine is to be so conducted as to be according to the Scriptures. Thus the article on original sin seeks only to "set forth the pure doctrine by virtue of God's word of this article, *sincera doctrina de hoc articulo, cum immota regula verbi divini congruens*," 523, 2, "to explain the discord in this doctrine Christianly and according to God's word, and to lead the pure doctrine of original sin rightly from and according to God's word." 574, 3. 4. The third article intends to show what the Concordia formula "unanimously confesses in our churches by the word of God and according to the content of the Augsburg Confession, that we poor sinners are justified and saved before God through faith in Christ alone. 527:1 The Lord's Supper is also taught "by the word of his testament," and that Christ's body and blood are partaken of with the bread and wine, we believe "by the simple word of Christ's testament. 544, 42. Concerning the impartation of the divine attributes and the person of Christ, the eighth article declares, "Whereof we have clear, certain testimony in the Scriptures in this case, which we ought to believe unafraid, and in no way to dispute against it, as if human nature in Christ could not be capable of it." 685, 53, and 687, 60. That Christ, according to his human nature, received these things, and that these things were given and communicated to the assumed human nature in Christ, we ought and must believe according to the Scriptures." Thus the Concordia formula knows only One guiding star of divine truth, the Scriptures. It does not want to shine ahead of Scripture with reason, but to be enlightened and guided by Scripture. All its statements are to be made only according to and by virtue of Scripture. In theology it lets everything be determined solely by Scripture, and nothing, nothing at all by man. And what is true of Christian faith is also true of conduct. Christians are to

"Learn to serve God, not according to their own thoughts, but according to His written law and word, which is a certain rule and guideline of a godly life and walk, according to the eternal and unchanging will of God". 640, 3.

Now if, according to the Formula of Concord, only that doctrine is right which is according to Scripture, then every doctrine is also wrong which is contrary to Scripture. For this very reason false doctrine is so exceedingly terrible to her, because it is contrary to the testimony of Scripture, 684:50, and a departure from the pure doctrine of the gospel. 698, 5. That which is not taught in the theology of Scripture, according to the Formula of Concord, is to be rejected and condemned by every Christian as false doctrine. In the preface to the Book of Concord the princes say page 16: "Concerning the condemnations, suspension and condemnation of false, impure doctrine, especially in the article of the Lord's Supper, ... our will and opinion is, that thereby the false and seducing doctrines, and of the same stiff-necked teachers and blasphemers, are actually rejected, because the same are contrary to the expressed Word of God, and cannot stand beside it." The condemnation formula in the individual articles then corresponds to this. Thus the antithesis in the doctrine of original sin is thus introduced: "Accordingly we reject and condemn all subsequent error as contrary to the direction of God's word." 524, 7. See also 578, 25. In the article of the person of Christ, the formula of condemnation is thus: "Accordingly, we reject and condemn as contrary to God's word, and to our simple Christian faith, all subsequent erroneous articles." 548, 19. See 695, 88. In the Article of the Lord's Supper, the condemnation reads, "Accordingly, with heart and mouth, we reject and condemn as false, erroneous, and seductive, all error, which is intemperate, contrary, and opposed to this doctrine, which is above stated, and founded in God's Word." 670, 107. Finally, the Concordia Formula declares, concerning the enthusiasts, "that we have neither part nor common with the same heresies, be they much or little, but condemn and condemn them all at once as unjust and heretical, contrary to the holy prophets and apostles' writings, and also contrary to our Christian Augsburg Confession, which is well founded in God's Word. 726, 8. Thus our Confession condemns all doctrine which is not in harmony with Scripture. And this is not something new and unheard of in the church. The old and approved conciliar doctrines have done the same. To this also the Formula of Concord refers, when it writes in 688, 62, concerning the heresies concerning the person of Christ: "For such and such like erroneous doctrines are in the old approved conciliis, on the ground of Scripture, justly rejected and condemned." See also 572, 17.

Scripture is the sole authority in the Church according to the Formula of Concord. In all struggles and religious disputes it is the judge,

Arbiter. It is the touchstone, rule, and guide by which everything in theology must be measured and judged. It is the *unica regula, norma, fundamentum, lydius lapis* of all doctrines and teachers in the church. According to Scripture every church must be judged, every teacher judged, every doctrine examined, every controversy decided. In the theological field our confession knows no duonomy or polynomy, but only the mononomy of Scripture. Neither the testimony of the church in its confessions, hymnals, catechisms, and church teachers, nor reason, whether Christian or pagan, stands in the same line with Scripture. Scripture stands in the same relationship to the faith of man as God stands to all creatures. In theology, our confession recognizes nothing but Scriptural absolutism. This very fact, that Scripture is the sole authority, the monarch, in theology and the church, places the Formula of Concord as a declaration of principles, as the first fundamental paragraph, at the head of its execution. The section "Of the summary concept, rule, and guide," etc., begins the Formula of Concord p. 517, 1 thus: "We believe, teach, and confess that the only rule and guide, according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged and evaluated, are the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as it is written: Thy word is the lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path, Psalm 119. 119; and St. Paul, If an angel come down from heaven, and preach otherwise, let him be accursed, Gal. 1." Furthermore, page 518, 7 emphasizes: "In this way the difference between the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and all other writings is preserved, and the holy Scriptures alone remain the only judge, rule, and guide, according to which, as the only test, all doctrines should and must be recognized and judged, whether they be good or evil, right or wrong." The *Solida Declaratio* professes the Scriptures "as the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments, as the pure and pure fountain of Israel, which alone is the only true guide by which all teachers and doctrines are to be judged and judged". 568, 3.

This divine authority and majesty is shared by Scripture and no other human writing. Scripture stands absolutely at the head of theology, which can in no way be said of any other scripture. The doctrines of faith cannot be traced to a rock lower than the sacred Scriptures. Scripture is the basic axiom for theological truths. All other writings, if they are otherwise pure writings, bear witness only to what the church has found in sacred Scripture and to what it thus professes. The writings of the great church teachers, as well as the confessional writings of the church, and not only the particular confessions of the Lutheran church, but also the ecumenical symbols, are derived from sacred Scripture.

The Word of God is in no way secondary, but rather subordinate, as are all creatures to the almighty Creator. Like Luther, the Formula of Concord also wants this difference to be explicitly stated and preserved, "that God's Word alone should be and remain the only guide and rule of all doctrine, to which no man's writings should be considered equal, but to which everything should be subordinated. 571:9, and 517:2: "Other writings, however, of the old or new teachers, as they have names, are not to be held equal to the holy Scriptures, but are all to be subjected to them, and not to be accepted otherwise or further than as witnesses, in what form after the apostles' time, and in what places, such doctrine of the prophets and apostles has been received."

This is not contradicted when the princes declare in their preface on page 21 that they do not deviate from the symbols of the Lutheran church "either in rebus or in phrasibus, but rather, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, want to remain unanimously in them and regulate all religious disputes and explanations according to them. Nor is this contradicted by the statement of the theologians on the Symbols, page 571, 10: "What has hitherto been said of the Summa of our Christian doctrine is meant only to the effect that there is a unanimous, certain, general form of doctrine, to which our evangelical churches all and in common profess, from and according to which, because it is taken from God's Word, all other writings, as far as they are to be tried and accepted, are to be judged and regulated." Further, it is not in conflict with the sole authority of Scripture, when our theologians declare that they wish to settle the controversy "according to the instruction of our Christian faith, *juxta analogiam fidei nostrae christianae*," 545, 4, or "according to the instruction of God's word and the summary content of our Christian doctrine, *ad normam et analogiam verbi Dei et compendiarium christianae nostrae doctrinae formulam et rationem*." 563. The confession, the summary content of Christian doctrine, and the *analogia fidei* are not, according to the Concordia formula, things apart from, apart from, and independent of Scripture, according to which Scripture must be interpreted and, if necessary, corrected, but are given in Scripture and depend on Scripture. That it does not think of setting aside the confession of Scripture, or even of pushing it into the place of Scripture, is clearly attested by the Formula of Concord itself. It writes on page 518, 8: "The other Symbols, however, and the writings they refer to are not judges like the holy Scriptures, but only testimonies and declarations of faith, as the holy Scriptures were at all times understood and interpreted in disputed articles in the Churches of God by those who were then living, and their repugnant doctrine rejected and condemned." The Confession is not *norma normans* to the Formula of Concord, but only *norma normata*, and that, as it says itself, "because it is taken from God's word." 571, 10.

Scripture is to be heard as the judge "imprimis, first of all," and only then, "deinde," the confession of the church as a testimony and declaration of faith. The Augustana is a confession "by which true Christians of this time are to be found next to God's Word. In its doctrinal statements, the Formula of Concord itself accordingly takes Scripture as its basis, and cites the symbols as witnesses. Ut enim - it says in 571, 13 - verbum Dei tamquam immotam veritatem pro fundamento ponimus: ita illa scripta tamquam veritatis testes in medium recte producimus⁸." The authority of the confession is therefore in every respect subordinate to that of sacred Scripture. This is all the more true of the sayings of the ancient Doctors of the Church. Their testimony has meaning only when it is taken from Scripture. 685, 51. In the "Resolution" to the "Catalogus Testimoniorum" it says on page 759: "These testimonies of the ancient church teachers, Christian reader, are not to be put to the opinion that our Christian faith is founded on the reputation of men. For the true saving faith is not to be founded on any old or new church teacher, but unitedly and solely on God's word, as comprehended in the writings of the holy prophets and apostles, as undoubted witnesses of divine truth."

Thus, for the Concordia formula, Scripture alone is the principle of theology. Their way of theologizing corresponds to this. For although it treats each article thoroughly, it knows no new, different way of teaching the old truth than that of the other symbols. According to modern theology, indeed, the theologian is to recognize scientifically in dialectical reasoning that which the layman is simply to believe upon the word of Scripture and the church. Instead of being content with the *8n*, the facts which Scripture presents, the modern theologian seeks philosophically to grasp the rational of the facts of faith, and to derive the propositions of faith as *denknothwendig* from a general supersentence. This rationalistic way of theologizing, however, which abhors the Scriptural principle, is completely foreign to the Concordia formula. Its theological method is no different from that of the Small Catechism. Here as there it says: As it is written, 523, 2, *sicut scriptum est enim*, 524, 3, as Christ speaks, 540, 15, St. Paul says, 546, 14, as the apostle testifies, 547, 18. Concerning the doctrine of the person of Christ, it is said, 685, 53: "But the best, most certain, and surest way in this controversy is this, namely, what Christ received according to his assumed human nature by personal union, glorification, or exaltation, and what his assumed human nature is capable of above the natural attributes without the same subtraction, that no one can know this better or more thoroughly than the Lord Christ himself; but he himself has, as much as we need to know of it in this life, in his word."

revealed. What we have clear and certain evidence of in the Scriptures in this case, we are to believe in simplicity, and in no way argue against it, as if human nature in Christ could not be capable of it. Thus the Concordia formula knows no other method than the citation of scriptural passages, no other theological proof than scriptural proof. In the "Resolution" to the Catalogus, page 760, it says: "For this reason, the book of Concordia points only to the Holy Scriptures and to the simple Catechism. For he that keepeth himself to the same simplicity with a right simple faith, keepeth his soul and conscience for good, as that which is built upon a firm and immovable rock. Matt. 7 and 17, Gal. 1, Psalm 119." Whoever, therefore, has traced a doctrinal statement back to Scripture, has, according to the Concordia formula, proved the theological, and indeed the only, criterion of truth to be present in it.

Our confession never goes beyond the Scriptures. Where Scripture speaks, it also speaks, and where it is silent, the Formula of Concord is also silent. Even where Scripture presents us with only fragments of divine truths, does not elucidate everything, and leaves many things unexplained, the Formula of Concord makes no attempt to continue the thread with its own thinking, to replace the missing links in the line of thought, and thus to clear up the darkness. It is true that our confession knows very well that there are many unsolvable difficulties in Scripture. But in defiance of reason, it remains with the statements of Scripture and makes no attempt whatsoever to reach beyond them and to unite the apparently contradictory statements in a higher synthesis. Page 696, 96 the Concordia formula says: "These errors and all that are contrary to the above doctrine, we reject and condemn as contrary to the pure Word of God, the holy prophets and apostles' writings, and our Christian faith and confession, and admonish all Christians, because Christ is called a mystery in the holy Scriptures, about which all heretics bash their heads, that they not foolishly ponder with their reason in such mysteries, but with the dear apostles simple believe, shutting the eyes of reason, and taking their minds captive to the obedience of Christ, and comforting themselves with it, and so rejoicing without ceasing that our flesh and blood in Christ are set so high at the right hand of the majesty and almighty power of God. Thus we shall certainly find constant comfort in all adversity, and be well preserved from harmful error." Concerning the doctrine of the descent into hell, the Concordia Formula asserts the Scriptural principle in the same way when it says: "Then it is enough that we know that Christ has gone to hell, destroyed hell for all believers, and redeemed them from the power of death, the devil, and the eternal damnation of the infernal pit. But how this

We are not to be concerned with high and pointed thoughts (for this article, just as little as the preceding one, how Christ is seated at the right hand of the almighty power and majesty of God, can be comprehended with reason and five senses, but only wants to be believed and held to the word), but rather save until the other world, where not only this piece, but also other things are revealed to us, which we here simply believe, and cannot comprehend with our blind reason. 551,4. 696, 2. It is especially evident in the article on the election of grace how anxious the Formula of Concord is not to go beyond the Scriptures in any word, whether it be to break off or to add something to them, an article in which human reason feels so great an attraction to spin the thread a little further where the Scriptures drop it, or to cut it off a little shorter, so that either synergism or Calvinism becomes the solution. When the Concordia formula has arrived at the boundary posts of our knowledge in divine things set by Scripture, it exclaims, "*Hucusque sacra scriptura in revelando divinae praedestinationis mysterio progreditur.*" 713, 43. Explicitly the Concordia 556, 13 declares, "And so far, hucusque, let a Christian embrace the article of the eternal election of God, as revealed in the word of God." 554, 6. Further, 715, 52: "But a distinction must be kept with special diligence between that which is expressly revealed of it in God's Word, and that which is not revealed. For over and above that which has hitherto been spoken of, and that which has been revealed in Christ, God has still revealed much of this mystery. God has kept much of this mystery secret and hidden, and has reserved it for his wisdom and knowledge alone, which we are not to inquire into, nor are we to follow, conclude, or ponder our thoughts in this matter, but are to keep to the revealed word. Which reminder is most necessary. For our folly is always more concerned with this than with that which God has revealed to us in his word, because we cannot make it up, which we are not commanded to do." 715:52, 53 - "But because God hath reserved this mystery to his wisdom, and hath not revealed it unto us in his word, much less commanded us to search it out in our thoughts, but hath earnestly forbidden us to do so, Romans 11, we ought not to follow, conclude, or ponder it with our thoughts, but to keep his revealed word, whereupon he instructs us." 716, 55. See also 717, 64. F. B.

(Conclusion follows.)

Modern theologians' attacks on God's Word.

6. The dawn of faith.

The approaching jubilee celebration of the Reformation in the year 1,817 was to be the occasion for the German Church to once again emanate a dawn. The Rationalist Bible, published in 1815 in Altona and privileged by the church regime for popular and school use, whose reinterpretations were printed under each verse in the same letters as the text, so that inexperienced readers could not distinguish between text and explanation, called God's warrior to the battlefield. It was the Archidiaconus Claus Harms in Kiel, a man who had once earned his living as a dustman, and was now a devout preacher, superior also in learning to all his opponents. On July 4, 1817, he had appealed to the government to confiscate the Altona Bible, but had received no answer. The approaching jubilee celebration made him remember that "Luther's theses, these diapers of the Lutheran Church, had become so entirely unknown." (Harms: Selbstbiogr., p. 114.) This might have inspired him to publish 95 theses on the distress of the church of his time, although he had to say afterwards: "I am not able to state when and from where the idea of writing theses came to me. (p. 113.) In the morning, before he sent the concept to the printer, he stood before God again with it, and examined himself whether he sought anything but God's honor and the church's best. That is why he speaks in the preface of a "presented Lord's Prayer," at which the world mocked. The Spirit of the Lord urged him to set to work with the joy of faith. His theses repeated protest and reform against the pope of reason, who "now formed the doctrine in such a way that, on the whole, men already fit into it". We will take out a few key words: "With the idea of a progressive reformation, one reforms Lutheranism into paganism and Christianity out of the world. - This operation, in consequence of which God has been lowered from the judgment seat and each man has raised his own conscience, has taken place while there was no power in our church. - According to the old faith, God created men; according to the new faith, man creates God, and when he has finished him, he says, Hoja! Is. 44:12-20 - It (the religion of reason) draws the sacredness of faith into the circle of common experience, and says, like Muhammad, How should God have a son? for he has no wife! - By the way, it has the appearance as if all heresies were let loose again at once: conscientists and naturalists, Socinians and Sabellians, Pelagians, Synergists, Cryptocalvinists, Anabaptists, Syn-

cretists, interimists, and so on. - We have a fixed word of the Bible, to which we pay attention, 2 Petr. I, 19.; and that no one by force twists it for us like a weathercock, is taken care of by our symbolic books. - Christians are to be taught not to put blind trust in preachers, but to watch and search the Scriptures themselves, as the Bereans did, Acts 17:11. 17, 11, whether it is so. - Christians are to be taught that they have the right not to suffer unchristian and unLutheran things in the pulpits as well as in church and school books. - Reason is running riot in the Lutheran church; it tears Christ from the altar, throws God's word from the pulpit, throws dung into the baptismal water, mixes all kinds of people at the confessional, wipes away the address of the confessional, hisses the priests out and all the people after them, and has done so for a long time. They are not yet bound? That is supposed to be a true Lutheran and not a Charlstadian one! - It would be desirable that in various Lutheran countries they would also have the text for a sermon: Luc. 15:18: I will make myself known and go to my father. - To say that one is advanced in enlightenment is surely not justified by the present darkness in true Christianity? Many thousands can declare, as once the disciples of John did, Acts 19:2. 19:2: "Neither have we ever heard whether there is a Holy Spirit. (Note from the Altona Bible: Holy Spirit == complete instruction in Christianity.) - As a poor maid, one would now like to make the Lutheran Church rich by a copulation. Do not perform the act over Luther's bones! It will come to life and then - woe to you! - Matt. 25:9: Not so, lest there be a breach between us and you. But go ye to the merchants. - Just as reason prevented the Reformers from building up their church and bringing it to unity, so the admission of reason into the Lutheran church would only cause confusion and destruction in it. - The religious element in man, if it does not lie bound to a divine revelation, is a fearful element." - In some theses the ungodliness of the Altona Bible Declaration is exposed. In two theses it is also testified that it was "a mistake made in haste and disorder" in the Lutheran Church, that the sovereign had been made the regional bishop, also that it was altogether contrary to its principles, that the congregations were deprived of the right to vote.

"Even the Bible comes again!" said a Bavarian, when in a society the talk was of inventions of modern times. (Corr. Bl. 1828, p. 217.) This was the impression which Harms' theses produced in Christendom, when they flew through the countries like a word un mutilated in his time. Joy arose among the seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal. Anger was kindled among the wicked, from a veil-maker to the foolish street urchins,

who sang in the streets of Kiel to the people who attended Harms' church: "Roses strewn on the road and Harms forgotten!" In two years there appeared about two hundred writings for and against. "A little cloud that at once flung down lightning upon the astonished multitude!" exclaimed an opponent. "A ray of banishment and a sign of impotence!" sneered Father Funk, the editor of the Altona Bible; but the Danish king, on November 29, 1817, ordered that all unsold copies of that Bible should be bought up on the royal account, and that new editions should not be allowed. The rationalist clergy met to demand punishment from the government for Harms, because they thought themselves offended by his testimonies; but they could not agree. "A demon has escaped from the realm of hell," sang one schoolmaster in a published diatribe. Students insulted Father Harms in the street. A letter to him was "dressirt" instead of to the Archidiaconus to _the Archi- diabolus (arch-devil), Harms the Pabst of Kiel. Dr. Johann Sr. preached in Harms' church on the 1st of Advent, and wanted to help reason against him to its feet, but in vain. Dying, Prof. Kleuker still cried out in Kiel at that time: "The rationalists will see that they are wrong." (Kzt. 1829, p. 363.) Consistorialrath Boysen scolded Harms in a counter-writing a stupid boy, and so blasphemies swarmed everywhere, such as: "the literalist without all learned learning; the darkling who clings to the letter and recalls the dark faith of former centuries; a blind tool of the obscurants and Jesuits, who has not seen the light (that is, the learning of the times), who blasphemes the noblest gift of God, reason; the blind guardian of Zion, dictator of the faith, heresy-maker, and even the worst heretic." A friend commented, "If every revilement and insult had become a wound on him, no warrior bore so many scars as he." (Ibid., p. 459.) But Harms sneered, "Is the little mouse so tremendously wicked? I mean reason." (Briefe zu einer näheren Verständigg. 1818, p. 87.) "He that believeth, believeth not. Isa. 28, 16.... I increase day by day in that strength which will soon make me say of the fiercest sting, it hurts not." (Ibid., p. 5 f.) He was divinely sure of his cause, and therefore could oppose the learned with the testimony, "I am more learned than all my teachers; for the testimonies of God are my speech. If these are my words, who will speak a word against them? If we accept the testimony of men, says John, the testimony of God is greater." (p. 12 f.) "Do you want learning?" he asked his enemies in a writing of 1819. "I know to meet yours every day. ... How should the little Archidiaconus be able to do anything against the high clergy of the country, whom you oppose to him, and stand behind them? So you do in your writings. How can the unlearned Archidiaconus do anything against all the high doctors?"

and professors, the servants of the word against the masters of the word, who are listed by you as rationalists according to the alphabet? If I were in your hands, you would send me back to the mill, as you have printed. . . . Will you but admit that against Cl. Harms nothing can be done." (That there is nothing with the religion of reason. 1819, p. 117 f.) He did not want to go in Saul's armor at all, but rather to say with David: "After all, when I was with my former army, I slew lions and bears without this device; why then should I not now go to the brook of living water, to the Bible, and seek for some smooth stones to hurl at the Philistines, who scoff at the testimony of the living God, and all the churches see that the Lord does not help by sword or spear? As that horse, Revelation 9, so is the power of these men in their mouth, out of which proceedeth fire, and smoke, and brimstone, by which the third part of men are slain. What matter, I rather stuff them with God's word than with man's?" (Letters 1818, p. 53.) In the struggle he grew in knowledge and strength, so that he held up Luther's words to the forgers, who did not want to see the queen of reason so rudely overthrown: "Our Lord must first let a good downpour come with a thunder, then let it rain with a fine gradualness; then it will wet through. But I would that I could speak loud thunderbolts against the papacy, and that every word were a thunderbolt." Thus his theses were to become to the rationalists like ploughshares on their backs, and like the tines of a harrow in their flesh. (P. 22.) "Let them!" he wrote, "those of the tollhouse and of the fish nets, those of the sheep and cows (Amos), they have preached the word, and have made room for it before all the height that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God. 2 Cor. 10, 5. For preaching must be done anew, and not treatises must be read in the academy for the academy, as is now so often done in the pulpits. Preaching must be done, and not roles must be played, which may be rehearsed before the mirror. . . . Science and art may serve as the Gibeonites, Jos. 9, who are supposed to come from afar, that they hew wood and carry water to the house of God; of course, the healthier the wood and the purer the water, the more estimable their service; but they must not come to pulpit and altar. ... It will yet come to pass, if science does not soon convert itself and be baptized, that in Germany, as has already happened in England, faith will free itself from science." Seventy faithful preachers, scattered over all Germany, would do more than all the learned books. (Vernunftreligion, p. 61 ff.) The wild waters of paganism would then be opposed by a firm dam.

The lurking Oberconsistorium zu Glück stadt demanded from Pastor Harms his two jubilee sermons of 1817, could not

230 The attacks of modern theologians on God's Word.

but did not come to him. Annoyed by this and by the confiscation of the Altona Bible, in the early year of 1818 it requested that he explain himself further about 22 of his theses, in which "remarks and expressions worthy of censure and unseemly might be contained. On his request to name these expressions, a tame reply was received on August 10, 1818, after much deliberation. August 1818, a tame rescript, according to which he had only to express himself as to whom the reproach should affect, that "there was no watch in the church"; whether his "passionate disapproval of the Altona Bible was expressed in proper terms" and "whence he could think himself authorized to make such a definite promise" that it would soon be rejected; whether he did not give the people cause for mockery; whether it did not appear as if he called upon the people "to assume the office of judgement over their preachers, and to help themselves against supposed false teachers." He was also to prove that the transfer of supreme leadership and decision in spiritual matters to the sovereign "was a mistake made in haste and disorder," and that the state-church way of filling pastorates was un-Protestant. (Kzt. 1829, p. 469 f.) In his reply he emphasized, "Your Royal Majesty does not wish to be prejudiced."-NB. Letters to a monarch's immediate counsel always have the form as if they were addressed to the Prince himself - "as if the present matter could be settled in Glückstadt or Copenhagen. No, there is truly a mustard seed of faith in it, which has already risen and can no longer be suppressed, even if one were to throw a mountain on it. I may be suppressed, I may have failed in this or that consideration, and then I am justly defeated; but the faith that lives in the theses is never dampened. He taketh care, and watcheth, who upholdeth all things with his powerful word. Heb. 1." The reproach of having failed to keep watch in the church was intended to affect all church authorities, for the rationalists had turned the faith upside down and openly taught against their oath, but the church officials had still assisted, as he proved by examples. Instead of rejoicing in his testimony and comforting and protecting him against the poisonous darts of his adversaries, they treated him as a defendant. "Shall I then, which seems unnecessary to me, name names? I hope I will be trusted with the courage to say, in Nathan's words, 2 Sam. 12:7, "Thou art the man." - Whether he had not given cause for ridicule? Yes; but not to mock the holy, but to mock the mockers. "If they mock at our holy things, we will mock at their unholy things. - I would like to have mocked more strongly, to make these people and their proceedings more ridiculous. If I have succeeded to some extent in doing this, I thank Luther for his instruction, which says somewhere in the sense of: If you want to speak to the people, then

look the people in the mouth, as they themselves speak. Therein lies the foundation for the other half, if my writings and speeches in general have some more influence than those of many other preachers and writers. My bullets are polished by the use of language; therefore they go further." - He called for mockery of the God of the rationalists and his Creator because the Christian was obliged to do so. It makes no difference whether one makes a God out of wood or ivory or out of one's thoughts; he is simply a made God or an idol. The warmth of the rationalists and idealists for him is the strange fire, of which 3 Mys. 10 is warned against. It "stems from their working into the depths and into the heights above head; and their zeal that we should also worship this idol is the zeal of those Ephesian goldsmiths with the cry, Great is the Diana of the Ephesians!" In rationalism, the dawn of Islam had shone; it had only exposed "the followers of Muhammad." If the rationalists had not already found the Bible, they would never accept it. If they had to choose between the Bible and the Koran, they would certainly reach for the latter. Let someone answer him in honor and conscience whether this is not so. - That he had presented the Altona Bible as the very worst book, he did not have to answer for before Christians. It no longer had a shred of apostolic Christianity, for it knew no Son of God, no Holy Spirit, no sacrament, no revelation, no holy scribes. As to Matt. 26:26, she has the note, "Behold in this broken bread the destiny of my soon-to-be-broken body." According to the treatment which the apostles receive in it, these would have to be the worst scribes. "If the Holy Ghost, under whose impulse and communication the holy men of God spake, take a wrong word at every moment," as seems to be the case from the notes of this Bible, "the Bible is a very faulty, most unreliable book." .. . "If Christ himself speaks so inaccurately and misleadingly, that he must, as it were, be constantly watched, lest he should soon be lecturing superstition, . . . soon a perverse morality. . . . so also Christ confused head and conscience." By the explanation the Bible is presented as a book that is dangerous to the people, confuses head and conscience, and is completely unsuitable for the school. "Reason, when it speaks in divine matters, is always and since Eve's time the devil's mouth. But by the Altona edition of the Bible this declaration is also exhibited in words." Her introduction had already been called by others a Judas kiss. "I would call it the nest of a brood of vipers, which afterwards creeps out into the Bible itself, and with its roguishness maddens the senses of the people, 2 Cor. 11:3, of the simple-mindedness in Christ, of schoolmasters for the most part, and also of many pastors." This, he said, must be repeated, "till from this castle of the rationalists not a stone (not a leaf) is left upon the

lies with others". As one bound by JEsu Christ, he would also spare no one and nothing, but let Luther be his captain, who warned, "Beware of your own thoughts and cleverness! It will the devil kindle the light of reason and lead you from the faith." - To the promise that the Altona Bible would soon be rejected he was justified by 1. science, for the work was too pitiful; 2. biblio-technique, for text and notes were not printed in such a way that both could not be distinguished; 3. the doctrine of faith, for God's Word was living and powerful and could not be treated in this way; 4. ecclesiastical law, for according to it the Bible could not be used as a text. Church law; for according to it, no such book may go out with royal privilege and the approval of the General Superintendent; 5. Old history, according to which a Bible edition contrary to the faith has already been forbidden three times in Holstein; 6. New history, which reports that Christians who can pray and testify have not yet died out; 7. State law, which still refers to the Augsburg Confession. In addition, he had also put some stock in the personal piety of the king. - He ascribes the office of judgement over the preachers to the laity not in the legal, but in the biblical sense. Of course, he meant Christians who were capable of judgment and not people who had fallen back into paganism. He did not call for unrest; but it would come of itself that "the congregations, for the sake of their own and their children's salvation and blessedness, would no longer remain silent about the rationalistic unrest in the church. If, then, in the night into which they have been led, a light dawns upon them, and they do not then receive assistance from their authorities, - they then do as they did at the time of the Reformation, chase away the false teachers, and place whom they consider to be a faithful teacher of their faith; and one congregation infects another; For faith, like the rationalists' science, does not follow a natural path, cannot be determined according to origin and goal, cannot be grasped and taken hold of on its way and flight; it is also bold, means joyfully using life to win life, and makes everyone skilful to be the foreman where it counts. Does church history show where he has ever allowed himself to be subdued by force?" - Harms did not want to exclude the sovereign entirely from the church regime; but he declared the state church law developed by the teacher of church law Thomasius in the previous century to be worse than "a church law for the sultan." He referred to Article 28 of the Augsburg Confession, according to which spiritual and secular government should not be mixed. Luther had recognized the consequences and had written to Melanchthon in 1530: "One person cannot be bishop and prince. One must die rather than permit such ungodliness and inequity"; and elsewhere: "Immediately when the prince says: Listen, preacher, teach me so and so, do not rebuke and punish thus! - then it is

gemenget." In the first joy, many a disorder had been overlooked, but no pope and no council had been set over matters of faith and conscience, but the Scripture, which says: Give to the emperor what is the emperor's, and not what is God's, namely faith and conscience. The historian Spittler writes: "Almost all the Reformation in Germany was only a request of the people heard by the regent; the regent, therefore, did not give religion to the people, but only did not take it from them." It was presumption, he said, that princes later claimed episcopal rights. To grant them supreme leadership and final decision in spiritual matters is to declare the Church their slave. One could again, like Luther, write a book "of the Babylonian captivity"; for the church was no longer a free, no longer a church, but a state institution. Hence also her general decay; for sermons, church and school books contrary to the faith were forced upon her, together with guards who were not skilled for her service. State authorities let in the enemy because they did not understand better. The unfree church is of no use to the state itself, but sighs, How could it! Ps. 137. "Only in freedom can the church become useful to the state." In the state-church prison the influence of the preaching ministry "stands as good as still; but suicides and fornications and arsons and bankruptcies and thefts become more numerous in the same proportion as the church enters into the service, that is, the unservice, of the state." The Lutheran Church had not chosen a king and there was no subject in it, but the princes wanted to serve it first by ordering church visitations. But things soon changed. She was deprived of her rights. The appendix of the Schmalkaldic Articles still testifies to the right of appointment of the congregations, and Luther wrote in 1536: "As we here at Wittenberg, according to the visitation, also allow the pastor to accept and permit without the knowledge and counsel of the secular regiment." The theologians, however, together with the state authorities, had caused the greatest confusion in the course of time. He who has built a church for the people should not appropriate the right of appeal for it; otherwise he takes more than he gives. If one wants to justify the robbery by saying that congregations are often guided in their appointments by foreign considerations, then no right can be built on this. They could not do worse for themselves than they do from outside. If the right of the princes to appoint is due to the fact that they have drawn the sword for the Lutheran faith, this is also no reason. Moreover, let it not be forgotten that the congregations had previously shed blood for this purpose, and that they had first snatched the authoritative sword from the pope and returned it to the princes. Besides, no Christian can be deprived of the right to withdraw his recognition as pastor from a false teacher; for this right lies in the conscience, an archive where there is no

Moths and mice come. All acquired rights should give way to the same. - Finally, Harms asked that the matter of the thesis be investigated in detail. The Oberconsistorium, however, did not hear anything more from him.

7. Rumor of Truth.

The truth rumbled. A breath of life went with this language of faith over the corpse-field, so that it seemed here and there almost as if the orthodox church should green again as in its youth. The ten virgins awoke from the clamor and welcomed the dawn of the Gospel. Light and darkness wrestled with each other in such a way that the light ignited even in many a dark rationalist heart. Such a one no longer considered the conversion of Saul a "natural fact" caused by a heavy thunderstorm and a dream (cf. Schmidt: *Krit. Gesch.* 1804. I, 188 f.). He realized that the word of the Bible is a fire from heaven; a hammer that shatters rock-hard hearts; a two-edged sword that goes through soul and spirit, through marrow and bone; a light from God above sin and grace; a healing ointment from Gilead; a seed for plants of the heavenly Father; milk and food of life for the new man; the Spirit and power of God for blessedness; the word of truth that gives peace in God and a living hope. From the bottom of his heart he confessed with Father Rußwurm in Lauenburg: "I thank my God that the scales have fallen from my eyes; that I have recognized myself as a sinner who was lost by nature, and that I have recognized Jesus Christ, the true Son of God, as my Savior, and now I know in whom I believe, and in faith I can proclaim the comforting Gospel. For more than forty years - a long, sad time! - I too lay in darkness and unbelief. ... But with a weeping heart I now sigh: Forgive me, Holy One, I did not know what I was doing. As proof I can cite that the natural man hears nothing of the Spirit of God, that it is foolishness to him and cannot comprehend it; for before the Lord opened my eyes through his grace, the whole Gospel seemed to me ridiculous foolishness. Now it is divine power and wisdom to me. And so it is and will be with everyone who is not yet born again and who, trusting in the wisdom of his reason and his naturally good heart, thinks he has no need of a Saviour. Only when one feels poor in spirit, and one fig-leaf after another falls off, with which our pride usually wants to cover its nakedness, does one bow before Him who calls sinners to Himself and makes the poor blessed." (Kzt. 1829. p. 261.) Thus many a preacher has publicly testified that before he hated the Bible more than a pope, but now, overcome by the truth, he has become a servant of the Word. (Cf. *Corr.-Bl.* 1826, p. 405 ff. 1829, p. 441 ff.).

Though the obdurate rationalists scoffed, raged, and cursed, yet once more it was only revealed what a wonderful book our Bible is. At one time it is so despised by Satan that he is too proud to listen to one of its sayings; at another time it is so feared that he summons the whole world with all its science and power against it and impresses upon his disciples that they have to fight not only with flesh and blood, but with princes and mighty men of hell. Again and again he awakens other tribunals of intercession, which soon run over her like vermin, soon offer her his friendship with many compliments. But in vain he leads the mighty of the earth against her; in vain the screaming frogs; in vain the cursing pope; in vain the clergy, whom superstition upsets before the letter; in vain the high scholars, who regard her as scum for the common people; in vain the rabble, who throw her to the scholars. She creates new life with divine power when and where God wills. The rationalists at least felt a blow from the hand of the Lord. Prof. Gabler had already been honest enough in 1799 to suggest to his unbelieving comrades that they should leave the Christian Church, since the rationalistic explanation of the Bible was only a forced one. He still wrote in 1802: "An unbiased biblical theology . . . must by its nature be quite orthodox. Only when the belief in immediate revelation and in miracles becomes wavering again through philosophy and history, and passes at most into a belief in indirect divine revelation, does biblical orthodoxy again dissolve into rationalistic heterodoxy." (Kzt. 1828, pp. 360. 366.) Now all theologians who opposed Biblical truth were powerfully reminded that they did not really belong in the Christian Church. The Grand Duke of Baden, Ludwig, in a decree of 1. In a decree of July 1, 1824, the Grand Duke of Baden, Ludwig, complained that "here and there the pure and truthful proclamation of the Gospel is more and more neglected, some important doctrines of the Gospel are completely bypassed or made doubtful or even disputed in sermons and catechism, and human temporary opinions and views are taught and preached in place of the eternal divine Word; Furthermore, that some clergymen, completely eliminating the proclamation of the main doctrines of our holy religion, elevate the morality of it to the main thing, while others again pay homage to a rationalism which undermines the fundamental supports of faith in the Gospel revealed directly by God through our divine Savior and Redeemer, and only too clearly betrays the tendency to gradually antiquate positive Christianity." Theological professors were to stick to biblical teaching and students were to be kept away from rationalistic universities. Pastors, teachers and candidates should also be supervised with regard to their teaching. No more rationalism should creep into the new catechism. (Corr.-Bl. 1832, p. 123 f.)

236 The attacks of modern theologians on God's Word.

After the death of this Grand Duke, the rationalists became so heated that in the Baden General Synod of 1834 they only demanded the compulsory eradication of Pietism - this was how the Christian faith was now blasphemed - and the Minister of Culture often had to shout in between: "Only not persecuted, gentlemen, only not persecuted!" To rationalism everything seemed dangerous, because it no longer dared to live. The address of the deanery of Karlsruhe introduced: "How many also in our region have already become separatists or even madmen, merely because the Pietists drew them into a theological thinking which their uneducated mental power was not equal to, and which in general is in every respect far more dangerous than useful for people of uneducated mental power." (Ibid. 1835, p. 84 f.) In an address to the Bavarian king in 1832, the free spirits of Fürth and Nuremberg lamented like old lamentations about the rapid spread of the old faith. (Ibid. 1832, p. 775 ff.) Wherever it was possible to do so, the police were called in at this time to prevent the conventicles or gatherings of the laity to read the Bible together. Even in free Switzerland, people often put liquor and tobacco on the table as a pretense, and quickly put the Bible under the table in case of a police raid, so that they remained unmolested. When a justice of the peace in Lausanne, on entering such a meeting, found Walter Scott on the table instead of the Bible, he said: "I will allow that; but if it had been the Bible, you would have had to deal with me." (Ibid. 1835, p. 591. - 1827, p. 700. - 1828, p. 793. - 1834, p. 295. 457 ff.) Individual political newspapers were already calling for the sparrows to be better spared and for "the Pietist vermin to be exterminated" instead. (Ibid. 1827, p. 731.) The rationalists behaved boorishly against Dr. Rudelbach, who had been called to Saxony and was known as a witness of divine truth, already at his colloquium in Dresden, boorishly from the Oberconsistorial-President v. Ammon down to the stupid boys, who stormed him out of the church with noise. (Ibid. 1829, pp. 709 ff. 741 ff.) Bavarian pastors drank "to the health of original sin" during their synod. One smashed his glass and cried out that as little as this glass would reassemble, so little would the dead rise again. (Ibid. 1827, p. 134. - 1833, p. 791.) All appeal to "common sense," which is by the bushel among the rationalistic leaders, so that their heaps should even think behind what those think before them. That a Bible without glosses was dangerous was considered as self-evident to them as it was to the papists. The insolent Oertel could therefore be just as much a rationalist as a papist, who wrote in his Critique of the Augsburg Confession, p. 18, of the Lutherans who believed in Scripture: "Do these gentlemen not know or consider that the Bible was already written before 1800 and that it was not written in the Bible.

that the Bible was written more years ago, and that it was written for Orientals, whose way of thinking, acting, language and customs were quite different from ours? - that therefore the Bible, if understood strictly according to its words, gives rise to the greatest errors, contradictions, and follies? - that therefore, what it was already before and at Luther's time, it still remains a heretic book?" (Kzt. 1836, p. 538.) After the Oberconsistorial-Director Bretschneider of Gotha had wheedled away until his old age that there was no divine revelation, that God did not lower himself to man, that human science must ascend to him, he still "set himself the task of counteracting the powerfully rising Pietisterei and reactionary belief in symbols" by a vile, scurrilous blasphemy ("Clementine oder die Frommen und Altgläubigen unserer Tage." Halle. 1841), wherein the novelist wishes to cast moral suspicion on the Bible believers. Thus, then, rationalism has defended itself against the Word of God coming again with all the means of falsehood and malice at its disposal. Nevertheless, these were loud proofs of weakness, and if nothing further had come, it might have gone according to Harms' prophecy that rationalism would soon wander arid places, seek rest, and not find it; for the freethinkers usually had the government religion, and were similar to that preacher of whom Harms tells us that he put a curse on him that he did not believe that Christ was the Son of God, after which he had it printed that he believed it and always confessed it. (That reason religion is nothing. p. 55. 59.) Dr. Böckel in Hamburg wrote that no man, nor any authority, had to ask him about his faith. (Corr.-Bl. 1830, p. 825.) The muzzler Dr. Röhr became so two-faced that he expressed the opinion that it would require a general tenant's fortune if one were to openly profess his opinion of Christianity in the pulpit. (Ibid. 1833, p. 772 f.) They already taught to pray to their Turk-god, "Preserve us the free use of thy eternal candle, the free use of reason, which we owe to JEsu." (Harms op. cit., p. 71.) So bad was their reason.

In a public disputation in Leipzig in 1827 and in several subsequent writings, Prof. Dr. Hahn called upon all rationalists to finally come out openly, to give honor to the truth, and to leave the Christian church. (Kzt. 1827, p. 74.) Even some Christians agreed with this determination. There was already talk of abolishing the monuments of rationalism for posterity. (Corr.-Bl. 1830, p. 145.) Already it was said: "That old and at least materially (in number of heads) powerful enemy, which under the firm of rationalism has long enough practiced its shallow and unscientific nature, now appears, thanks be to the Lord! on the theo-

238 The attacks of modern theologians on God's Word.

logical as well as in the philosophical field, beaten and pushed back in all fields. . . . Soon the old rationalistic malaise will be preserved only as an antiquity in the history of the Church as well as of philosophy." (Ibid. 1834, p. 86.) "For some years now, an invigorating, almighty breath of God has been walking over the land that lay full of dry dead bones, and a rustling of the resurrection in the power of the Lord can be heard everywhere.... .. Is not a voice of joy heard everywhere: Behold, the winter is past, the rain is gone and gone; the flowers are sprung up in the land, the spring is come, and the turtledove is heard in our land; the fig tree hath budded, the vines have gained eyes, and give forth their smell? Doth not the fearful whining of the night spirits tell thee in all the public sheets, that they have heard the cock-call, and scent the morning air? Is not the worst period of irrationality and sinful apostasy already largely over, and must they not already everywhere be fighting for life, the proud hearts that only a short time ago dreamed only of new conquests and of world domination? Do they not soon approach parliament here, soon there, and send their trumpeters to invite us to an amicable dialogue? True, they still make front on all heights and canonize freshly on all sides; but it is only to secure their retreat, and their boldest commanders can do nothing but seek to cover it to some extent. Their general retreat is no longer to be concealed, and every day they lose more terrain and men. How could it be otherwise? . . . those adhere to the spirit of the times, we to the spirit of God; those seek the truth in the Leipzig Missal Catalogue, we in the Bible; those appeal to Prof. Paul" (a rationalist leader), "we to the Apostle Paul; those swear by the word of some magister, we by the word of the Lord; those shatter themselves on the eternal rock, we build on it the castle of our confidence; those sing: A free life we lead; we: A stronghold is our God." - Since the Christian church has again celebrated the feast of Pentecost, and the Lord has poured out his Spirit upon all flesh, and sons and daughters have prophesied, and old men have dreamed dreams, and miraculous revivals have taken place, and the Lord has added to his congregation many who are saved, there has been a great cry of lamentation, like that of Rachel on the mountain, when her children were no more; a lamentable wailing over Christianity like that of the seer in besieged Jerusalem; and like the little owls in disturbed places, so now many who want to be called friends of men sigh over the dark, sad, fearful Christianity which the "mystics" - as the wicked world now scolded all believers in the Scriptures! - "spread." (Ibid. 1827, pp. 212 f. 229 f.)

G. G.

(To be continued.)

Miscellany.

A contribution to astronomical "science". Chicago, Ill, July 22. A special dispatch from Boston, Mass. reports: Lowell, Boston's famous astronomer, is at present on his way to Flagstaff, Arizona, at the head of an immensely important astronomical expedition. The purpose of the expedition is to make observations of the planet Mars and, if possible, to obtain full proof that Mars is inhabited by highly organized life forms. Mr. Lowell has for several years devoted his studies to Mars, and in 1894 he drew up a very complete map of it, and his statements that the canals observed on Mars are the work of purposeful living beings, and not the fruit of inanimate natural forces, have caused great sensation among the astronomers of Europe. As a result, the observations which Mr. Lowell now intends to make are looked forward to with great excitement by astronomers throughout the world. The editor of a local newspaper remarks: "It is not true that Lowell was the first and the most outspoken in the assertion that Mars must be inhabited by intelligent beings. The Italian Schiaparelli and the Frenchman Flammarion were before Lowell the main observers of Mars and the main advocates of the view that it was inhabited by intelligent beings. Luther wrote: "It is not possible for nature to be known by reason after Adam's fall, which blinded it, further than experience or divine illumination gives. So the restless reason cannot remain still and be satisfied with it, wanting to know everything, like a monkey; therefore it starts and writes poetry and investigates further than it is commanded, and despises what experience or God has given it; and yet it does not grasp what it seeks. So all her study and knowledge is a fool's work. Hence it came to pass that men, despising the natural arts, or being unable to attain them, divided themselves into innumerable parts and sects. Some have written of the earth, some of the waters, some of this, and some of that, so that there has been no measure of bookmaking and study. Finally, when they were tired of studying on earth, they went up to heaven and wanted to know the nature of the heavens and the celestial bodies, although they had never had any experience of them. They have been given free rein to lie, to lie, to lie, and to say of the innocent heavens what they have willed. For as it is said, "Those who lie from far-off lands lie with violence, so that they cannot be denied by experience. So also, because no one may reach to heaven and get experience of their doctrine and error, they lie with full and sure violence." (St. Louis ed., XI, 301.) F. P.

The Bible in Africa. From the Stöcker'sche Kirchenzeitung we learn the following interesting information: The Holy Scriptures have been translated into about 300 languages of heathen peoples in the last hundred years. Also 85 languages of African Negroes and Bantu peoples have been made into written languages by missionaries, and the Holy Scriptures have been translated in whole or in part into 67 of these languages and dialects. The missionaries found the African heathens everywhere without writing and without books; this great success is due to their faithful, untiring work. Some beginnings and rudiments of a written language can be found in paintings of animals, on rock faces in the area of the bushmen, as well as lines, crosses and rings; similar attempts can be seen among Negroes and Bantus, such as the "property signs", which are often visible on tools in West Africa and whose meaning is comprehensible to the natives, as well as the "reading sticks" with signs in Mashonaland. Apart from this, only one African tribe formed its own written language at the beginning of this century. It is the Yez tribe, which lives on the west coast in the southern part of the English territory of Sierra Leone. Not only the individual sounds, but also whole syllables were represented by the signs used, and this African script was so useful that the English church missionary society made use of it for its publications for some time. The Africans easily understand the written languages brought to them, and readily adopt them, which has great influence in the spread of the gospel. The oldest people often still learn to read; adults usually learn it one from the other without special reading instruction from the missionaries, and the black children learn to read in the schools at least as fast as the white ones in the homeland. A special dexterity of the children also speaks for the mental ability of the Africans, which used to be quite general and is still often doubted. In their games, they imitate animals in clay and the like with the peculiarities they perceive in them, and often with surprising natural truth. The blacks also love music very much and sing beautifully in several voices when instructed. The missionaries have therefore had to produce not only Bible translations (from the original Hebrew and Greek texts), dictionaries, grammars, and reading books, but also translations of songs, after they had acquired and written down the African languages. The African languages have a close, mutual relationship in their construction. From the south to Kilimanjaro and the Cameroon mountains, all the many Bantu tribes speak basically only one language, even if it seems to be divided into many dialects. Thus the laborious work of the first linguists and translators has been groundbreaking for all later missions and over the farthest stretches of land. The first writings and

Books are being printed in new fields even now by the missionaries. Trained printers are sent to them by the missionary societies to set up printing presses, and the blacks learn setting easily. In the trading cities on the coasts there is no lack of printing presses; in South Africa, for example, newspapers are printed in all parts of the country south of the Zambezi, altogether 120 different sheets; therefore missionary printing presses are no longer necessary here, but they are in the interior. Translations of the entire Holy Scriptures, however, are mostly printed in Europe under the direction of one of the translators. The British and foreign Bible Societies spare no effort and expense in this. The importance of this literature in African languages, which has grown to enormous proportions, is all the greater for the evangelization of the continent, as some of these languages are also spoken or understood further inland. The Sulu language is spoken west of the Nyassa, also east of it at the upper Rovuma, even up to the Victoria-Njansa by larger and smaller peoples. What is printed in Swahili may serve as a means of spreading the gospel as far as the interior lakes and beyond. There are examples of books and papers having awakened desires for salvation here and there before a missionary had come there. The Basel missionaries, when they came to the Abolande from Cameroon in 1888, found a Christian congregation in the midst of the jungle. Through a New Testament the chief had become acquainted with the gospel, had gathered a congregation around him, and had arranged life according to the word of God. There are only a few evangelical missionaries in Uganda; some of them have only been able to work there temporarily. Nevertheless, thousands attend the church service and 200,000 are more or less under the influence of the Gospel, thanks to the Bibles and other Christian writings that are eagerly read and faithfully preserved even in times of persecution. One missionary sold 12,000 small catechisms in six months in 1894. In four weeks 7271 scriptures were sold, including 688 gospels. And it is written, "The word that proceedeth out of my mouth shall not return unto me void, but shall do that which I please, and shall prosper when I send it."

Insanity as a ground for divorce. The dispatch reporting the adoption of the new Civil Code for the German Reich also contains the following words: "Previously" (i.e. shortly before the final vote at the third reading) "the Prussian Minister of Justice Schönstedt, the Federal Plenipotentiary for Saxony, Count von Hohenthal, and the Deputy Federal Plenipotentiary for Baden, Dr. v. Jagemann, had still thrown their weight behind the proposal of the free-spirited deputy Munckel, according to which incurable insanity is considered grounds for divorce. v. Jagemann, were still vigorously in favor of the motion of the liberal deputy Munckel, according to which incurable insanity should be considered grounds for divorce. They also had the satisfaction of having passed the motion by 161 votes against."

133 votes to be included in the marriage laws." One cannot expect the world to be governed by God's word. But reason alone teaches that divorce on the grounds of insanity is crudeness. Nor does "incurable" insanity make matters better. Moreover, experience teaches again and again that after a few years healing occurred where the medical "authorities" had "constatirt" incurable insanity. F. P.

Literature.

Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche.

With the cooperation of many theologians and scholars, edited in a third and improved edition by Dr. Albert Hauck, Professor in Leipzig. - 1st ed. Leipzig. J. C. Hinrichssche Buchhandlung. (Philadelphia: Schäfer and Koradi.) 1896. 80 pages. Price: 1 Mark.

The first edition of this great work, edited by Prof. Dr. J. J. Herzog, appeared in the years 1853-1868; the second edition, procured by the same theologian in connection with Prof. Dr. G. L. Plitt, was begun in 1876, and completed in 1888. Both editions have found reviews in this journal. We believe we should also say a few words about the third edition now begun, which is edited by the professor of church history in Leipzig, Dr. Albert Hauck, who had already completed the second edition after the death of Herzog and Plitt. The volume of the work is set at 18 volumes of 800 pages each, which are to be published in 180 deliveries of 1 Mark each and are to be completed in 9 years.

In Germany, this new edition was warmly recommended as soon as the first edition appeared. The "Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung" says at the end of a long review: "The emphasis on the historical, the results of conscientious research, the criticism, that will generally become the signature of the new edition and we hope from it a salutary effect for theology and church, if only always the excessive is kept away; it will have a clarifying and promoting effect on many". Luthardt's "Theologische Litteraturblatt" welcomes the new edition "joyfully and gratefully" as "indeed a work of Protestant science in Germany." And Eger's "Theologischer Litteratur-Bericht" calls it "the great enterprise which the scientific theological world in Germany welcomes with pride and joy. The work needs no recommendation. Every theologian who wants to continue his scientific work in any way cannot do without it. We can in no way agree with such unconditional praise and recommendations, based on the similarity of the character of the third edition with that of the second, which we know quite well from several years of use; based on the list of the 177 present contributors, and based on the nature of the first delivery before us. It is not necessary, in this place and time, to say anything more detailed about the second edition, which is now almost out of print. That has been done before. But this much is certain: anyone who wants to learn about true, scriptural theology from it will find himself bitterly deceived and led astray. The third edition, however, according to the Prospectus, is to "join the earlier ones in the leading essentials." "The common basis of all the work," the announcement continues, "is faith in the revelation of God's salvation in Christ JEsu and love for the Church of the Reformation." After perusing the list of co-workers, we believe we can say that it will be easy to pick out a dozen of the same, who hold twelve different views, contrary to Scripture, of the "faith in the revelation of God's salvation in Christo

JEsu". And the "love for the church of the Reformation" will be so little recognizable in this Realencyklopädie that it will rather be a testimony that the entire theological "science" of Germany, which is heard in this work, has fallen away from the principles and basic teachings of the Lutheran Reformation. Just take a closer look at the list of contributors! Men of all tendencies and schools, by which German Protestantism is torn asunder, are to be found among them, theologians of the extreme left, who make the most unveiled attacks on the center of Christianity, such as so-called "positives. The Ritschlians are strongly represented: Harnack, Achelis, Brieger, Gottschick, Herrmann, Kattenbusch, Schürer, Loofs, Krüger, Bornemann, etc. The above-named are doctors of exegetical, systematic, historical, and practical theology. They will all work and write more or less in the interest of their school. Radical critics who have more or less cleared up the Old and New Testaments, such as Kamphausen, Kautzsch, Guthe, Weizsäcker, and others, will most probably treat articles which strike into the field of exegetical theology. Open deniers of the divinity of Christ, such as Beyschlag, Reformed, Unirte, Lutherans of all colors, as well as those who cannot be classified at all, as long as they only call themselves "Protestants" and have a "name", have been won as co-workers for the Realencyklopädie. The fact that a whole series of "positive" and "Lutheran" names can be found in contrast to the liberal element does not detract from anything, and should not be a cause for concern. It is generally known that Zöckler, Cremer, Zahn, Strack, König, v. Orelli, Köhler, Volck and others have made the most extensive concessions to criticism and modern theology, and in particular have long since thrown overboard the old Lutheran, biblical doctrine of inspiration.

The impression we get from the brochure and the staff directory is confirmed by the first delivery, which contains 15 longer or shorter articles. We will pick out some of the more important works. About the French scholastic Abälard, it is said in the final characterization (p. 25): "Nevertheless, by virtue of his personality, his fate, and his scientific influence on contemporaries and posterity, he remains . . . an important phenomenon, from whom we also cannot withdraw our sympathy, if we consider that his criticism shows not only Protestant, but also evangelical traces, and that his love for Heloise, who was herself a 'romantically great' character, elevated at first by scientific, then by religious ideality, is, for all his aberrations, not only a romantically appealing, but also humanly touching trait." What is one to say to such a judgment? - Different theologians write about "The Lord's Supper," but not, as in the second edition, a Lutheran about the Lutheran church doctrine, and a Reformed about the Reformed church doctrine, but the Unirte Cremer presents the Scripture doctrine, and the Ritschlian Loofs the church doctrine. Very characteristic! Nowhere in the six pages of the "Doctrine of the Scriptures" do we find the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, which is solely in accordance with the Scriptures, clearly and unmistakably stated. We prefer the way of the second edition. Of course, nothing else could be expected from Cremer. As U. v. Barm recently reported in the "Neue Lutherische Kirchenzeitung", he uses the Unirte Spendeformel when he administers the Lord's Supper in Greifswald. We cannot go into Loofs' 30-page article here. Only this much may be stated, that in it, too, the doctrine of our church never and nowhere comes into its own. And the "love for the church of the Reformation" in which the whole thing is written is shown right from the beginning: "The less the New Testament of the exegesis of earlier times was able to decide the questions whose passionate discussion made the Lord's Supper, the love feast of the oldest church, a ragged feast of the confessional struggle, the more zealously the history of the Lord's Supper was drawn into the doctrinal disputes. . . . In Marburg, on October 3, 1529, there was a long and useless discussion about the fathers' positions. And still in our century the renewed confessional contrasts have been reflected in the different ways in which the history of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper has been treated. . . . The history of the Lord's Supper is a history of suffering, which more easily excites displeasure and anger than interest, - one of the most unpleasant passages in the history of dogma. But the study of the history of the Lord's Supper must remain completely unfruitful if it is considered from the point of view of the confessional controversies of the sixteenth century."

We break off. In the foregoing we do not wish to be understood as denying the Realencyklopädie any value. It has its value, its great value, if you like. The second edition has served us well. It is especially a convenient reference book for those who, for professional reasons, must deal with certain questions and orient themselves about the state of modern German theology in its most outstanding representatives. Its historical, archaeological, educational, and biographical articles, for example, contain a wealth of material, some of which has been well edited and provided with valuable bibliographical references. This will also be true of the third edition. The very first article on A and Ω contains a thorough and meticulous archaeological treatise by Prof. Dr. Nik. Müller, the director of the rich and interesting "Christian Museum" there. However, many of the articles that are not really dogmatic must be read and used with great caution and scrutiny; they often lack the desirable precision, the objectivity much praised by their authors, and the right assessment; they will only be of use to those who do not allow themselves to be impressed by boldly posed hypotheses and boldly thrown assertions. We are not mistaken in assuming that there are still many gaps in the libraries of most American Lutheran pastors, which would first have to be filled by good Lutheran theological literature before one would think of purchasing this great, but also costly work. L. F.

The Canons of the Most Important Early Church Conciliar, Together with the Apostolic Canons. Edited by Lic. Dr. Friedrich Lauchert, Professor at the Old Catholic Theological Seminary in Bonn. Freiburg i. B. and Leipzig. Academic publishing bookshop of I. C. B. Mohr. 1896. XXX and 228 pages.

This book, which was sent to us for display, forms the twelfth issue of the "Collection of Selected Source Writings on Church and Dogma History as a Basis for Seminary Exercises. Published under the direction of Professor Dr. G. Krüger". It is distinguished by a short, but well orienting historical and bibliographical introduction, by clean, accurate, with the necessary text-critical apparatus provided reproduction of the documents in the original and by a detailed subject and name index. The documents printed here comprise the decisions of all ecumenical church assemblies up to the second Niceneum in 787, among which the canons of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, etc. are known to be especially important. It is convenient to have them available in such a handy compilation. In general, these editions of patristic writings, as far as they have come to our attention, are quite recommendable. Several writings of Tertullian (*de praescriptione haereticorum*, *de poenitentia*, etc.), Augustine's *de catechizandis rudibus*, selected speeches of Bernard of Clairvaux, writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, Jerome and others have appeared so far. The price of a booklet is 1-4 Marks, depending on the volume. L. F.

The doctrine of the last things especially for non-theologians. From *zug aus der "christlichen Eschatologie"* von † Dr. Th. Kliefoth, bearbeitet von Traugott Witte, Pastor in Kirchdorf in Mecklenburg. Leipzig. Dörffling and Francke. 1895. 82 pp. Price: 1 Mark.

The last work of the late Oberkirchenrathspräsidenten von Mecklenburg, Kliefoth, the extensive "Christliche Eschatologie" (Christian Eschatology), published by the above-mentioned publishing house, has found a detailed review in this journal of fine time, to which we would like to refer herewith, cf. volume XXXIV, p. 65 ff. The present writing is but an extract from the great work. In the hands of "non-theologians" we certainly do not wish to see this doctrine of the last things. For such readers the "Christian Eschatology" and accordingly also this excerpt contain too many errors contrary to Scripture, as the above-mentioned review proves. For such readers, the excerpt is also not written simply enough.

What is the point of foreign words like potentiality etc. that are not explained? But whether theologians who want to deal with Kliefoth's views will be completely satisfied by this excerpt seems somewhat doubtful to us. It is, after all, almost too thin a skeleton that is presented to us; precisely the explanations and justifications that one first asks for are missing. But we do not deny that one can quickly orientate oneself about Kliefoth's opinions from this little book; and that some of his explanations are accurate has already been said before. L. F.

The Revelation of St. John according to the lectures of weil. Prof.

Dr. J. Ch. K. von Hofmann edited for the understanding of the congregation by
E. von Lorentz, Pastor. Leipzig. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf.
1896. 274 pages. Price: 3 Mark 25 Pf.

The exegetical work of the late Erlangen theologian v. Hofmann has already been repeatedly commemorated in this journal, the philological accuracy and sharpness of the development of thought has been acknowledged, and the violence to which he let himself be carried away in the interest of his theosophical system has been rejected. Almost twenty years after his death, this interpretation of the Revelation of St. John appears, edited according to his lectures. All learned, linguistic discussions are avoided; the language is not so dark and heavy as is usually the case in Hofmann's writings. The interpretation is also intended to serve laymen who love and study the Scriptures. But to such the book cannot be recommended at all. The author considers Revelation to be Johannine and says after a lengthy discussion: "We have good and solid ground under our feet if we remain convinced of the apostolic origin of our book. There are certainly some apt individual remarks and explanations. But otherwise we consider Hofmann's consistently final-historical, realistic interpretation to be wrong. Chiliasm and general conversion of the Jews are taught, the pope at Rome is not recognized as Antichrist. P. 10, for example, states: "The Christian church has to hope that Israel as a people will come to the knowledge of salvation and become obedient to the truth, which now gathers a church of obedience in the world of nations; that Christ will reveal himself in his power and confess his church; that the church of the name of Christ, whether from death or in the life of the body, will be transfigured into the likeness of his glory and, what necessarily follows from this, that the whole created world will be restored to a glory of incorruptible nature in the likeness of it. Only then can history come to an end; only after the separation of good and evil is complete, so that in those who are God's there is no longer any sin or evil. But here follows the prospect of an interval between the revelation of Christ and the complete accomplishment of that to which his revelation is made." We cannot, therefore, join in the praises which this work has otherwise received. However, the owners of the great, but unfinished, Hofmann Commentary, "Die heilige Schrift neuer Testament zusammenhängend untersucht," will reach for this volume for completion. L. F.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

The Editorship of Church Magazines. The editor of the Lutheran World, Father F. G. Gotwald, has resigned his pastorate in order to devote himself entirely to editorial work. In reference to this, the "Lutheran Standard" remarks: "It is becoming more and more evident that a Redacteur should be only a Redacteur and nothing else. If an editor wants to remain oriented, he must read so much that three days of the week alone are hardly sufficient. What a power

could be a church paper, if it were properly edited! Will the General Synod (of Ohio) wake up too late in regard to this subject? The editing of periodicals is too responsible a work to be taken lightly. We should have editors who devote their whole time to this work." So much for the "Standard." We agree with what he says about the importance of editorial work. There is no question, too, that the work connected with it might well take up all a man's strength and time even if he had industrious assistants. But it is still doubtful to us whether someone who is "Redacteur and nothing but Redacteur" will remain capable of Redaction work in the long run.

F. P.

A whimsical description of the General Council is found in the Lutheran Herald of June 27. It says: "Here in America the General Council forms the unifying middle between two unhealthy extremes. On the left stands the General Synod, which even today tolerates professors in their seminaries attacking and rejecting certain articles of the Augsburg Confession instead of calling them to account; indeed, in this body the unheard-of has occurred that a professor of theology has been sued because he has presented in a Lutheran seminary the doctrine of the Lutheran Church as it is laid down in the Confessions. On the right we have to defend ourselves against a direction which carries into the Confessions things which they do not contain and which our Lutheran Church has never taught and which are contrary to the revealed way of salvation." The "unhealthy extremes" mentioned here, however, are found in the Lutheran Church of America. But the Council does not form the "unifying middle" between the two, but its characteristic is that it stands "left" and "right" at the same time.

F. P.

General Council and the Lodges. The "Herald" reports from the Pennsylvania Synod: "Justifiable offence is caused by the vouched news that two younger pastors recently allowed themselves to be tempted to become free (?) bricklaying lodge brothers. How does this fit in with the Synodal Constitution signed by both of them, which forbids members of the ministry - according to the principle, 'No one can serve two masters' - to belong to secret societies? A Lutheran clergyman, for the sake of evangelical liberty, must not allow himself to be caught under any human yoke; he must be 'one-sided' as a Christian." So far the "Herald." What is the meaning of saying here, in reference to membership in the Lodge, "A Lutheran clergyman, for the sake of evangelical liberty, must not allow himself to be caught under any human yoke" ?

F. P.

The General Council Heathen Mission has 8 missionaries and 4 evangelists. The wards number 4800 Christians, an increase of 272 souls in the last two years.

The General Synod of the Reformed Church opened at Dayton, Ohio, on May 27 of this year. Among the most agreeable reports were those concerning heathen and internal missions. Of the former, it was declared that not only had the former debt been paid off, but that there was a surplus of 83,000 in the treasury. The Committee for the Inner Mission gave almost the same report, except that the amount of the surplus was not stated. It was decided to pursue this work more diligently in the South and West, especially on the coast of the Pacific Ocean. In addition, an annual expenditure of \$6000 was voted for missions among immigrant Hungarians, Bohemians, and Poles. The total annual expenditure for internal missions was found to be \$45,000, and that for heathen missions 835,000.

(Theol. Zeitschr.)

Of Dr. Harper, president of the University of Chicago, Dr. Henson, preacher of the First Baptist Church in Chicago, says: "I freely and openly confess that I would rather see 'Bob Ingersoll' at the head of Chicago University than Dr. Harper. Ingersoll is an outspoken unbeliever, so you know who you are dealing with and how to meet him. Dr. Harper is a man of two faces and a man who hangs his coat to the wind. At a public meeting in which Dr. Harper was present, I made a speech in which I confessed and declared my belief in the doctrines of the Bible. I knew that my views on various points were just the opposite of what Dr. Harper believed. To my utter astonishment, the Doctor rose and declared that he heartily agreed with my views on the points I had particularly emphasized. When, shortly after, Dr. Harper again freely confessed his doubts and disbelief, I said to him: 'Doctor, I cannot quite comprehend them; you have very lately endorsed my views in my public assembly, and now you teach again just the opposite.' I have done so," he answered, "but only to a certain extent. With disgust at such duplicity I turned away from him. Such a man stands at the head of the great Chicago University. That institution of learning has become a hotbed of unbelief, in which the old Bible faith is being destroyed. The religious air in that institution is poisoned, therefore dangerous to the students and to all who persevere there. It would never occur to me to send one of my children to that institution and expose them to the corrupting influence that is exercised there. For these sad conditions I hold Dr. Harper responsible. He is an unfit man to be at the head of an institution founded by Baptists. . . . Christian families should not send their children to Chicago University if they wish to preserve the Christian faith in God's Word." (Theol. Zeitschr.)

II. Abroad.

In Thuringia, rationalism was at home throughout this century and remains so to this day. Recently a new "Gesangbuch zum Gebrauche in Kirche, Schule und Haus für die Herzogthümer Sachsen-Koburg und Gotha" was published. While since the fifties most of Germany's regional churches have been striving to get rid of the old, miserable hymnals and to give the people the core hymns of the Lutheran Church in an unadulterated form in the new ones, this can only be said of the hymnal in question to a very limited extent. We gather from a review of it in the "Siona" the following details: A number of the most beautiful hymns which have become common property of the Church are missing, e.g.: Now rejoice, dear Christians together. Our Father in the Kingdom of Heaven. Now praise, my soul, the Lord. Praise God, all you Christians. Now let us bury the body. I love thee, O Lord. We thank thee, O Lord Jesus Christ. As I live, saith thy God. Where shall I flee to? To my dear God. O God and Lord. We men are to that, O God. O sorrow, O heartache. Instead, many newer songs are included, poems by Spitta, the recently deceased Julius Sturm, and others, which are in themselves quite beautiful and edifying, but certainly not church songs. Even less do poems by Friedrich de la Motte-Fouqué and Gottfried Kinkel belong in a church hymnal. But what are we to make of the fact that the old, vul-

gery rationalism, in addition to the most miserable rhyming, is contained in verses like the following:

Instill modesty in our breasts, and warmth for
virtue, And teach us to practice every duty with
pleasure, Even in youth!

Furthermore, the most well-known songs have been irresponsibly changed, shortened and deteriorated. For example, they say: A lamb goes and bears the guilt. The glorious, old Lutheran hymn: Es ist das Heil uns kommen her etc. has been shortened from 14 verses to 5 and has also been greatly reworked. The third verse of the hymn: Shall I not sing to my God? reads here:

His son, the native, he gives out of mercy For
me poor and lost To eternal salvation gain. O
grace without bounds, unfathomable deep sea,
Our human thoughts never contain thee, etc.

Of what quality may the hymnal in use up to now have been, when the reviewer says of the new one: "All who have sighed under the most miserable hymnal of 1827 will breathe a sigh of relief, as if freed from a heavy pressure"? But what else can one expect in that region, when one looks at the ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Saxon duchies! The Duke of Gotha has lately appointed a Berlin Protestant, Bahnsen, as General Superintendent, just as the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen a few years ago appointed Dreyer, the author of "Undogmatic Christianity," as Oberkirchenrath. And news has just come that the Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar has appointed Spinner, the first missionary of the Protestant Union Mission in Japan, as Oberhofprediger and General Superintendent.

L. F.

Church buildings in Berlin. At the annual meeting of the Protestant Church Building Association in Berlin, the chairman gave an overview of the entire activities of the association. Since the founding of the association in 1888, thirty churches have been completed in Berlin and the suburbs through the cooperation of the royal house, the authorities, the city synod, the magistrate, the church congregations, the church aid society and the chapel society; five are still under construction and four will soon be started. The construction of these 35 churches, along with several parish and community houses, took about 15 million Marks. The value of the building sites, most of which were donated or transferred free of charge, amounts to about 6,000,000 Marks. Independently, the Church Building Society has built three churches at a cost of 8,850,000 Marks for the buildings themselves and 761,000 for building sites. In addition, it has contributed to seven other churches in the amount of 2,730,500 Marks for buildings and 1,585,000 Marks for building sites. (Theol. Zeitschr.)

The German Teachers' Congress, which met this year in Kiel, was attended by 260 delegates representing 80,000 teachers. The position which the Teachers' Conference took on questions of the Christian faith and, in connection with it, on questions of religious instruction, was clearly expressed on several occasions. A university professor from Kiel said that, since the moral and religious ideas of the past had begun to falter, the natural sciences were called upon to determine the thinking of the future; they teach us, for example, that our first ancestors were predatory animals whose evil instincts are still present today in the world.

The teaching of religious education should be adapted to scientific requirements; only pedagogy should decide on the manner of teaching. In another lecture, it was emphasized that religious education must be adapted to scientific requirements; only pedagogy can decide on the manner in which it is to be taught; accordingly, it must be closely related to the treatment of moral questions. Another teacher made the same point: That religious education today has a great task to fulfill, there is full agreement among us. Whoever has taken into himself the image of Jesus, whoever heeds his teachings in the Sermon on the Mount, possesses social ethics, has everything that is necessary for progress: Love of neighbor, love of brother; he knows no distinctions of class or rank. It is a great and beautiful task for us teachers to carry the social ethics of Jesus to the people. If it is said to us that we do not do this with the necessary energy, we say that is not true. But we hold with Jean Paul, who said: The multitude of pillars darkens the church. The multitude of dogmas makes ethics recede too much. We shall have to come to terms with many an endeavor, e.g. with Egidy's, in which much is human, perhaps also with those represented by the Society for Ethical Culture, etc. (A. E. L. K.).

From Baden. The two largest cities in Baden, Mannheim and Karlsruhe, were surprised with the announcement that the government had gone over the heads of the city council and allowed Corpus Christi processions. By means of a very detailed order of procession, a preliminary inspection of all participants was announced, so that it could be seen which authorities, officers, associations, and schools were represented. The ultramontane "Badischer Beobachter" called with quiet pressure and hidden threat of boycott "to follow the example" of many towns "in which the people of other faiths have supported and promoted this celebration by decorating their houses, so that on this feast day not only the Catholic faith, but also the mutual tolerance of the different confessions would be most beautifully revealed". (A. E. L. K.)

The Thuringian Church Conference. At this conference, where the "positive" pastors of the Thuringian states meet, Pastor D. P. Ewald from Erlangen spoke this year about "the credibility of the Gospels" and dealt with the following ten theses: 1. The first prerequisite for the considered recognition of the credibility of the Gospels is the need for salvation and the faith in salvation, since only where these are present does the miracle of the person and work of Jesus, of which the Gospels report, appear unobjectionable. Therefore faith is not to be thought dependent on a previous conviction concerning the "credibility" of the evangelical writers. (2) In the same way, faith in Christ does not necessarily protect us from far-reaching doubts about the reliability of the Gospel account of history, but in the long run it will be most seriously damaged, even endangered, because the preached Christ in whom we believe cannot be detached from the Christ of the Gospels. It is therefore an important task of positive theology to examine and refute the doubts that arise against the credibility of the Gospels, in order to give a helping hand to souls that may already be challenged, and on the other hand to prove anew to the Church the right to use these writings not only as books of religious sentiment and religious value, but as a norm and a pure source of the proclamation of Christ. (4) For this purpose, however definite the assurance may be that we are to regard the Gospels, which, moreover, nowhere themselves expressly make this claim, as inspired writings, it is not sufficient, nor is it sufficient even to refer to the fact that in the Christian Church the Gospels are the only inspired writings.

5. The main concern and point of attack for the dissolving criticism is the difference between the synoptic and the Johannine type of Gospels, since we can, according to thesis 1, leave aside the question of the possibility of miracles. (5) The main concern and point of attack for the dissolving criticism, since we may, according to Thesis 1, disregard the question of the possibility of miracles, will be the difference between the Synoptic and Johannine types of Gospels, which is usually played off against the latter in particular. But with it concurs the difference in many parts of the synoptic account, which is all the more striking in spite of all similarity. In addition, the alleged mythical character of some narratives, apparent repetitions, inaccuracies, etc., which, at least in connection with the first-mentioned difficulties, acquire greater weight and can serve to make the actually relatively late fixation of the Gospels, and even of their sources, a disturbing instance. 6. 6 The appeal to the explicit statements of the third and fourth evangelists about the position of the two authors on their material is the first thing that needs to be considered, but it does not remove the difficulties, but rather exacerbates them. (7) A closer examination of the question of the compatibility of the reported facts leads further. Specifically, the two types presuppose each other. The coexistence of the four different accounts is explained, on the one hand, by the fact that our four Gospels do not all bear the character of chronicle-like accounts of the life of Jesus, but that certain special intentions on the part of the writers were evidently active in their composition. (9) But this will not suffice; on the other hand, we will have to assume that there were some peculiar source writings which, on the one hand, gave rise to the conspicuous one-sidedness of the older synoptic type, and, on the other hand, in connection with other traditions and the like, helped to produce the peculiar interrelation and divergence of the three synoptics. The more detailed determination of these sources is a matter of detailed literary-critical research. (10) The difficulties that cannot be overcome in the double way of determining the special intentions of the evangelists and assuming peculiar sources for the synoptics will mostly prove to be of a non-objective nature. The possibly remaining brittle residue will in any case only be of importance if one has from the outset set everything on screws by a wrongly conceived theory of inspiration, which, by the way, is already led ad absurdum by the nature of the text. The inspiration of the Gospels, as well as of the whole of Scripture, is to be determined according to what is given, and not to rape what is given according to an abstract theory. - These omissions are a new proof that even the newer "confessional" theologians turn everything upside down. The matter is in reality just the reverse of what Ewald indicates. The Gospels present themselves as God's Word, as inspired Scripture. We have to judge about the inspiration only according to the Scriptures. Scripture teaches clearly, e.g. 2 Tim. 3:16, that all that is written is inspired by God and therefore infallible truth. Faith in Christ is dependent on the credibility of the gospels. For without the word there is no faith, no faith in salvation. The right faith, which is simple in its adherence to the Word, protects against doubt and excludes all doubt. If a believing Christian once comes to doubt about any part of the

begins to doubt, such doubt comes not from faith and spirit, but from the flesh. G. St.

From the Rhine Province. Pastor Idel, who has been deposed from his office and currently resides in Elberfeld, travels around as an itinerant preacher. The character of his sermons may be discerned from a recent pamphlet which he has self-published, "The Righteousness that Holds Before God." Idel advocates the idea that a truly born-again person no longer sins. He is firmly convinced of his own sinlessness - but he blames the Reformers and the entire Protestant Church for the doctrine that even one who has been born again through God's Spirit inevitably remains a "bad person all his life" (p. 25). And now follows a passionate attack on all the Reformers, on the "so-called" Reformation, on all the pastors of the present day. "Can Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and the Reformers at all be our models and guides to heaven? Are they filled with the spirit of Christ and his apostles? We answer with a most decided No! and a thousand times No!" (p. 15.) "The existing churches are the Babylon, the false prophet." "The so-called Reformers have been poor beggared men" (p. 4). Luther's "false unbiblical teaching has led the millions of the Protestant Church to despair and hell. Luther and his blindly deaf followers are to blame" (p. 5). "Let us commend the poor man (Luther) to the grace and mercy of God" (p. 9). Concerning Luther's verse, "So is auch unser Thun nicht rein auch in dem besten Leben" (Originally, "It is yet our Thun in vain even in the best life"), Idel remarks, "And with such a doctrine of woe the people should feel happy." Does not Pastor Idel even think of the sad outcome of so many of his predecessors on this path of self-delusion? (A. E. L. K.)

This year's Lutheran Pentecostal Conference in Hanover dealt primarily with the subject: "The Reconciliation through the Death of JEsu." The paper of Pastor Dittrich opposed Ritschl's school with many a correct assertion, which, however, was not new. What was new, on the other hand, was not correct. It was in the lecture, as in the discussion that followed, that the thought was "brought to the fore": "Not what has been suffered for us, but who has suffered for us, is the decisive thing." This is evidently the influence of Frank's system, which denies all value to the suffering of Christ as such, and denies that Christ suffered the punishment of our sins. This error, which strikes at the heart of the doctrine of reconciliation, at the heart of Christianity, continues to eat away at the "ecclesiastically" minded theological circles of Germany. Thus, for example, it is cultivated in the recently published writing of A. Seeberg, professor at Dorpat, entitled "The Death of Christ in Its Significance for Redemption." G. St.

Emperor and Sunday celebration. The "Ev. Kirchenzeitung" writes: "The Emperor was invited by the Berlin Night Club to a regatta on the Müggelsee on one of the last Sundays during the time of the main service. He had the Court Marshal's Office reply that he regretted not being able to attend a regatta taking place during the main church service. This will hopefully be a lesson to the organizers of such regattas and similar amusements during the hours of worship."

Chiliasm as a Fighter of Social Democracy. At the Berlin Pastoral Conference held during Trinity Week, Father Israel said that if one had preached diligently in Germany that Jesus must also be victorious in this world time, Social Democracy would not have had so much success. There-

The editor of the "Ev. Kirchenzeitung" remarks: "The assumption is all too bold that the sermon of the millennial kingdom, namely in the version in which it has become a favorite dogma in some religious circles, would certainly have been able to prevent the social-democratic high tide that threatens the social existence of today's society. The power of Christian preaching lies not in the idea of a millennial kingdom, but in the fact that Jesus, crucified and risen, has redeemed us from sin, death and the devil.

Scholarly odysseys. The "Ev. Kirchenzeitung" reported: "Professor Lütgert-Greifswald dealt (at a pastoral conference in Berlin) with the question: Can a Christian be sinless? The topic was posed in order to take a stand against the sanctimoniousness of sectarianism. The lecture essentially moved between the two passages: 'Whoever is born of God does not sin', 1 John 3:9, and: 'If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us,' 1 John 1:8. The former word was called a verdict of faith. It wants to be believed that God in His omnipotence can put an end to all sins. Without faith in the power of Jesus to make free from sin, we do not have the Lord. The power of the LORD is absolute and unlimited. The other word, 1 John 1:8, has been called an experiential judgment. And it is precisely because we repeatedly experience the misery of our sins and are dependent on repeatedly asking God for forgiveness that God continually binds us to Himself. In his closing words, Lütgert confessed that he had not solved the problem. As soon as he had found the solution, he would have it printed."

From Hanover. The Hanover District Teachers' Association, to which 936 of the approximately 1000 teachers in the district belong, adopted the following theses on the importance of biblical history as the basis of Christian religious instruction at its recent annual meeting: I. Biblical history is the foundation of religious instruction, for by its content it corresponds most closely to the nature of the Christian religion, by its vividness best satisfies the needs of the child's nature, is the most suitable material for moral-religious character formation. In the selection of material for the teaching of biblical history, all religiously inferior and morally questionable Old Testament stories are to be excluded, and the emphasis of instruction must be shifted to the New Testament. . The treatment of the Old Testament must be dominated by the spirit of the New Testament; the historical character of the treatment must not be obscured by an abstract doctrinal trait; in the treatment of the New Testament the person of Christ must always be the central point.

(A. E. L. K.)

From Paris. In Paris a league has been formed for the restoration of paganism. The worship of Zeus and the other Olympian gods, as well as the unrestrained cult of beauty and art, are the obligations that the members of the alliance must take upon themselves. The place where the declarations of membership are received is the editorial office of an immoral illustrated newspaper which, because of its immorality, has been confiscated countless times by the Paris public prosecutor's office, which is rather lax in these matters. In a notice published on numerous corners of Paris it says: "Will we endure forever, without ever rebelling, the ugliness and despair of modern life? Life, which the almighty gods had created for splendor and for joy, has for nineteen centuries been transformed into a

a dreadful hell! Since the day Jesus of Nazareth was crucified, his disciples have glorified the cross: the crowning of the agony of death has become the symbol of life! The elevation of our souls, the pleasures of our bodies are broken by the wheel to which we poor slaves have bound ourselves, instead of our shaking off our chains and opening our eyes to light, beauty, and love." This appeal is made to all who "do not believe in the gloomy religions, whose impotence has been daily coming out for nineteen centuries, and who wish to see again the serene and beautiful life of ancient civilization."

(A. E. L. K.)

From Italy. A piece of the oldest polyglot Bible, which was organized by Origen, has recently been found again, as Prof. Dr. E. Nestle in Ulm reports in the supplement to the "Allg. Zeitung" No. 123. This polyglot Bible, called the Hexapla of Origen, was organized in his time because in the disputes between Jews and Christians it often happened that Greek Christians, who referred to the Old Testament in their hands, had to hear from their Jewish opponents that in the original Hebrew this or that passage sounded quite different from the Greek translation known only to the Christians. This gave Origen the idea of producing a polyglot Bible. Because the work consisted mostly of six columns, it was called the Hexapla; for individual books, especially the poetic ones, especially the Psalter, it is said to have even contained eight and nine columns. In the first he placed the Hebrew text with Hebrew letters, in the second the same in Greek transcription, in the third a quite literal translation, which a Jew named Aquila had made at the time of the emperor Hadrian, in the fourth that of a Samaritan named Symmachus, in the fifth the one used by the Christians, the so-called Septuagint. Finally, there was the translation of a Theodotion, and for individual books one or the other that Origen had found. For this enterprise a rich senator Ambrosius provided the means, so that Origen could employ seven quick writers and seven beautifully writing girls. The work had disappeared until now. Now suddenly comes the news that a piece of the Hexapla has been discovered in Milan in a Greek palimpsest. The finder is the clergyman Giovanni Mercati, who in 1893 made inquiries about the time of one of these Bible translators, Symmachus. With few gaps, it covers 11 psalms. The first column (Hebrew with Hebrew script) is missing, but, what is much more important, the second (Hebrew in Greek transcription) is there, in the third - deviating from the hitherto known descriptions of the Church Fathers, which the above enumeration follows - Symmachus is written, then Aquila, then the Septuagint, then Theodotion, then variants. With regard to the significance of the find, Prof. Dr. Nestle points out, among other things, that it can be used to better study how the Alexandrian and Palestinian Jews spoke and transcribed their Hebrew at the time of Origen.

(A. E. L. K.)

Travelling Chapels in Russia. The Trans-Siberian railway, which is at present under construction, will, by order of the Czar, be provided with travelling chapels and all objects necessary for Orthodox worship. The appointment of a special clergyman to conduct the railway service has also been ordered. This arrangement has been made because the villages and towns along the route in question are usually too far away from the railway itself to make it possible for the railway personnel to attend church.

(Theol. Zeitschr.)

Ban on smoking in the Greek Church. The Bishop of Kursk and Belgorod has issued a serious ban on smoking to the Greek Catholic clergy: "From personal conversations with many representatives of the clergy of our eparchy, as well as from written complaints sent to me, I have had to convince myself with sadness that some representatives of the clergy and even their wives have the disgustingly bad habit of smoking tobacco, which is quite unseemly for ministers of the altar. This habit, which in itself is harmful to health and contrary to sound thinking, gives many members of the congregation cause for offense, while in the Gospel, as we all know, the Lord threatens punishment to those who give offense (Matt. 18:6, 7). For this reason I consider it my duty to recommend to the chief pastors that they direct their special attention to this matter, and in my name to urge the clergy and church officials who suffer from the moral disease of tobacco smoking to give up the sinful habit, mindful of their pastoral duties and fearing God's punishment for the offense given to their neighbor. For my part, I address the same request by these lines to all clergy and church officials who are subject to this pernicious habit. If it be objected that it is difficult to give up a habit of long standing, I answer, It is true, yet possible, and must be given up for the sake of God and His commands by virtue of pastoral duty." (Theol. Zeitschr.)

From Africa. The President of the South African Boer or Transvaal Republic, Paul Krüger, is continually arousing the interest of the political world and has won much sympathy through his courageous and determined stand against the English. A brief characterization of the man will therefore not be unwelcome to the readers of this church newspaper. Krüger's father, of reformed faith like the other Boers, belonged to the so-called "Doppers", i.e. people who distinguish themselves to a special degree by adhering to the traditional, e.g. also in their costume. They also maintain a strict religious direction. Paul Krüger originally wanted to become a preacher, but his father decided that he should remain a farmer, as he himself was. Later, the son also joined the "secluded" church, which emphasized old reformed doctrine and usage. His earnest Christian spirit, together with his unusual eloquence, contributed to his rising from year to year in the esteem of his peers. When in 1860 for the first time German missionaries settled among the Boers for the conversion of the heathens there, Paul Krüger's name was already highly respected. During a war campaign against the Matabele chief Mapela in 1856 he took a leading position in the Boer army and stormed the enemy fortifications in one night. When at the end of the seventies the English General Wolseley solicited his support with great promises, he gave the messengers the answer: "Tell the general who wants me to help him build his house, I refuse my help; his house is built on sand, it will fall; he has begun his work without the Almighty Lord, it will not last." Then in 1880 the Boers revolted against England. Kruger was determined to fight to the death. When in the beginning of the uprising regrettable excesses occurred, assassinations of defenceless Englishmen, he took a serious and successful stand against them. After the peace was concluded, the leaders made speeches to the victors. Paul Kruger made the deepest impression. "God has helped you," he said, among other things, "may his goodness lead you to repentance, that you may rightly turn to him and convert." To an English chaplain, who had made his Er-

admired, he replied: "I have had a good general, my Lord Jesus Christ. The Boers themselves judged of the victory, "God alone did that, and our Kruger with his prayers." Finally, we may mention his characteristic appearance at a synagogue dedication some years ago, which he had to attend as president; to the astonishment of the Jews present, he accompanied his benediction with the words: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

(A. E. L. K.)

The following report on the **conditions of the Dutch Reformed Church in the country of the Boers can be** found in the "D. E. Kirchenzeitung": The ecclesiastical conditions of the Reformed State Church of Transvaal are not pleasant. It is difficult for the uninitiated to find his way through the disputes which have divided the Boers for decades and have assumed a great extent. Religious disagreements have been commonplace among the Boers since the "Vortrekkers" abandoned their old seats in the Capcolonie to move to the unknown north. When, after a long period of wandering and many battles, they gradually settled in the area which now constitutes the South African Republic, they continued for a while to adhere to the statutes of the Dutch Reformed Church, whose synods and synodal decisions were also binding on them. Gradually they broke away from this union, but were not able to unite into a single all-embracing national church, but divided themselves into three sects, which assumed the following names: "Nederduitsche Gereformeerde Kirche," "Nederduitsche hervormde Kirche," and "Dopperkirche," to which latter President Krüger belongs. The two former actually differed from each other only in name; in their doctrines, services, in their internal cultic and external constitutional institutions they were the same. The idea of a reunion of the two was therefore very obvious, and there was no lack of attempts to bring about the reunion. But only after the end of the War of Independence against England did the Boers feel compelled to finally comply with this need, and so the religious peace was achieved in all points except one: the choice of the - name! (?) Each of the two parties wanted to have its name transferred to the united church, and since both parts clung to the name with true Boer tenacity, but could not agree on it at all, it was decided to leave the matter to a later time, but in the meantime to get along as good brothers of the "United Church". The choice of the final name was to be made after three or five, at the latest ten years. The "Hervormde Kirche", at that time the stronger and originally the State Church, from which the work of unification had also been set in scene, quietly hoped to see its name penetrate quite securely. But she had reckoned without the gold fields, which had not yet been discovered at that time. These were scarcely known when the Transvaal rapidly and ever more rapidly received a strong influx of inhabitants of the Capcolonie and Natal, who enormously strengthened the ranks of the "Nederduitsche Gereformeerde Kirche." The "Hervormden Kirche" became frightened; it saw itself pushed back more and more, but still hoped to be able to win, if it could still bring about the choice of name quickly, before the majority was on the side of the opponent. But it was already too late. The name "Gereformeerde Kirche" was chosen with the respectable majority of several thousand votes. This settled the matter for most. - But the defeated party was not satisfied; the spirit of discontent soon broke through again. They did not want to give up the beloved name, and so, very soon after the unification, a new division occurred in the State Church. The dissatisfied left and immediately took the old name "Hervormde Kirche" again.

on. Luck seemed to be with them. Most of the Dutch immigrants from Europe joined them, and in 1888 the "Hervormde Kirche" already numbered about 3000 adherents, among them men in high and influential positions, such as General Joubert and others. The small but energetic party now began to lay claim to the property of the old church of its name, and when the State refused to surrender it willingly, it simply resorted to self-help by seizing by force in 1890 the church in Zeerust as its property from an earlier period, and thereby intervened in the judgment of the Court of Pretoria, to which this ecclesiastical dispute was submitted for decision. A terrible commotion arose. The followers of the Hervormden Church were called by their opponents direct followers of Satan, which increased the bitterness to the highest level. In vain Krüger himself tried to mediate. In vain he explained that the whole matter was nothing more than a dispute over names, and he even went so far as to promise that the question of ownership would be decided in each individual district by a vote of the parishioners on both sides, and that in each case the losing party would be compensated in some other way. This did not help either. Finally, in 1891, the matter was submitted to a conference of delegates from both parties, which passed the following resolution: It is desirable that all parties show themselves to be yielding in the interest of peace and unification. First of all, it should be determined who belonged to the "Hervormden Kirche" in 1885; this should also include those who were later confirmed in the united church. Since, however, both churches differ from each other only in name and not in matter or rite, those who were confirmed after 1885 should be free to choose which church they wish to belong to. The property of the "preceding church" remains with the members of the congregation", where they are in the majority compared to the members of the other church, for which the renouncing part is compensated. In spite of the fact that years have passed, the dispute has still not been settled. The violent events of Zeerust were followed by others of a similar nature and the Court of Pretoria had its hands full with settling them. Still in the year 1894 it had to deliver a judgement which forced the "Gereformeerde Kirche" (State Church) to hand over the property of the "Hervormden Kirche". The court based its judgment on the fact that the agreement of the parties had been announced at the time, but that there was no evidence that it had been accepted by both sides and had thus become legally binding. According to this procedure, the state church is now to restore the former property of the "Hervormden Kirche" in all parts of the country. Two years ago an attempt was made in the Volksraad to have the state intervene against this, but the attempt failed and it is probably for the best. Let the two churches, who are at loggerheads, deal with each other. President Krüger is not directly involved in this dispute, since he belongs to the "Dopperkirche" and this is outside of it. But the "Hervormde Kirche" also forms, to a certain extent, a political party, the Joubert party, whose aspirations are directed toward the presidential chair. A pacification of it in ecclesiastical matters takes away from it much of the sharpness and influence which it exercises in political relations, so that Kruger has a considerable interest in seeing the church question settled. The only question is whether it can be settled at all, for the satisfaction of one church will inevitably arouse the dissatisfaction of the other. It is clear from this that President Krüger, as in external, so also in internal politics, is not bedded on roses.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42. September 1896.

No. 9.

Are political pastors an aberration?

(Conclusion.)

Luther, as is evident from the words quoted, so decisively rejects the so-called Christian legislation in the area of the state. To him, it is a mixture of two kingdoms that are supposed to be separated according to divine order.

And in all efforts to compose and govern the state according to Christian principles, nothing Christian comes out. All the effort that is made in this respect is wasted effort. At the same time one betrays the fact that one does not know what Christianity and Christian principles are. How then does the matter stand? What the state can include in its legislation are parts of the law contained in Scripture, namely, in so far as this law regulates the outward conduct of men toward one another. Supposing, then, that the State were to introduce all the laws contained in Scripture in this respect - in which it would certainly do very well - we should still have no Christian legislation and no government according to "Christian principles". Why not? Well, the law does not constitute the essence of Christianity. The law is rather something that Christianity has in common with paganism, as the apostle expressly testifies, Rom. 2, 14. The essence of Christianity lies in the gospel. Only where the gospel is accepted by faith and has come into the heart, there is Christianity; there are such people who, as they have become children of God through faith in Christ, now also refer their works and their conduct to God and serve God in them. In short, only where there is Christianity through faith in the gospel, there, and only there, are "Christian principles" and "Christian views," even in reference to social conditions. Since when are a number of legal regulations and the external regulation of public life according to them called Christianity? All the

258Are political pastors an aberration?

The advocates of "Christian legislation" on the part of the state suggest that they are in deep ignorance of what Christianity is, that they regard the outward observance of certain legal provisions contained in Scripture as Christianity. Luther writes: "Where worldly rule or law alone reigns, there must be vain hypocrisy, even if it were God's commandments themselves. For without the Holy Spirit in the heart, no one becomes truly devout; let him do whatever fine work he may." 1) It is no more absurd, for example, to instruct quadrupeds, which lack wings, to fly by means of flight regulations, than if the state wants to regulate the "social" conduct of citizens, who lack Christianity, according to "Christian principles. - This is also clear from the examples given in Stöckersche Kirchenzeitung. Let us look more closely at the first and last example given: "The honor of work" and "the heavenly sense in the estimation of earthly good. The honour of labour, according to Christian principles, consists in this, that a man refers the labour of his earthly occupation to God; that he works, not from the well-known natural motives, but because God, who in Christ JEsu has become his God and gracious Father, wants the labour from him. "The heavenly sense in the estimation of earthly good" consists in this, that man's heart has found its satisfaction in the heavenly goods which the gospel brings, and regards earthly good only as a provision on the journey to heaven. But what can be done for these Christian principles by means of state legislation? The State, in order to make them effective, would necessarily have to include the Gospel in its legislation. We would then have the most complete mixture of Church and State. The State would then also have to command the hearing of the Gospel and to proceed with "bodily sounds" against those who fail in this respect, as the Calvinist spirit of Zwingli has done in many places. Admittedly, nothing Christian came out of this either. The state can at best compel the outward hearing of the gospel. It cannot work faith in the gospel. That is reserved for the Holy Spirit. Luther writes in reference to this: "The blind, wretched people do not see how futile and impossible a thing they undertake. For no matter how hard they command, and how much they rage, they could ever force people no further than to follow them with the mouth and with the hand; the heart they may not force, if they should tear themselves apart." 2) Therefore there is nothing in all so-called Christian legislation in the governmental sphere. As it is unchristian in itself, because it mixes state and church against God's order, so nothing Christian comes of it. It remains

1) E. A. 22, 69. 70.

2) E. A. 22, 85.

"Vain hypocrisy," as Luther says. Therefore leave the "Christian principles" to the Christian church, because it has the gospel and thereby produces and maintains Christianity in men. Every agitation, no matter how well-intentioned, which is directed toward bringing Christian principles to bear through state legislation, is perverse political activity.

But not only nothing Christian comes from the mixing of church and state just described. It will also always do great harm. If the church or its ministers direct their efforts to make the world outwardly conform to Christian principles, the world gets the impression that the church is an institute for the improvement of outward, bourgeois morality. Thus the church, by its encroachment upon the domain of the state, falls out of the proper calling which it has toward the world, namely, to preach repentance and faith in Christ to the world. This perversion of the church's profession is already widespread in this country. The American sect preachers often say outright that the real task of the church in the world is to educate good citizens. The president of the Society of Christian Endeavor, which is spread over the whole country, stated in the North American Review that the "Christian endeavors" of this society are directed toward the education of good, loyal American! citizens. Hence the many political and purely civic moral sermons in American pulpits! And the world is happy to put up with such "sermons". After all, it will put up with anything, if only it does not have to repent and believe in Christ. This explains the phenomenon mentioned earlier, that the world occasionally praises and protects "political" preachers, while pastors who preach repentance and forgiveness are a nuisance and a foolishness to them. Poor world! But what a pity it is when the church itself abets the blindness of the world! When the church, instead of preaching the gospel that saves from sin and death, comes before the world with a number of civil ordinances that it likes to call Christian ordinances! She becomes shamefully unfaithful to her profession assigned to her by Christ. She pursues other goals than those set for her by her Lord, Marc. 16, 15. She does not point the world to heaven, but keeps it on earth.

And she herself, the church, must thereby degenerate more and more. The fact that it is involved in politics is already proof that it no longer lives in the Gospel and considers the Gospel to be the true treasure of the Church. Indifference to doctrine is breaking down. Doctrine is no longer to be the primary consideration. Morals and the external order become in

to the forefront. The church sinks to a kingdom of this world. The Apology drastically describes the degeneration of the Roman church, because it got involved in worldly affairs. When one reads the words of the Apology, one involuntarily thinks of the sectarian and state churches that have degenerated from the same cause. The words of the Apology read: "The adversaries do not forget what concerns money and goods; but how the most necessary, most useful offices in Christendom are ordered, there they care nothing. They do not inquire how to teach or preach; they do not inquire how to preserve the Christian use of the sacraments; they ordain crude asses" (scientific and unscientific); "thus the Christian doctrine has perished, that the churches are not filled with competent preachers. They make traditions and infallible burdens to corrupt souls, and whether such their traditions they hold much more firmly than whether God's commandments." 1) Hence Luther's earnest and oft-repeated admonition to the church and its ministers not to fall into "worldly dealings," but to stick to the preaching of the gospel, in which the church has enough and more than enough to do.

And when the church confines itself strictly to the ecclesiastical sphere and is entirely absorbed in the activity assigned to it, it indirectly renders the best services to the secular regime, social and other reforms. In the first place, secular government and civil order owe their very existence to the church. The world, the kingdoms of this world, and all that belongs to them, the civil order, etc., God allows to exist only for the sake of the church and its work, the preaching of the gospel. When the last elect is saved by the preaching of the gospel, God will cause the world and the world empires to fall together. Luther says, "The world at large stands and remains for the sake of this state alone"-namely, for the sake of the ministry of preaching-"otherwise it would long ago have fallen to the ground." 2) Next, the kingdoms of this world enjoy the church in still another way. The individual members of the Church intervene powerfully and exceedingly salutary and beneficial in the life of the state and of the citizenry, by faithfully and conscientiously doing their duty as citizens in all spheres of that life. Christians know that they must also regard their services in the kingdom of this world as divine service and conduct them accordingly. This is pointed out in the sixteenth article of the Augsburg Confession, where it says: "The gospel teaches not an outward, temporal, but an inward, eternal nature and righteousness of the heart, and does not reject worldly regiment, police, and matrimony, but wants all these things to be kept as a true order, and in such states Christian love and love of God to be kept.

1) Müller, p. 286.

2) St. Louis ed. x, 424.

and do right good works, each according to his profession." Christians also, by their good example, cause the children of this world to show more natural honesty and faithfulness in the works of civil and governmental life. Just as the standard of natural right is raised in a region or in a whole country where the strictly moral conduct of many earnest Christians is in view. Thus it is precisely the "personal social virtues," which are held in somewhat low esteem by the "Christian social reformers" of today, that the church must emphasize in its members for the good of the civil community. She has enough to do with that. She need not burden herself with the useless and foolish work of trying to make the world outwardly Christian. It has enough to do with its own members proving themselves to be true Christians in the various civil classes and professions. It must only too often experience that its members, who, for example, enter upon a political career, do not display the "personal social virtues" befitting a Christian, but adopt the "social" vices common among un-Christians, to the shame of the Christian name and to great harm to the civil community. Oh, how different and better things would soon look in the political sphere if all who bear the Christian name and hold political offices were to prove their Christianity in personal civic virtues! In America, in many political bodies, e.g. in the state legislatures and in the Congress of the United States, the Christians, that is, those who call themselves members of a Christian community, are for the most part in the majority. How, as if with a blow, political life would take on an entirely different face if these people practiced their Christianity in political virtues! Here the church lends a hand for the good of the civil community. But let it give up all attempts to compose and govern the world or the civil community according to "Christian principles," because this is impossible and against the order of God. The civil polities or the states are to be constituted according to natural law or according to reason, which Luther calls the "fountain of law," from which the laws in the state or world empire spring. 1) Natural law or reason is the divine law for the state. The Gospel, and in general the whole revealed Word of God, is the divine law for the Church.

F. P.

1) E. A. 22, 105.

Frank's Theology.

(Conclusion.)

After we have illuminated Frank's doctrinal position, we will highlight several points of Christian and ecclesiastical practice from his "System of Christian Morality," the fundamental basis of which we have already touched upon in our discussion of his theory of regeneration, conversion, and sanctification.

Frank treats in detail the ecclesiastical position of a Christian, especially a Lutheran Christian, the behavior of the same against his own church and against other Particular Churches. He first emphasizes the necessity of a formulated ecclesiastical confession, then shows how divisions in the confession have occurred, and points out that the various particular churches, even during and after the confessional separation, have held fast to the confession of the earliest ecumenical symbols, which referred to the central elements of the Christian faith. In order not to be involved in the sin of contradicting the truth of salvation on which it lives, one church has separated itself from another by means of its confession: nothing can be more thoughtless than the opinion that such separations should have been omitted, for the sake of love, for instance, or because one was united in the main matter. It might just as well be demanded that some one, for love's sake, in order not to fall out with others, should commit a sin of which he has no doubt as to its character as a sin. But only conscious sin, however; wanton sin is incompatible with the state of grace: If, therefore, the error, the reversal of the truth of salvation, which is never without moral fault, is held by the other party without such consciousness, in the opinion that in it he confesses a piece of divine truth, the moral obligation of the other party to follow his better knowledge confessionally is not thereby abolished, but the position toward the erring and the judgment about them is thereby modified." According to this, it is the duty of Lutheran Christians to follow their better judgment in every way, and to keep themselves separate from other church communities which have perverted the truth of salvation, even in the case when they are convinced that their opponents *bona fide* confess error. This is a correct maxim. But it seems peculiar to one that here a theologian stands up for the right of the Lutheran confession, who contradicts it in all articles of doctrine and teaches precisely that which is rejected in the Lutheran confession as contrary doctrine and error. The Modern "Ecclesiastical" Theologians

With their pronounced "confessionalism" they only deceive the simple-minded Christians by giving them the opinion that they, the teachers and leaders of the church, still represent and defend the old biblical Lutheran doctrine. How this fits in with "Christian morality" they may settle with their own consciences.

Frank, therefore, does not even seriously think of consequently carrying out this right principle, the demand to separate from error. On the other hand, he urges the following: "In general, what is no less in accord with these principles than with the state of life of conscious evangelical Christians within the individual confessions, is that the Christian must continue his spiritual life begun in such a particular church in fellowship with it, in an exchange of receiving and giving, as long as that fellowship does not prevent him from asserting and further developing this life. A member of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, notwithstanding his conviction that his confession possesses the evangelical truth in its purest form, has no reason to make the unreasonable demand that members of the Reformed or the Uniate Church must leave it without further ado and join the Lutheran Church. Nor does the fact that such a Christian's own church has been corrupted by anti-evangelical tendencies, by false doctrine and lack of discipline, constitute a moral necessity to abandon such a community, from which, after all, one's own spiritual life originates and to which one is pointed by historical guidance. How many believing souls, at the time of the generally prevailing nationalism, maintained and furthered their spiritual life with the help of their Bible and their edification books, which kept up their connection with the Church of God, without separating themselves from the ecclesiastical community of that time. Before speaking in any way of the right or of the duty of separation, such and similar facts will have to be considered." P. 123. "Only one thing should be certain to us, and with this the tide turns, that a Christian may suffer unspeakably much from sin, but cannot do it with a conscious will." "Though there may be much folly and injustice in an ecclesiastical community, yet the moment when the possibility of mere bearing ceases, will not occur until the individual's life is at stake, so that he shall be compelled to deny the truth, and to commit sin." S. 126.

In Frank's opinion, a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Church should remain faithful to this church and not join a community of another faith, but on the other hand, he should not demand that members of the Reformed or Uniate Church leave their church and join the Lutheran Church. How? Is it not a duty, a service of love, if we Lutherans, who hold the evangelical truth, are not to be a part of the Lutheran Church?

What is the reason for this, if we possess the purest form of our own spirituality, to offer this treasure of ours to others? We will not, of course, be so imprudent as to demand of reformed and un-reformed Christians that they leave their church fellowship and come over to us as soon as possible, before they have recognized the differences, but we will nevertheless testify to them, according to profession and opportunity, that their church harbors and cultivates questionable errors, and that it is dangerous to live under the influence of error. Above all, we are interested in Frank's judgment of the right conduct of Lutheran Christians toward their own church, in the case that the latter is "decomposed by anti-evangelical tendencies, corrupted by false doctrine and lack of discipline. He obviously has in mind the so-called Lutheran churches in Germany, in which false teachers of all kinds are in office and so many obviously godless, unbelieving people have a seat and a voice, and in which, according to all previous experience, there is no hope for an improvement of conditions. As things stand, Frank sees no moral necessity for believing Christians to give up such a community. He reminds them that their own spiritual life comes from this community. But they truly do not owe their spiritual life, their Christianity, to the error with which their so-called mother church is infected, but to the remaining truth, and they are only committed to the truth and remain faithful to the truth when they separate themselves from a community from which error can no longer be separated and eliminated. Frank further refers to "the historical guidance." But how, if this "history" is not guided by God's hand, but, admittedly under God's permission, is determined by human folly, by sin and Satan? The devil also has an ancient, historical right in the church. According to Frank's instruction, a believing Christian should persevere in a corrupt church community at least as long as the assertion and further development of his spiritual life is not hindered. Who, what is to decide this? One's own deceptive consciousness? We have here again the old swarm-mindedness. No doubt the spiritual life is hindered and damaged by sin. It all hinges here on the question of whether a Christian can remain in a false-believing and unfeeling church community without sin. Frank, too, finally declares that the possibility of mere bearing ceases as soon as the individual is compelled to commit sin; a Christian may well suffer much from sin, but never consciously commit sin. But a Christian is compelled to sin when it is made impossible for him to do the will of God. God's Word also speaks clearly about the Christian, ecclesiastical action in question. The Scriptures command Christians to avoid false teaching and false teachers, to separate themselves from false teachers, to exclude obviously ungodly people from the Christian church, to avoid the fellowship of unbelievers, and to avoid the church.

left. Matth. 7, 15. Rom. 16, 17. 1 Joh. 4, 1. Matth. 18, 15-17. 1 Cor. 5, 13. 2 Cor. 6, 14-18. Every Christian who is and remains a member of a church that is corrupted by false doctrine and immorality and thereby maintains the church connection with false teachers and obviously godless people is acting against this clear command of Christ and His apostles. It is deceit and self-deception when the leaders and teachers of the German national churches persuade themselves and others that this is only a matter of carrying and suffering, of carrying foreign folly and foreign wrong. No, no Christian can remain in the fellowship of the national church without contradicting the word of the Lord, without himself committing sin and wrong. Nor do we absolve from all guilt those pious souls who, at the time of the prevailing rationalism, nourished their spiritual life with the Bible and good edifying books, without separating themselves from the ecclesiastical fellowship of that time. But if God, in a time of general ignorance, overlooked such errors and, through his marvelous power and grace, preserved their faith even in the midst of a completely apostate church, this is not a letter of safety for today's Christians and theologians, who, after God has again given them better knowledge, neglect and fight against the separation commanded by God.

Frank remembers the separations of these days and the difference between those who separate and those who hold back with the following words: "We must not be hasty in our judgment when we notice that others hold back in a struggle against heresy and corruption that leads to separation, a struggle that is justified in itself and approved by us. Such restraint may be cowardice, and in some way it is undoubtedly connected with sin. But here everything depends on the position of conscience, on the gift, on the measure of knowledge, and as it is incumbent on the individual not to injure his soul by transgressions against his better knowledge and conscience, so in such a case we may counsel others and exhort them to prudent conduct, but we shall leave to God the judgment as to what is indispensable for the preservation of their salvation. We will have to act in the same way in the opposite case, when protests are made against the corruption that has taken place in the church, and separations are thereby brought about under circumstances where the moral necessity of proceeding to the extreme is not apparent to us. It may be that a false sharpening or binding of conscience is the cause of such action, a legal standpoint on which one does not know how to distinguish the unessential from the essential. There are, to use a military expression, -immature attacks^, attacks which have not been sufficiently prepared, and which therefore, for all their bravado, remain without success. But here, too, one must not be too hasty in judging-

judge. Such agitations, oppositions, and separations may be quite inconvenient to those who - rightly, after all - consider them unnecessary, untimely, especially to the respective church regiments; but from a later historical point of view, they appear slightly different, for instance, as preparations for a later Reformation that would not have come about without them. Seen from the present, they are really 'immature attacks,' in which much blood, such as martyr's blood, is apparently shed in vain, and yet, according to later judgment, these premature attacks were necessary to shake for the time being the position of the adversary, which was afterwards assailed with success." P. 128. This is the purest subjectivism and probabilism. What is right for one is said to be wrong for another; one and the same thing is said to be untimely, erroneous, unsuccessful from one point of view, necessary and fruitful from another. In such a position God's Word ceases altogether to be a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path. God's Word makes the same demand on all Christians without distinction, namely, to speak with our confession: "It is hard to want to separate from so many countries and people and to lead a special doctrine, but here is God's command that everyone should beware, and not be in agreement with those who lead unrighteous doctrine or intend to maintain it with despotism.

The German Landeskirchen are at present state churches in the full sense of the word. Frank deals especially with the state church system by excusing and defending it to the best of his ability. He writes: "We know nothing of a divine institution of a certain church constitution and certain church regimental! offices. We can get along with any order that leaves us the evangelical preaching of salvation, the administration of the holy sacraments, and allows us to practice our faith. It is not necessary for us to diminish and blunt our ecclesiastical and moral principles, in order to permit state organs a greater or lesser influence on the ordering of ecclesiastical relations, except the unabridged granting of that which alone is essential to us." In any case, the church, as an external organization, needs a legal order, and if it allows this to be provided by the legal community of the state, on the basis of an interpenetration of state and ecclesiastical life, while preserving the spiritual, confessional task that belongs to the bearers of the spiritual office as such, then we have no reason to object to this combination from the Christian ethical standpoint. We prefer the emergency roof of the princely sumpiscopate, with all its consequences, to the papal hierarchy, this caricature of Christian community, and we still want to be sure of the proof by which greater ruin is brought to the church.

whether by the secularized Roman Catholic or by the nationalized Protestant church government. And even if only bitter servitude is the reward for the benefit which the church of the Reformation has done to the state, if the latter, instead of regulating the principles of church life by law, allows its interests to be decisive and uses the church as a means to state ends, the decisive question for the Christian conscience, for the conduct of the church as well as of the individual, will always be this, whether or not the church, even as *ecclesia pressa*, is still left the possibility of continuing the functions essential to it through the spiritual office." Frank justifies the mixture of state and church, on which the present state churches are based, and thus contradicts the word and will of Christ, who wants these two spheres, state and church, world kingdom and kingdom of God, to be strictly separated from each other. Matth. 22, 21. Luc. 22, 25. 26. Joh. 18, 36. As certainly as church constitutions, church ordinances, and church government are not divine institutions, as certainly as Scripture contains no definite norms for the organization of a church community, for the union of several Christian congregations into a whole, On the other hand, according to the Scriptures, all church power and, consequently, all conceivable church functions, including those of church government, are given into the hands of the church, and it is an absurdity and profanation of the sacred if organs outside the church, state organs, regulate and order church relationships. It is inevitable that the state, as Frank also admits, allows its interests to be decisive. It is obvious how the state church regiments govern the churches subordinate to them according to state principles. For example, the state has imposed its state marriage laws on the state church. The state must tolerate all kinds of injustice in its territory, and so the state church proclaims toleration in the same way. But it is illusion, or rather delusion, to suppose that the church, or rather the spiritual office, can still continue the functions essential to the church under such bondage. No, the pastors of the regional churches are compelled, if they want to remain in office, to do in many cases the opposite of what Christ commanded his church to do. They are compelled to copulate all those couples to whom the state has granted marriage licenses, even where God's Word forbids marriage. All possibility of practicing the church discipline instituted by Christ, Matth. 18, 15-17, is cut off from the national church congregations. And to make black into white is to declare such disobedience to the Lord of the church to be a disgrace to Christ, as it is ordained for the *ecclesia pressa*.

What Christians can put up with according to Frank's judgment is shown by the following omission: "Of course, the situation becomes more difficult when

the state and ecclesiastical rulers touch the existence of the confession itself, for instance by pretending not to want to touch it, when they decree on their own authority that the confession has lost its separating meaning; when in cabinet orders the church is shown the ways it has to go, or princes who come to government as 'summi episcopi' make known to the church their opinion of will about the needs and affairs of the same; or when a new minister of culture soon gives directions as to how far the yes or the no of faith in the church is justified and permissible; when such state-church authorities continue to create organs of church administration, synods, church councils, etc., which are based on the needs and affairs of the church. If the perfectly well-founded principles of the Reformation concerning the competence of the Christian congregation to manage its affairs are caricatured and transferred to congregations to which it never occurred to the Reformers to attribute such competences. In such cases, according to the respective spiritual knowledge and the position of the individual in the organism of the church, the question will come to him and the like-minded communities whether and to what extent they may or must submit to those ecclesiastical measures. To prescribe with unconditional certainty, once and for all, for every person involved, what he is to do in this case, that he is to resist and leave the degenerate church system, is therefore impossible, because the respective position of conscience, the higher or lower knowledge, the ecclesiastical profession, etc., have a say in this. What the one can endure without harming his conscience, his Christian standing, it is morally impossible for the other to endure." If, then, a pastor of a national church, for instance, recognizes, at least *in practice*, the parity of faith or unbelief, the equal rights of the yes and no of faith in the church, on which the existence of all national churches, even of the so-called Lutheran churches, is based, and absolves, communicates, gives Christian burials, etc., to obviously unbelieving church members, he can do this without harming his conscience, his Christian standing? Where is the Christian conscience left?

Frank defends the modern state church with all its evil consequences against the so-called Principienreiter. He thinks that even a bearer of state power, who is a stranger to the faith of the church, can handle the ecclesiastical order quite well, that a Protestant church often does quite well even under a Catholic "summus episcopus". He finds a certain "measure of compulsion" in the church quite appropriate. "Without such external force even ecclesiastical communion cannot exist." "No one will willingly obey the obligations incumbent upon him for the external maintenance of the ecclesiastical system.

and without a previous and proper solution of the union." He has no idea that in a church, where things are right, the Word alone determines everything. Taxes, however, which are collected by force and violence, are necessary to the existence of a national church, and especially the theological professors there would fare badly if their external existence depended on the free gifts and sacrifices of the church members.

In the context of the duties of the church and its members, Frank also speaks about "the scientific-theological teaching authority. There he comes to speak of the fact, which at the present time is deplored by all serious Christians and preachers of Germany, that the students of theology at the German universities are exposed to the influence of unbelieving theological professors, but he also knows how to appease the troubled minds and consciences. "Now here the representatives of practice should have some patience with those of theory. There, too, there are difficulties which cannot be removed from the world at once: one must reckon with them and bear them temporarily. Thus it happens in learned theology, too, that in times of unbelief, of the lapse of spiritual experience, mountains of errors and difficulties are heaped up, which cannot simply be left to one side, the less so as they have arisen on the occasion of moments of truth. And to this must be added the fact that, in accordance with the historical development of our Church, the position of theological doctors is no less a state than an ecclesiastical one. For the state, it is a task of education and culture, which it pursues with the universities, and therefore also with the theological faculties, in order to achieve state and national goals; the ecclesiastical purpose is only secondary. Here lie difficulties which cannot be removed with a stroke of the pen or with a brief, energetic resolution. It may happen that unbelievers, apostates, enemies of the gospel, who, however, are distinguished by abundance of natural gifts, by great learning, may, on account of state appointment, obtain the theological magisterium; but are you sure of the contrary, if it were merely a matter for the organized church to appoint to the theological magisterium?" P. 168. 169. While the prophets pronounce woe on false prophets, while the apostle Paul curses every teacher who preaches the gospel otherwise than he preached it, in Frank's opinion "unbelievers, apostates, enemies of the gospel" are a still tolerable evil in theological chairs. He is quite blind to this great abomination of desolation in the holy place, to the deceit of error, by which thousands of poor souls are plunged into ruin. He has lost all and every spiritual judgment here. He still sees light there, where there is only darkness.

He is a star. He says that the errors of today's theologians are the result of moments of truth, while they are born of lies and come from the father of lies. By the way, he draws the circle of "unbelievers," the "enemies of the gospel," very narrow. He once remarks: "It is not error per se, even if it reaches into the center of the knowledge of salvation, that causes us to miss the way of salvation ... but devotion to error in connection with the chaining of the heart to idolatrous goods." Thus, according to Frank's judgment, an "honest" Ritschlian who denies the central dogmas of Christianity, the mystery of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the atonement through Christ, can, in spite of these errors, still become blessed and make blessed those who hear him! Modern ecclesiastical theology has gone so far as to blur the line between Christianity and antichristianity and to make us forget what belongs to the essence of Christianity.

But not only with regard to the ecclesiastical conduct of the Christian, but also in other respects, the moral norms which Frank sets forth in his system conflict with the unified norma vitae, the holy Scriptures. It is impossible for us to deal here with all the manifold activities of the Christian moral life. For example, we will pick out only a few points from the extensive field of Christian morality. Frank judges the duel as follows: "There are differences of degree in natural morality, the importance of which we have already appreciated. He who stands up for his honor, and who may stand up for it with his life, stands morally higher than he who accepts insults in dull callousness, and the common desire for revenge that lashes out at the insulter with a club stands lower than the impulse, which is admittedly erroneous according to Christian understanding, to face the opponent with a bare weapon in one's hand and thereby prove oneself to be a free, fearless, honorable man. This must be taken into account in pedagogical treatment. Wherever and so long as the highest, Christian moral attitude and conception cannot be brought about - and nothing can be forced in this - it will be permissible and commanded to acknowledge the relatively better as such and to give it preference over the mean." P. 327. 328. With such lazy arguments all sorts of crimes may be re-stamped as something relatively morally good. Not only according to Christian, but also according to common human morality, according to the law that is written in the hearts of all men, the duel is murder, or suicide, nothing else, conscious and intended murder, and the authorities neglect what is their duty when they omit to decapitate or hang on the gallows duelists who have shot their opponents. He who calmly puts up with insults, who strikes at his insulter with a club, not in order to kill him, but in order to beat him up.

The man who is able to put himself in a position to fight a duel, no matter how morally repudiated he may otherwise be, is at least not a murderer in the outward, crude sense of the word, like one who confronts his neighbor with a bare weapon in a fight to the death. The concept of "freedom, fearlessness, honorableness," which, according to the above *raison d'être*, makes dueling among worldly men seem permissible, even imperative, is also, according to the natural moral ethos, a corrupt concept. As Rector of the University of Erlangen, Frank also practiced this theory in his time and allowed the students who fought duels to run free. - Frank regards and treats dancing as a moral *adiaphoron*, and not only dancing itself, "insofar as it is a matter of noble, rhythmic movement of the human body," but also the dancing that is customary in the world today, "insofar as a rapprochement of the different sexes is brought about by it. "It need not be mere complacency if noble forms are held to in such intercourse; for the sexes depend upon each other even in this, and educate each other. It is better to permit the train of approach within certain limits marked out by good custom (!), than to contain it from the outset, thereby agitating and directing it on wrong courses." The Scripture says: "Love not the world, nor the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, in him is not the love of the Father. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." 1 John 2:15-17. Incidentally, anyone who once studied in Erlangen or even in Leipzig, when he reads the above description of "innocent" dancing, feels involuntarily transported back to the life and doings of university circles, and remembers how the daughters of the theological professors also fluttered about at all private and public balls, masquerades, etc., while their daughters were in a state of rebellion. while their fathers kept up good comradeship with their colleagues, also pronounced materialists, atheists, scoffers, over beer and jokes. (NB. The thing was obvious to everyone, even to him who kept away from it.) - Among the old Jewish teachers of the law there were, as is well known, two schools, a stricter and a more lax one, of which the latter permitted an Israelite to divorce his wife for any cause, while the former recognized only adultery as a ground for divorce. Judgment on divorce is still a measure of morality today. Frank is liberal in this piece as well. Besides adultery and *desertio malitiosa*, he regards other cases "analogous" to the latter as ecclesiastically permissible grounds for divorce. What can one not accomplish there, if it is permissible to add to and expand at will what Scripture places as commanded or forbidden or permitted!

Frank is an opportunist in every sense of the word. He knows how to get himself into the situation. From what I've told you, it's clear enough from what-

The first thing he said was that his system of Christian morality flowed from the same source. Truly not from the Christian ego, which lets itself be determined in all things by the word and commandment of Christ, and to which all other considerations are subordinated, but from the old, natural ego, which is guided by the course of the world and of time, and, so far as it reckons with and handles "Christian standards," remodels them according to time, circumstances, and conditions. Frank's theology, both as regards doctrine and life, leads his disciples and followers astray. There is a certain method in it, but it is μεῦοδεῖα της πλάνης. Eph. 4, 14. before the

Forum of truth, the holy scripture, this theology cannot stand. Ritschl or Frank - that is now the inevitable alternative for German theologians. For our part, we must disavow both theological directions with equal decisiveness. Ritschl's theology is pure, naked paganism, outwardly adorned only with Christian names and titles. In Frank's system the well-known "Christian realities" are woven in; they give the thing a Christian appearance, but so far as it is a system and has systematically worked out the Christian dogmas and principles, it is likewise pagan-rationalistic philosophy, which reasoned about God, the world, heaven, and the way to heaven just as the natural man is wont to think and talk about these things. We thank God that we have a firm prophetic word and a doctrine and theology which is built on this unshakable foundation and will therefore remain when the modern systems fall over one by one.

G. St.

The position of Lutheran symbols in relation to Scripture - proof that our confession represents literal inspiration.

(Conclusion.)

From what has been said in the previous two issues of this journal about the position of the Formula of Concord in relation to sacred Scripture, it is clear that Scripture is the only source and norm of all theological truths. Apart from the direct statements to this effect, it follows from this that the Scriptures must also be the infallible, inspired word of God for the Formula of Concord. Only on the premise that Scripture in all its parts contains nothing but divine truth, is inspired, infallible, and inerrant, is the Concordia formula justified in granting Scripture the exalted position in theology which it, together with the other Lutheran symbols, concedes to it. A book to which human origin, defect, and blemish are attached cannot, without idolatry, be accorded the

The Bible can only be ascribed the authority and majesty that the Concordia formula grants to Scripture. Only then can the sacred Scriptures be set over against all products of the human mind with the same supremacy as God is over the world, if the Bible can trace its genesis back to God, while all other writings are of creaturely origin. If the Formula of Concord wants us to submit all Scriptures, even the ecumenical symbols, to the holy Scriptures par excellence, and demands that we should trust the Scriptures implicitly, believe the Word, and not question any letter of the Scriptures or take a critical attitude toward them, this can only be done without idolatry if every word of Scripture has come from the mouth of God. As we may and ought to trust in Christ, only because he is true God with the Father and Holy Spirit, so we may and ought to trust in the Scriptures, but only because they are God's Word par excellence. If the Scriptures were not divinely inspired and infallible, the Lutheran Church would have to meet the word: "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and holdeth flesh for his arm, and departeth from the Lord with his heart." She would indeed be in the same sin and condemnation with antichristianity, which holds the pope and his judgment to be infallible.

It would also be a gross contradiction in terms if, on the one hand, our confession were to extol Scripture as the sole source and standard of faith and life, while on the other hand it were to call into question the divine infallibility of Scripture. Every sensible man must admit that Scripture, if it is to be the source of truth for us, must in itself be a pure and untainted fountain, without any impure admixture. If the stream is to be pure, the source from which it flows must not be impure. A fountain from which error and truth flow at the same time can no more be the principle of truth than can the corrupt human heart of itself be the source of all piety and virtue. And if Scripture is not only to write all things, but also to judge all things, but is itself to be judged by no one, then again every reasonable man must admit that this can only take place if Scripture is divinely inspired and infallible. The author of such a Scripture, which is to seal and judge all things, can only be the infallible, omniscient, truthful God himself, who can and will always judge rightly and speak the truth. And if many modern theologians want to drop the infallibility of Scripture, but at the same time hold fast to its authority as teacher or judge, this can only be done - if their position is otherwise a consciously chosen and championed one - with Jesuitical ulterior motives, which in fact deny reason its authority.

Primacy over Scripture. Thus, the exalted position of Scripture as the source and norm of all doctrine, which the Formula of Concord, as well as the other Lutheran symbols, concedes to Scripture, undeniably makes its inspiration and infallibility its necessary postulate, and we are confronted with the alternative of either branding the entire theology of our symbols, indeed, that of the entire Lutheran Church, as bibliolatry and gross inconsistency, or else declaring Scripture to be the inspired, infallible Word of God. *Tertium non datur.*

However, not only indirectly, but also directly, it can be confirmed, as from the other confessional writings, so also from the Formula of Concord, that Scripture is the infallible word of God. It is precisely the purity, truthfulness, infallibility, and inerrancy of Scripture that finds repeated, clear, and powerful expression in the Formula of Concord. Scripture is to her "the truth," 7, "the light of the gospel and of the only saving truth," 3, "the light of divine truth," which we ought not to put under the table and bushel. 20. The enemies of Scripture are to the Concordia formula "adversaries of divine truth." 5. Scripture contains to it the "pure doctrine of divine word." 4. It is the "pure aloud word of God." 5. The writings of the prophets and apostles are "pure" writings. 696, 96. 726, 7. Truth and puritas is to the Concordia formula an essential quality of sacred Scripture. 569, 5. To hold fast to Scripture, therefore, means nothing else than to hold fast to "pure divine truth." 568, 2. The Scriptures tell us what we are to hold to be right and true, and what we are to reject, flee, and shun as false and wrong. 572, 16. The prophetic and apostolic Scriptures are the "pure noisy fountain of Israelis, limpidissimi purissimique Israelis fontes." 568:3 The Scriptures do not merely contain truths, they are truth itself. For this very reason everything that is written in Scripture and taken from it is truth. Inasmuch as anything is taken from the Scriptures, it partakes of their divinity. Thus, for example, the Lutheran confession, because it is well founded in prophetic and apostolic Scripture, is "divine truth. 21:6 And he who departs from the Scriptures is in error, and he who abides in the Scriptures abides in the truth. Scripture is the pure, and therefore also the "infallible and immutable word of God, sincera et immota verbi Dei veritas." 12. (12) From this it follows that every doctrine of it, immota veritas, is also eternal truth. 6. 571, 13. Thus, for example, according to the Formula of Concord, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is *eo ipso*, because it is taken from Scripture, "the infallible truth of the divine Word." 17. the aucturity of Scripture is its "invicta auctoritass," which has not yet lost its prestige in any point. 565, 4. The Scripture is a "firm and immovable

Rock". 760. It is "certissima regula", absolutely sure and reliable norm to judge all teachers and teachings. 569, 3. The sayings of Scripture are "Bright irrefutable testimonies, clarissima et solidissima testimonia, solida fundamenta." 570, 6. 572, 17. Nothing more reliable than a scriptural statement is even conceivable. And this is true not only of some, but of all scriptural statements. If a saying is a scriptural testimony, it also infallibly contains certain truth. What the immediately obvious fundamental truths in logic and mathematics are for reason, that - and much more - are the individual sayings of Scripture in theology for faith. All that Scripture says is clear, certain, and solid, not merely for the moment, but for all eternity, so that not a jot of it will pass away. "Verbum Dei - says 540, 13 - non est falsum aut mendax." Whatever is written cannot be untrue or false. 550, 37. Scripture cannot be broken. Every statement that comes into conflict with Scripture is false. Error is never in harmony with Scripture, but rather in conflict with it. 005 Every false doctrine is a doctrine contrary to the word of God. (16) He therefore that hath the Scriptures cannot err, except he, like the errorists, willfully and wantonly pervert "the dry, bright, clear word of Christ's testament, and the true testimonies of holy writ. (760) To this, then, the false spirits are also directed, "by the special and crafty cunning of Satan, to lead men out of the holy Scriptures. (759) "He that keepeth himself to the same (Scripture) simplicity, with a right simple faith, keepeth his soul and conscience for the best, as that which is built upon a firm and immovable rock. Matt. 7 and 17, Gal. I. Ps. 119." S. 760.

Thus, according to the Concordia formula, Scripture is absolutely reliable and thoroughly infallible. And this comes to Scripture because it is God's Word. According to the Concordia formula, Scripture cannot lie or be false because it is God's Word. 540, 13. As God's Word, Scripture is eternal truth, and as such may be laid at the foundation of theology. 571, 13. Scripture is accordingly called by the Concordia formula the "divine prophetic apostolic Scripture," 4, the "holy Scripture," 711, 32, „*sacrosancta* prophetica et apostolica scriptura," 3, 19, or also (both attributes joined) "the holy divine Scripture," 18. 633, 3. 572, 17, the "holy divine Word," 646, 1. By all these expressions the Concordia formula intends to emphasize that in Scripture we have God's Word, divine revelation before us. 685:53. It is true that the Concordia formula also speaks of the Bible as the "writings of the prophets and apostles," because prophets and apostles wrote it. But the actual author of the Scriptures, according to the Concordia formula, is the Holy Spirit, who, in the

He used the prophets and the apostles as his instruments. The Scriptures are inspired by God to the men of God. *Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata*. Three times the Concordia formula confesses the passage 2 Tim. 3, 16.: All Scripture is inspired of God. 707, 12. 642, 14. 572, 14.

For this reason, the Concordia formula also wants Scripture to be respected and treated as God's word when interpreting it. If the Scriptures contradict our reason or so-called experience, or if one passage of Scripture seems to contradict another, then instead of mastering the Scriptures with our reason, we should take our reason captive to the obedience of the Word and faith. Concordia speaks of this in the Article of the Lord's Supper pp. 656, 45-47 in the following glorious manner: "So then we owe not to interpret and construe these words of the eternal, true, and almighty Son of God, our Lord, Creator, and Redeemer JEsu Christ, as foggy, figurative, foreign speeches, otherwise than they seem to our reason, but to accept the words, as they are, in their proper, clear understanding, with simple faith and obedience, and not to be hindered from them by any objection or human contradiction, spun out of human reason, however pleasant they may seem to reason....however pleasant they may seem to reason, turn us aside. - How Abraham, when he hears God's word of the sacrifice of his son, whether he had cause enough to dispute whether the words, because they are not only against all reason and against the divine and natural law, but also against the high article of faith of the promised seed Christ, who was to be born of Isaac, should be publicly disputed, should be understood according to the letter or with an easy or gentle gloss! Nevertheless, as before, when the promise was made to him of the promised seed born of Isaac (though it seemed impossible to his reason), he gave God the glory of truth, and concluded and believed in the most certain way that God could do what he promised: So also here he understands and believes God's word and commandment plainly and badly, as they are according to the letter, and leaves it to God's omnipotence and wisdom, which he knows to have many more ways and means of fulfilling the promise of the seed of Isaac than he can understand with his blind reason. - So we also, with all humility and obedience to our Creator and Redeemer, are to believe plainly, firmly, clearly, and earnestly, without all doubt and disputation, as it may rhyme or reason with our understanding. For this Lord hath spoken such words, who is infinite wisdom and truth itself, and can certainly put into operation and accomplish all that he promises." See also pp. 667, 92. 696, 96.

As the Word of God inspired by the Holy Spirit, as *verbum Dei*, the Scripture of the Formula of Concord is now also "*instrumentum Spiritus Sancti, quo conversionem hominis efficit*". 526, 19. Man's word, probably even deceitful man's word, cannot have such high effect as is ascribed to Scripture. But of Scripture as the word of God, what is written in Concordia 710:20 applies: "And such a calling of God, which is done by the preaching of the word, we are not to hold up to any mirror fencing, but know that by it God reveals his will, that he may work in those whom he thus calls by the word, that they may be enlightened, converted, and saved. For the word, by which we are called, is a ministry of the Spirit, which gives the Spirit, or by which the Spirit is given, 2 Cor. 3, and a power of God to make blessed, Rom. 1. And because the Holy Spirit by the word desires to be strong, to strengthen, to give power and ability, God's will is that we should receive the word, believe, and follow the same." See still pp. 710, 29. 601, 52.

This Scripture, inspired and filled by the Holy Spirit, and therefore divinely true and powerful, is now, according to the Formula of Concord, the necessary condition for the certainty of our Christian faith. If enthusiasts, who boast of immediate enlightenment, conversion, and the sealing of grace, attach little or no importance to the divine truthfulness and efficacy of Scripture, this is not to be wondered at. Lutherans, however, know only a certainty of faith that springs from the inspired and therefore divinely true and effective Scriptures. Accordingly, in their preface to the Book of Concord, the Lutheran princes confess that they are "certain of their Christian confession and faith from divine prophetic and apostolic Scripture. (19) Without the Scriptures, nothing remains to them but uncertain "*opinionones* and doubtful, disputable delusions and opinions, *opinionones et ἑποχαι academicae*. Thus, according to the Concordia formula, only Scripture can transform the skeptical "*ἐπέχειν*" - 19 - into faith. certainty. Without Scripture, left to himself, man is left only with delusion, uncertain opinions, and open questions, of which modern theology, with its "attempts" and "open questions," is a chilling example. Of the enthusiasts who, for the sake of their scripture-less, untenable theology of opinion, refer to their thinking, their necessary thinking, and to whom, according to the definition of our Confessions, the newer scientific Lutheran theologians must also be counted, the Concordia formula says with Luther 669, 103: "Who will believe their thinking? By what do they make such thinking certain? Quo argumentorum genere hos cogitationes suas confirmabunt?" Undoubted knowledge, faith arises to them solely from revelation of holy Scripture. 736 In the Epilogus to the Catalogus Testimoniorum it says

es 759: "Vera et salvifica fides nullius neque veteris, neque recentioris ecclesiae doctoris testimonio, sed solius et unius Dei verbo in scriptis prophetarum et apostolorum testium veritatis coelestis maxime ἀξιόπιστων comprehenso, velut fundamento immoto, inniti oportet." 759 Whoever, therefore, denies the inspiration and infallibility of sacred Scripture, destroys, according to the Concordia formula, as much as there is in him, both Christian theology, and the beatific faith.

After we have thus pointed out to the reader, on the one hand, the almost innumerable passages in all our confessional writings in which the holy Scriptures are highly praised as the sole source of theology and the only norm of faith and life, which has the inspiration, infallibility, and divinity of Scripture as its necessary prerequisite, On the other hand, however, also on the many passages in which, once upon a time, the infallibility, inerrancy, inspiration, and divinity of Scripture itself are expressly and vigorously emphasized, - we have to consider the verdict of modern pseudo-Lutheran theology: "Our ecclesiastical confession contains nothing on the question of inspiration" as an exceedingly frivolous, false, un-Lutheran, nay, downright slanderous one. At the same time, however, we rejoice that by God's grace we stand with our unambiguous and cheerful confession on the literal inspiration and infallibility of Holy Scripture not only - which alone is decisive - in Scripture, but also on the ground of all Lutheran confessions.

F. B.

Miscellany.

Boys' and Men's Clubs. On the dangers threatening the Young Men's and Young Men's Associations, the President of the International Central Committee, Cd. Barde in Geneva: "In the past, at the time of the foundation of our associations (which goes back half a century), their main focus was on the salvation of young men. Nowadays they also want to entertain and instruct them. And I do not think I am a prophet of misfortune if I notice here and there a tendency to regard entertainment, if not as a means to salvation, at least to confuse the two with each other. But that would be nothing less than progress. . . . Numerous recent facts give full justification to this cry of warning. I was recently informed of a most amusing evening entertainment which was given by a young men's club not far from Geneva. Much life, exuberant merriment, extremely successful disguises, very funny presentations, nothing was lacking. . . .

In other places, our new locations are considered particularly suitable for theatrical performances. This is also used; actors are trained, and some develop an extraordinary talent for it. Success obliges', you say. Certainly, but sometimes it is also dangerous. The world is pleased that you are not narrow-minded, as your fathers were: you do not want to do without the applause of the world. With evident satisfaction you point out the hundreds of young men who accept your invitation. Well, hold on to them, these friends; double, increase tenfold their number; we shall be the first to rejoice in it. But on one condition: that you do not forget for a moment the purpose and aim of our associations. When they held their first ecumenical conference in 1855, they all adopted as their motto: the evangelization of youth through youth. Mind you: the evangelization, not the entertainment. . . . A clubhouse that is filled with evening entertainment but empty at meetings may enjoy great fame in the newspapers and in the eyes of the world: its downfall is not far off."

Financial hardships of German country pastors. A Brandenburg pastor writes about the situation of a pastor who has just taken office: "He has a starting salary of 1800 Mk. (about 400 dollars), "which consists in part of income which is not fixed and is not paid out in cash. It is a well-known fact how little the actual income corresponds with that on paper. How many fees must the pastor remit; how few certificates are still paid; how many deprive the pastor of what is due him, because they know that he cannot well sue them! But who will remit even a penny to the pastor? In no state are the taxes so high as in the clergy. Two cents go to the pension and relic fund. In all Christian associations, his subscription must come first; the poor of his parish expect help from him first. If the parish is then still richly blessed by offspring, one can get an idea of the miserable situation of a country pastor. In addition, the pastor needs a lot of money to be able to take up his office. Even if one must admit that only rarely does a pastor overpay his successor in office, it is still the rule that the one taking office must pay 500-600 Mk. in cash. If he does not have the sum - and that is the usual thing - he must borrow. But who will lend him? Good friends regret that they do not have such sums in stock, businessmen demand securities which he cannot offer. What is left? He must go to the Jew! Not everyone is lucky enough, as Schreiber is, to find a Jew who is content with six cents interest on quarterly instalments. As soon as the priest has taken up his office, the

Universities with their demand to pay the deferred college fees. Again the search for money begins, and to the debts just incurred are added new ones. Then, when sickness comes to the family, the misery is complete."

Difference between Free Church and State Church. In the Stöckersche Kirchenzeitung we read: "The Augsburg Confession of Faith calls the church an assembly of all believers. In this way it describes them as a community of faith. In the eighth article, however, she added that the assembly of all believers and saints in this life includes many false Christians and hypocrites, and that public sinners will remain among the pious. Thus it recognizes and declares that the church will not be able to avoid being a gathering place" (gathering place?) "of believers and unbelievers, of saints and unholy ones. The former is the ideal, the latter the real state of Christendom. This is the same in the popular churches as in the free churches. But in the Free Churches, so far as they are healthy, unbelievers, if they are known, are not acknowledged as full members" (merely as not full members?) "unconfessing preachers are not employed or yet dismissed, manifest sinners are disciplined or excluded. In the popular churches, as they are now, this is impossible. The unbelievers form such a large number, and by paying taxes have such an apparently important share in the existence of the congregation, that they are recognized as entitled members. They vote with them and are elected; any determinations of their qualification - the so-called qualification determinations - are mostly fruitless, moreover, they do not exist for the voters. The free-minded Schleiermacher demanded, as a condition for the active right to vote in congregations, regular church attendance and participation in Holy Communion twice during the year. But where have such demands remained? Even the most orthodox state churchman would not have the courage to assert them today. The sense of ecclesiastical honor is just weak or even non-existent; one is often glad if only the elected church representatives occasionally take part in the service, and is also content if they do not come. This is the case at least in the cities of the east of our church, and also in many a village. - It is even worse with the confession of the university teachers and many clergy who are educated by them. Here it is the state government, the head of state and the minister of culture, both excellently involved in the church government, who leave room for theology contrary to the confession; the church authorities themselves, however, through their vote, are involved in the appointment of theological professors, thus also in the responsibility for it. Here the discord between church doctrine and false doctrine penetrates very deeply into the innermost organism of the church. - The Church

In the mass congregations of the large cities it has become impossible at all and could only occur in individual cases. What the Augsburg Confession recognizes as a doom, namely, the mixture of true and false Christians, has by the newer church constitutions become almost an institution of the church."

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

General Synod. In some circles of the General Synod one holds hard above false doctrine. In the Alleghany Synod, a synod connected with the General Synod, it was a question of the ordination of candidates. There it was reported to the Committee, which had to report to Synod, by the student-colleagues of a certain Candidate, that the latter was "absolutely unsound on the Sabbath question." Closer inquiry revealed that the Candidate, in Bright and Light Day, asserted that in the New Testament the Sabbath was abjured, and that Sunday was not of divine appointment, but an ecclesiastical institution. The grave *casus* came before the Synod itself. And the Synod refused ordination because the candidate "declared again and again that the New Testament had abthaned the Sabbath, so that we have no cause to hold it divinely obligatory, whether it be called Sabbath, Sunday, or the Lord's day." All this is reported with the greatest naivete in the "Lutheran Evangelist," and the account closes with the remark, "I do not think there was anything unchristian in the whole matter." One can see what almost incredible ignorance of Lutheran doctrine there is in certain circles of the General Synod. F. P.

The Ohio Synod was the first "Synod of Delegates" to assemble in Dayton, Ohio. An assistant editor of the "Kirchenzeitung" reported about the meeting: "To be honest, we missed some of the old and dear things at this meeting. A meeting of delegates is quite different from a full synodal assembly. Instead of hundreds, one finds fifty to sixty taking care of the business, etc. That may have its great advantages. Perhaps not. We do not allow ourselves to judge about that now. Time will tell. The delegates have worked diligently, that must be said at the outset. Nor was there any lack of eloquence and willingness. The officials did their duty in a successful manner. The 'guests' were respectful and did not interfere in an unseemly manner. They did not forget where their proper corner was. In short, it was all lovely and affectionate in this respect, if often a little strange. Strangeness, too, one can get used to." The amalgamation of the various theological seminaries of the Synod, which had been proposed, was not decided upon by the Synod for the present. "However" - reports the "Kirchenzeitung" - "it was almost universally felt that in not too distant a time it should come about that our theoretical seminary at Columbus should increase in efficiency by doubling its teaching staff, and that our future pastors should receive a much more thorough education; but it was also felt that a definite and detailed plan should be pre--

would have to be laid before such an important transformation could be decided upon." The practical seminary at Hickory, N. C., "is not to be abolished, at least now." The Synod believes that it has a great missionary work to do both from Hickory in the South, and from St. Paul in the North. Whether in the Ohio Synod conversion and salvation will continue to depend not only on God's grace, but also on the conduct of man - we have found nothing about this in the detailed report in the "Kirchenzeitung". So it will probably remain the same.

F. P.

At Ohio's Capital University, the board of trustees...

Change occurred. E. S. reports about this in the "Kirchenzeitung": "The indicated change in the board administration has occurred. Mr. Ph. Long, brother of the Rev. S. P. Long, has taken over the position and is assuming all responsibility for it. The board money (\$1.75 per week) is paid him directly by the students. He, on the other hand, has to pay the institution a certain sum for the use of the house and kitchen facilities per year - for now \$400. As it now appears, this new institution will give satisfaction. But only time will tell. We, at any rate, wish it with all our hearts, after having been through a most constant war for nearly 38 years concerning the feeding of the institution."

General Council. The "Church Gazette" of Philadelphia reports: "An innovation has been decided upon in Thiel College of the Pittsburg Synod. Namely, the choir robe is to be worn in chapel services in the future. Likewise, the English Church Book will be used." This innovation will not do much harm if things are otherwise orderly and Christian.

F. P.

II. Abroad.

The "social question" in Germany. Prof. v. Nathusius, Hofprediger a. D. Stöcker, and Rev. Lic. Weber have published the following declaration, which they curiously call "clear and unmistakable": "The undersigned men from various groups and directions on the right side of church and political life consider it necessary, in view of the development of the Protestant-Social Congress, to state their church-social convictions clearly and unmistakably: 1) Economic and social life is subject to conditions of Christian morality which may not be neglected without endangering the spirit of the people in the most serious way. There are many obstacles to Christian and moral life in the present economic and social conditions, and the church must strive to remove them for the sake of charity. We reject the view that social conditions and the economic situation are none of Christianity's business. - 2) The preaching of the Gospel and the assertion of its vital powers are indispensable for the establishment of the foundations of a healthy social and economic life; the moral care of social and economic goods is one of the necessary means for the healing of the sick spirit of the people. We demand that the church be given free space in both directions within the sphere of activity given to it, and that it bear powerful witness against sin in all areas, in social democracy as well as in the circles of education and property. - 3) Only the unadulterated biblical gospel and an ecclesiastical activity based on faith in the "cause of salvation," as attested in our confessions, can bring the right sanctifying forces of renewal to the life of the people. Only social activity that is connected with

The only way to improve conditions and to reconcile the classes is to link them in a prudent way to what has become of history. Therefore, after the experiences we have made, we see a danger for church-social work in its connection with modern theology, whose representatives increasingly dominate the evangelical-social congress and prove by their behavior the unsuitability of common work, as in the agitational activity of a direction that throws reprehensible slogans among the crowd, stirs up the class struggle, arouses discontent, and sets human passions in motion for alleged purposes of the kingdom of God. - 4) The eternal purposes of the church are not to be set aside in favor of this-worldly purposes, the Christian concepts of evangelical freedom and equality before God are not to be applied directly to earthly conditions. On the other hand, the church, even in its offices, should not direct its witness only to other-worldly and inward conditions, not only against the ungodly mind and the mammonistic sins of individuals, but should also extend to the social conditions themselves and raise its voice for their improvement, also through law and justice. We cannot grant the Roman Catholic Church the sole right to social activity, but consider the Church of the Reformation to be competent and obligated to enter into and influence public life in the spirit of the prophets and apostles. - 5) In the participation of the church in the work of social reform we see the promising guarantee for the prosperous progress of public life and the indispensable condition for blessed church work. Under certain circumstances, it can become an unavoidable duty of the clergy to enter personally into the struggle for the moral forces of life, to gather like-minded people, and to cultivate both the Protestant workers' associations and the works of the inner mission in the sense of church-social activity. - 6) The healing and renewing social work cannot be done by the church alone, but only with the cooperation of the state in its legal life as well as in its administration, and with the assistance of the circles involved in economic activity, especially employers and employees. The choice of legislative means in detail we consider to be outside the proper ecclesiastical tasks. However, every beneficial social-political activity must recognize and seek to protect the divine fundamental orders in marriage and family, home and society, work and property. In particular, it should have in mind the economic security of the dependent clans, as well as the spiritual, mental, and moral elevation of all estates. - 7) Only by upholding and proving the principles enunciated here will the Church of the Reformation be able to fulfill its God-given calling for the salvation of our people. We therefore call upon our comrades to join together in common work on the basis of the ancient faith of the Fathers, without regard to human favor or fear. The present struggle is for the goods of the Reformation, for the preservation of the divine revelation against apostasy, for the preservation of the popular church against dissolving sects and enthusiasts. The Protestant Church must remain the salt of German life. To this end may God the HErr help by the power of His Holy Spirit." - On this the "Pilgrim from Saxony" remarks: "'Clear and unmistakable' we do not find this manifestation. The Evangelical Lutheran Church knows no social 'question' at all, but the social 'duties' are taught by the fourth commandment, which it, like all others, strives to fulfill in the spirit and power of the Spirit of Christ. Let every man learn his lesson, and it will be well in the house."

Baden. In Baden an "evangelical Protestant church paper" is published, which recently has been making unbelievable and blasphemous attacks on the teachings of the Holy Scriptures. In Nos. 27 and 28 of this year this paper, which is published by a professor and doctor of theology, seeks to prove that the Lord Jesus was the bodily son of Joseph. But this is not enough. In Nos. 31 and 32, all who hold the doctrine of Scripture of His true sonship with God and birth from the Virgin Mary are most vehemently attacked, and it is asserted, among other things, that these all think and believe catholically, because they put the Catholic doctrine of the deity of Christ above the evangelical-biblical doctrine of the sonship of JEsu with God! (P. a. S.)

Leipzig Mission. The Leipzig Mission in India currently has 25 European missionaries, two missionary sisters, the head of a work school, and a factor, making a total of 29 mission workers; four missionaries are currently on leave in their homeland: Päsler, Hörberg, Dachsel, and Meyner. Besides the European missionaries, there are 17 native preachers and five candidates. Thirteen missionaries and one missionary economist are stationed in Africa; two missionaries, Wenderlein and Böhme, are recuperating at home.

(P. a. S.)

The Prussian Higher Administrative Court has made the following decision on **corporal punishment of pupils**: "The teacher is absolutely entitled to carry out 'severe corporal punishment', both on pupils of another class and on those of his own class. Since the behaviour of the pupils is also subject to school discipline outside school, chastisement on the part of the teacher may of course also take place outside the school locality. The clergyman also has the same right in his capacity as a teacher of religion. School discipline may only be the subject of legal proceedings if a noticeable or substantial violation of the pupil has taken place. A noticeable or substantial injury, however, is only one which 'demonstrably' endangers the health and life of the pupil. Ordinary bloodshot wounds, bruises, and welts are not among them; for all severe punishment leaves such manifestations." Here, the Supreme Administrative Court has conditionally overshot the mark. Where is this to lead when it says, without qualification, that the conduct of pupils "even outside school" is subject to school discipline! F. P.

"Positive" theology against university theology in Württemberg. In Württemberg, too, theological courses are to be held in the spirit of positive theology. The place of the meeting is Stuttgart, the lecturers are clergymen who "will give lectures from the results of their scientific studies, followed by free discussion of the burning questions in the field of recent theological research". The enterprise is based on a joint decision of the Evangelical-Lutheran Conference and the Evangelical-Church Association, which, as reported in the "Stutt. Sonntagsbl.", considers it advisable "to offer younger ministers the opportunity to become still more closely acquainted with the positive representation of the ecclesiastical standpoint, the testimonies on which the doctrine of our church rests, and the scientific substantiation of the truth contained in the ancient faith". Unwillig writes concerning the last sentence of the "Kirchl. Anz. f. Wttbg.": "As if one could not and could not also learn this in Tübingen!" To this even the A. E. L. K. remarks: "The 'Kirchl. Anz.*' should still have in memory, besides much else, the case of Steudel, and how there it was announced *urbi et orbi*, without thorough contradiction, that the theological

The new theological equipment in Tübingen is in contradiction with church doctrine and subsequently causes the young theologians entering the ministry grave distress of conscience.

A unique case of student laziness is reported from the University of Czernowitz. There the perception was made that a large number of students of law consistently stayed away even from the compulsory lectures. To the astonishment of the college of professors, it was discovered that numerous matriculated students did not live in Czernowitz at all, but had only traveled here to matriculate. Even the students who lived permanently in the capital attended only the smallest part of the lectures. The College of Professors of the Faculty of Law therefore decided to urge the students to attend the lectures regularly, otherwise they would be expelled from the University "for persistent indiscipline".
(A. E. L. K.)

A "Supplement of the old-ordered office activity of the clergy" in Schleswig - Holstein. The A. E. L. K. reports: In Schleswig-Holstein a "Church Association for Evangelism" has come together under the leadership of Provost Hasselmann in Husum, the General Superintendents I). Kaftan and I). Ruperti in Kiel etc. The association emerged from the realization that in view of the great alienation from the church, "the traditional ministerial activity of the clergy must be supplemented by free activity. In addition to the work of love of the Inner Mission, there is also a need for a special proclamation of the Word, which must take place in two ways. "On the one hand, by arranging for helpers to preach the Word and minister in congregations where the existing spiritual forces are insufficient; on the other hand, by attempting in general to reach circles not usually accessible to the church by preaching the Word in a freer form, in addition to the church-ordered services." This work is to be rooted in the teachings of the Evangelical Lutheran Confession, and pursues the goal of "awakening a decided, fully conscious Christianity in the members of our church who are still inwardly distant from the Gospel, and thereby strengthening, gathering, and increasing the lively circles in the congregations who participate in church life. The organs of the work are, on the one hand, gifted and carefully trained church helpers (city missionaries, country missionaries), and on the other hand, clergy who are gifted and willing to engage in evangelistic activities. The executive committee of the "church association" will endeavor to provide suitable personnel from the clergy to the ministers on request, as well as to provide for the training and orderly stationing of church helpers. In the latter respect, a step has already been taken, in that the association has taken over the Brüderanstalt in Breklum as a training institute for the parish helpers. The leadership will be given to a suitable and paid clergyman. A printed appeal asks all members of the Schleswig-Holstein Regional Church, as far as they approve of the undertaking, to join the Association for Evangelism as members. The duty of a member is to support the efforts of the association as much as possible and to pay an annual voluntary donation for the work of the association.

The Basel Mission has never had to mourn so many deaths as since the previous annual festival. Including the veteran Christaller, who had been active in the field of African languages in his homeland for years, it has lost 18 workers, namely twelve on the Gold Coast, four in Cameroon and one each in India and China; among them were several who had only been on their field of work for a very short time. A missionary bride was lost to

the day designated for their wedding. A former pupil of the Basel Mission House, the Armenian pastor Abufajatian, was killed in the bloodbath in Urfa in December. The Indian missionary Nagel resigned from the mission house because of fundamental concerns, in order to work henceforth as a free missionary. - The work in the various mission areas is progressing well. On 51 main stations - 23 in India, 13 in China, ten on the Gold Coast and five in Cameroon - there are 155 missionaries, 96 women and nine virgins. The mission church had 1460 pagan baptisms, of which 831 were on the Gold Coast alone, and an increase of 1503 church members; the total number of the same is 31,703. China, in spite of 127 pagan baptisms, has an increase of only 22 persons; likewise Cameroon, with 293 pagan baptisms, has an increase of only 177 persons, there a result of emigration, here of exclusion. The number of pupils is 14,449. The cash balance is a favorable one; an expenditure of 1, 295,406 Frcs. and an additional income of 1791 Frcs. - As to the several regions, in India, on the Nilagiris and in Malabar, the inclination to accept the Gospel is growing; while in South Maharatta, Kanara, and Kurgland, the ground is still hard; in Udapi, during the years 1890-'95, only 230 heathens were baptized, while 245 persons were excluded. Catholics and Syrians (St. Thomas Christians) more often join the evangelicals; on the other hand, the Muhammedans are on the whole inaccessible. - In China the mission was often threatened, but the missionaries remained unharmed, and only the station of Moilim was plundered by a band of robbers. - On the Gold Coast the mission extends on two sides, to the northeast in German Togo territory to Bismarcksburg, and to the northwest to Asante. Ramseyer is enlisted as a missionary in Kumase, where he was a prisoner for four years. - Likewise the mission advances in Cameroon. Buna, once destroyed by Gravenreuth, has been rebuilt; in Lobethal there is a boarding school with 80 pupils, and in the Wangamba region the "God's Cause" continues to spread. (A. E. L. K.)

Protestants in Munich. The A. E. L. K. reports: "According to the results of the last census, the total number of Protestants in Munich has risen from 48,104 to 57,478. With the completion of the third church, the division of the congregation into four parishes will proceed, three of which will be attached to the three churches in the interior of the city, the fourth to the church in Haidhausen." Probably the increase of the Protestant population is due to immigration.

Desideratum in theological examinations. The "Kirchenfreund", edited by Prof. D. v. Orelli, reports on the results of the last theological examination that eight candidates passed it. "We had the impression that the majority of this year's candidates had taken their studies more seriously, and were also somewhat better versed in the biblical disciplines than was the case in earlier examinations. Nevertheless, the unfortunate fact persists that the knowledge of the Bible and the understanding of the original language of their books fall short of moderate requirements."

Against Roman propaganda. The A. E. L. K. reports: The Consistory of Brandenburg has recently addressed a confidential circular to the Superintendents, in which the attention of these gentlemen is called to the rampant propaganda of the Roman Catholic Church. Everywhere, especially in the large cities, the Roman Church is seeking to extend the sphere of its power with all the forces at its command. Among other things, the circular refers to two points: in the Catholic infirmaries and in the Catholic hospitals, the

The best workers would be employed everywhere in the Protestant houses, and the spouses living in mixed marriages would be frequently visited by Catholic priests because of Catholic baptism and the Catholic education of the children. The authorities wish the Protestant clergy and presbyteries to keep an open eye to this danger. Reports are to be sent in of the measures which have been taken, or are to be taken, to meet the growing danger of the propaganda of the Catholic Church.

The glory of a Roman priest was recently described by the Roman professor of religion Ender at Tisis in Vorarlberg thus: "The priest is a reverend. For his dignity reaches up to heaven, down to the boundaries of earth, and down to the abyss of hell. An angel descends, speaks the words: "This is my body, this is my blood. And bread remains bread, wine remains wine. The Queen of Angels herself approaches the altar speaks the words of Consecration, and bread remains bread, wine remains wine. A simple, plain priest approaches the altar, takes the bread, the wine in his consecrated hands, speaks the words of Consecration, and bread is the true Body of JEsu Christ, wine the true Blood of JEsu Christ. The word of the priest has penetrated through the clouds to the very depths of the Godhead, and has as it were compelled the Son of God to descend upon the altar. Is not he whose power reaches so high a reverend? Emperor Francis Jysephe I is a mighty lord. From Lake Constance to the Carpathians, from the Krkonoše Mountains to the Adriatic, his sovereign word reaches. But greater still is the dignity of the priest." God's word and order is nothing in the papacy. It is the person of the pope and his clergy! **F. P.**

The "Pilger a. S." writes about **the priestly ordination of Prince Max of Saxony**: The priestly ordination of Prince Max of Saxony took place on July 20 in the Church of the Guardian Angels at Eichstätt in Bavaria, where the prince had been attending to his theological studies, by the "apostolic vicar" of Saxony. The Prince's family members attended the ceremony. On August 1, the newly ordained prince priest said his first mass in the chapel of the Josephinienstift in Dresden in the presence of the king and the royal family before a circle of invited guests. The melancholy with which we see this noble Wettin priest, endowed with rich gifts of the Spirit, placed in the service of a church that has abandoned the infallible source of all knowledge of truth and has erected a priesthood that sadly diminishes, if not completely abolishes, the honor of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ as our sole mediator, is understandable and is certainly shared everywhere where the Reformation of the church by our dear Dr. Luther and his helpers is seen as a that of the Church. Luther and his helpers as a deed of freedom of conscience and commitment to conscience, and where one is determined to manfully hold on to the sacred goods acquired through this Reformation in clear awareness of their infinite value and, if necessary, to stake life and limb, life and blood, on their defense. For this reason, we do not agree with the trusting, appeasing statements with which certain press voices in the country have endeavored to cover the deep gulf that undeniably exists between the priesthood of the papal and the spiritual office of our Evangelical Lutheran Church; we would like to see the prince of Protestant faith consecrate himself to the service of this office, - but we are also not afraid of the new upsurge of ecclesiastical boldness which will be the natural effect of this latest success of ultramontane cleverness. And if the renunciation given by Prince Max on August 1.

on the rights to which he is entitled as prince of the Saxon royal house according to the constitutional charter of the country states in its final clause that the same shall immediately be legally ineffective for the future, if ever Prince Max would be the only still living prince of the royal house in the event of the throne being abolished, then we confidently place the future of our beloved Saxon country, as well as that of its entire noble princely house, in the hands of the Lord, whose service (!) the young prince, for his part, consecrates himself to the best of his knowledge and conscience, but whose sole honor we feel bound in conscience to uphold, even in persistent protest against Rome and its pope.

F. P.

At the meeting of the Scottish Presbyterian Council, some raised

Deputies from America protested against the use of Christian songs and chorales, as well as organ playing during sessions. They wanted only psalms sung. The great majority was alienated by this request and thought that it was not necessary to comply with these strange wishes of a few Americans. They were also told that the Psalms call for praising God with harps and cymbals and trumpets, and that instrumental accompaniment of the singing was therefore in keeping with the Bible. But when the petitioners could not be convinced, they finally gave in "for the sake of the weak" and from then on sang only psalms, and without an organ. F. P.

Protected house right. In Paris a so-called bookseller, who had sent advertisements of pamphlets into the houses, was accused by two fathers of families and sentenced by the court to pay 400 marks each to both, "because no author nor publisher has the right to offend the morals of those to whom he addresses himself, nor to send into a house against the will of its inhabitants shameful, insulting and slanderous writings." F. P.

The taxation of the ecclesiastical orders in France is proceeding with great obstacles. Of the 1½ million taxes that have recently become due, only 194,500 frcs. have been paid in good faith; the tax authorities must intervene compulsorily for the remaining amount. Even of the six million arrears, which are to be gradually paid off by the congregations, almost nothing has been settled.

(A. E. L. K.)

Asia Minor. The spread of the gospel in the Asiatic provinces of the Turkish empire has for half a century been carried on in a special way by the American Board. The mission of the latter has been from the beginning to revive spiritually the remnants of the old Oriental churches, whose members number some millions, and include the Armenians, and to gather out of them Protestant congregations. To this end, they were especially concerned with the dissemination of the Word of God and Christian writings. Now the Bible has been translated into 27 different languages and dialects, and through the Bible House in Constantinople, 80,000 volumes of holy scriptures and other books are distributed annually in the country. The American Board has also done much for the education of the people; in addition to many elementary schools, it has established a number of secondary schools for boys and girls. There are already 111 Protestant congregations, numbering 11,835 communicants; the total number of Christians gathered in the congregations is 46,357. These congregations raise large sums of money for the maintenance of their preachers, teachers and for general welfare, in one of the last years almost 250,000 Mk, quite an achievement in view of their poverty.

(A. E. L. K.)

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42.

October 1896.

No. 10.

The wrong attitude of today's evangelical Christianity toward Rome.

There was a time in the church when pretty much all of evangelical Christianity recognized Rome as the greatest enemy of the Christian church and vigorously fought it. This was especially the case within the Lutheran Church, as long as it held on to the heritage of the Reformation and lived in the truth of the Gospel. But also within the Reformed Church there was - from the light of divine truth, which was still held fast - no lack of a continuing principled fight against Rome. 1) This has become different today. It is not as if there were no longer any fight against Rome in the "God-ordained" way. The Missouri Synod, for example, and the ecclesiastical communities associated with it, bear witness, friend and foe alike, including Rome herself, that they fight Rome not merely as an enemy alongside others, but as the chief enemy of the Christian Church, untiringly and unceasingly. Nor is it to be denied that individuals within the American Lutheran synods, the German regional churches, and the American Protestant sects recognize and fight the papacy as the Antichrist prophesied in 2 Thess 2. But these are exceptions. In general, the sword of today's evangelical Christianity has become blunt toward Rome. In general, today's evangelical Christianity - even that which calls itself Lutheran - takes a false position toward Rome. We intend to prove this in the following by means of a few statements which we have just found in the "Sächsische Kirchen- und Schulbatt" and in the "Allgemeine Ev.-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung" on the occasion of the ordination, etc. of Prince Max of Saxony.

Prince Max of Saxony has studied Papist theology at Eichstätt in Bavaria, as has already been reported in this paper. At

1) Compare, e.g., Quenstedt, Theol. did.-pol. II, 161)7, the enumeration of the Reformed teachers who declared the Pope to be the Antichrist.

July 31 of this year he received the "ordination to the priesthood" and on August 1 he read his "first mass" in a chapel in Dresden in the presence of the King of Saxony, the royal family and many high invited guests. On August 9 the "reverend priest," as the Berlin Papist "Germania" calls him, preached a sermon in the Dresden Court Church, in which he calls upon all Protestants to return to the Pabst Church, because this alone possesses the truth. Following up on this sermon, the "Sächsische Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette) writes: "Naturally, the 'Germania' had to publish a brilliant article about the sermon that Duke Max of Saxony held in the Dresden Hofkirche on Sunday, August 9 of this year. The fact that the latter happened at all does not belong to the subject we wish to discuss, and is a matter entirely of its own, about which we are not entitled to make a statement, or even an evaluation, from the Evangelical Lutheran standpoint." This probably means that the "Kirchen- und Schulblatt" wants to leave undiscussed the question whether the King of Saxony, out of consideration for his Lutheran subjects, should not have prevented his priestly relative from preaching that sermon in the Court Church. Prof. Fricke condemned this sermon at this year's meeting of the Gustav-Adolf-Association as a provocation of the Protestants and as a "propaganda that cannot be justified". On the other hand, the "Sächsische Kirchen- und Schulblatt" continues: "Every Catholic priest, just like the Protestant pastor, has the right to express his personal convictions in a sermon; whether he thereby strikes the right note in each particular individual case and, in particular, promotes the salvation of his congregation, is merely his own affair and, in the present case, a question that touches us less." Here is right and wrong mixed. Without a doubt, Max of Saxony, as a preacher of the Pabst Sects, has just as much right as any other preacher to "speak his personal convictions." That is the state's legal right and belongs to the religious freedom in the state intended by God. Everything that goes beyond touching the state's freedom of religion is evil, is not pleasing to God, and is of no use to the church. The Protestant Christians of Saxony, even if they were asked for their opinion, should not press upon the King of Saxony that he, as a secular prince and for any political considerations, should restrict the preaching activity of the Prince of Saxony. But the "Kirchen- und Schulblatt" goes further. It also wants to leave undiscussed the question whether the prince preacher "promotes the salvation of his congregation" with the sermon held in the Dresden Court Church. With the question of the provision of souls the matter has passed over to the ecclesiastical field. Here it is a question of the right of that sermon before God and of the ecclesiastical evaluation of it. And how must this judgment turn out on the part of an evangelical Christian? The Content of the Prince's Sermon

is well known, and the "Kirchen- und Schulblatt" itself cites him after the report of the "Germania". The Prince has said that the Pabstical Church alone is in possession of the truth, and, taking up the Encyclica of the Pope, he calls upon all non-Papists to come under the rule of the Pope. "Let the arms of the Church be opened wide to embrace lovingly those who return." Is there any possibility, by such preaching, of promoting "the salvation of the souls of the congregation"? Does this mean caring for souls by assigning them to the pope and leading them away from Christo eo ipso? No, such preaching is a great, terrible denial of the beatific gospel, and a preaching and glorification of the monstrous lie of Pabst. By such preaching the Prince of Saxony has not cared for souls, but has murdered souls, as much as there is in him.

Therefore, when the "Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Church and School Gazette) says with regard to the sermon of the Prince of Saxony: "Whether he thereby does the right thing in each particular case and especially promotes the salvation of his congregation is only his own affair and in the present case a question that touches us less," this reveals a completely wrong position on the Pabstacy. One does not reject the papacy as a soul-murdering abomination, but lets it pass as an ecclesiastical institution by which souls are still provided for, though perhaps somewhat less well than within the Lutheran Church. To this fits the further execution of the writer. After referring to the omissions of the "Germania" on the occasion of the "princely sermon," 1) he continues: "One should not think it possible that a Catholic paper could adopt such challenging language, especially since on the Protestant side everything has long been avoided with scrupulous care that would be capable of causing the slightest offence in the Catholic sister church." There you have it! The Catholic Church a "sister church"! The Church which, in the Tridentinum, curses the Gospel and all who adhere to it; the Church whose great ecclesiastical machinery works to One end only, namely, to plant and foster in hearts a reliance on human works, and to perpetually destroy and tear out of hearts the faith in Christ, that for Christ's perfect merit alone we obtain grace and blessedness; the church which puts in the place of Christ and his word the pope's word and authority - the church is to be a "sister church" of the Lutheran church! Nevertheless, the writer in the "Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt" wants to fight against the "Catholic sister church." But how? He concludes thus: "Here the Protestant clergyman, and especially the Protestant-Lutheran clergyman, has in every appropriate place by word and writing

1) A printout of the "Kirchen- und Schulblatt".

in order to oppose with all energy such insolence as ultramontaniam takes upon itself almost daily. We have just said that the Protestant-Lutheran clergyman in particular must act in the sense indicated; yes, especially this one, because he must so often read in Catholic papers that our Luther was a discontented innovator and a drunkard, and that his K  the was a lecherous nun, while both deserve to be set up as models of the most beautiful and purest family life." So the fight against Rome is mainly because Luther's person is attacked from there! To this struggle are especially committed the "evangelical Lutheran clergy." Certainly "Lutherans" will occasionally reject the shameless Roman lies against Luther's person. But if this personal side is to be made the main point in the controversy, Luther himself says: "Let Luther be a knave or a saint, I care nothing for that; but his doctrine is not his, but Christ' himself. For you see that the tyrants do not deal with killing Luther only, but they want to destroy the doctrine; and because of the doctrine they touch you and ask you whether you are Lutheran. Here thou must truly not speak with reed words, but freely confess Christ, that Luther, Claus, or George preached him. The person let go; but the doctrine thou must confess." 1) This points to the basic defect of modern polemics against Rome. No vigorous doctrinal struggle is waged against Rome. Neither the pure doctrine of the gospel, nor the abomination of the gospel-abrogating papist doctrine, is properly brought into the light. One gets the impression from most modern antagonists of Rome that they would cease the polemic if Rome would only recognize other church fellowships as equal. In the latter case, one would leave Rome alone, in spite of its peculiar doctrine, and even extend the hand of brotherhood. On the other hand, it is God's will and the duty of the Christian Church to fight Rome ceaselessly and with holy zeal because of her abominable, soul-murdering teachings. This alone is the right attitude towards Rome.

In Germany, and especially in Saxony, much has been missed in recent months. It caused a great stir that a prince of Saxony was ordained to the priesthood, read mass, and then preached a truly papist sermon. All the newspapers wrote about it. Nothing happens by chance. There can be no doubt that God permitted the prince of Saxony to become a priest, to read mass, and to preach, so that the Protestant Church of Germany would have the opportunity to expose the terrible abomination of a papist priestly ordination, mass, and sermon before all eyes.

1) St. Louiser Ausg. XX, 91.

and to illuminate anew the whole abomination of the Pabst Church with the light of the Gospel. It is certain that a man can obtain forgiveness of sins and salvation by God's grace alone, for the sake of Christ's vicarious life, suffering, and death, that is, through faith in the gospel. The beatific truth has disappeared from Christian doctrine as soon as grace and blessedness are also founded on human works and worthiness. What then does the papacy do, in whose full service the Prince of Saxony, according to his own sermon, wants to place himself? The entire, great machinery of the papacy works, as already mentioned above, directly and indirectly in the interest of the fundamental false doctrine, destroying the Christian faith, that man does not become righteous and blessed by grace alone for Christ's sake, but also by human works. Everything in Pabstism is in the service of the abolition of the doctrines of grace. Therefore, the souls are not cared for through the ministry, but through it, as much as there is in it, the souls are only led into eternal damnation, for those who deal with the works of the law are under the curse, says the Scripture (Gal. 3:10). The ministry is the greatest deceiver in the world. It calls individuals and whole peoples to itself, claiming to be the "only saving church," to possess the "one and only truth," as the Prince of Saxony said, in order to offer the deceived, when they come, a doctrine of works leading to damnation instead of the blessed gospel. If, nevertheless, there are still souls - and there are such - who, under the papacy, trust in Christ's merit alone and become blessed, it is against the will and intention of the papacy. The Pabstacy itself also puts a curse on these souls, when it says in the Tridentine: "If anyone says that men are justified either by the imputation of Christ's righteousness alone, or by the forgiveness of sins alone . . . let him be accursed." 1) St. Paul curses Gal. 1, 8. 9. all false teachers who falsify the gospel of the free grace of God in Christ; the papacy curses in the Tridentinum all who teach and believe this gospel. Yes, this is the papacy as it has been for centuries and still is today, doing its sinister work among the nations! To become a "priest" in the Papacy, and thus to take upon oneself the obligation of helping to conduct the business of the Papacy in the world, is about the most wretched occupation that a young man can choose under God's permission. And now the Papist Mass, the first celebration of which took place so "solemnly" in the Dresden Court Chapel! The Mass is so very much in the service of the antichristic abomination, the denial of Christ and His Evan-

1) Sessio VI, Canon XI.

gelium. By pretending that in the mass Christ is continually offered by the hand of the priest for the living and the dead, present and absent, for the atonement of sin, Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice, once offered, is continually blasphemed, and poor, deceived souls are continually kept from basing their faith in the forgiveness of sins on the gospel and the sacraments which are in the service of the gospel. Luther says of himself, "These are my greatest sins, that I have been such a holy monk, and with so many masses for more than fifteen years have so grievously angered, martyred, and afflicted my dear Lord." 1) The Papist Mass, as Luther so often states, is not God's service, but the devil's. 2) What the Papists sacrifice in the Mass, they sacrifice to the devils. And the matter is not made any different by the fact that Max of Saxony serves as "sacrificial priest" and the Saxon court and many "high invited guests" look on. And how are Protestant Christians to judge the sermon of a papist priest? They know that in the Christian church only God's word may be preached, but all teaching of men is forbidden. For all teaching in the church, St. Peter lays down the rule: "If any man speak, let him speak it as the word of God," 1 Pet. 4:11. In the church of God, obedience may only be demanded for God's word. The Papist preacher, however, demands obedience above all things to the word of the Pope. This is just what Prince Max of Saxony did. In his sermon he called upon all non-Papists to submit to the Pope. He thus at once introduced himself as a loyal helper of the Antichrist, who "will not let Christians be blessed without his power, which after all is nothing, not ordered nor commanded by God." 3

This and other things should have been done in Germany, especially in Saxony, when the prince of Saxony's ordination to the priesthood, his reading of the Mass, and his preaching had to be noted. In this way, the Protestant Christians would have been promoted in the knowledge of the Gospel and would have been salutary warned against the Pabstacy. Perhaps the eyes of one or the other of those entangled in Pabstism would have been opened. In any case, the Christian duty of confession would have been fulfilled. But one did not rise to the occasion given by God. One did not expose the abomination of Pabstism in general and of the Mass in particular. They have not confessed, but denied. One has thrown sand in the eyes of the poor people when one spoke of the Pabstical Church as a "sister church" and left open the possibility that even through the

- 1) St. Louis ed. XX, 1103.
- 2) Compare Luther's strong but quite appropriate expressions XIX, 1233 f.
- 3) Schmalk. Articles, Part II, Art. IV.

The sermon of the Prince of Saxony would promote the salvation of the congregation.

The writer in the "Sächsisches Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette) remarks that the Centrumspreffe, especially the Berlin "Germania", uses a challenging language; on the other hand, the Protestant side has "long since avoided with the most scrupulous care everything that would be capable of causing the slightest offence in the Catholic sister church". What a pitiful state of affairs! The Pabst's disciples open their mouths wide, praise their antichrist master and his soul-murdering teachings and institutions, and blaspheme Christ and the holy Gospel. But Christ's disciples will not open their mouths to these antichristic manifestations in praise of their highly praised Saviour and his blessed gospel! And why? They do not want to cause the slightest "offence" to the "Catholic sister church"! Does the Christian Church cause offence when it confesses Christ and His Gospel to the enemies and blasphemers of the truth? If she gives offence thereby, it is the offence which she ought to give in the world; the offence of which the apostle says, "We preach Christ crucified, an offence to the Jews, and a foolishness to the Greeks," 1 Cor. 1:23. The offence of which it is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence: and he that believeth on him shall not be put to shame, Rom. 9:33; the offence of which the Lord himself saith, Ye shall not think that I am come to make peace on earth. I am not come to send peace, but a sword," Matt. 10:34. He that would have outward peace here on earth must renounce his membership in the Christian church, for the Christian church is not for concealing, but for confessing the gospel in the world. The confession of the gospel "ber will always be exposed to the enmity of the world and of the false church. - Another reason for not fighting against Rome is given by a writer in the Leipzig "Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung." He says, among other things, the following against Prof. Dr. Fricke, who, at this year's meeting of the Gustav-Adolf-Verein, struck a "somewhat sharp note" against the Roman Church: "Who actually profits from such fighting speeches? Probably first of all the Roman Church, which, as a glance at the ultramontane press amply proves, takes pleasure in spreading such incidents in order to show that it is not the Catholics but the Protestants who are the disturbers of the peace, that therefore the Catholics have every right to bring out the great arsenal of their weapons, some of which are not always clean, in order to do all possible harm to the Protestants." Translated into simple German, this means: "Let us avoid the fight against Rome, for in such

We'll just take the short end of the stick." Has the writer considered what dishonor he thereby does to the Protestant Church? On our, the Protestant, side - we speak in the name of all true Protestants - is divine truth; on the side of the Pope and his is falsehood. We have God for us, while the Papists have God against them. And we should now avoid the commanded battle, because in it we would only have to fear defeat! Did Christ therefore sit down at the right hand of God, and give the gospel to his church, promising her mouth and wisdom, as well as victory, so that she might tremble and plead peace and good weather with the enemies of Christ and his gospel? Truly, the voice of that writer in the Leipzig "Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung" is not the voice of the evangelical church. The truly evangelical church knows itself to be far, far superior to Rome. Rome always draws the short straw in the battle with her when she fights as she should fight, that is, when she wages a real **doctrinal battle** against Rome, when she opposes the Roman lies on all points with the clear, certain truth of Scripture. Then she is as much stronger than Rome as God is stronger than the devil and all the devil's accomplices. Let Rome open all her arsenals, and fire at us all the projectiles at her command, even the foulest. It can do nothing against us. We have the arsenal of the clear, unerring Word of God, whereby we break all the weapons of the enemy, throw him out of all his positions, and beat him completely all along the line. "The weapons of our knighthood are not carnal, but mighty in the sight of God, to break down the strongholds, that we may destroy the assaults, and every high place that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God," 2 Cor. 10:4, 5. O, if only the so-called evangelical Christianity of today would remember again the unconquerable power of the simple gospel of Christ! With the simple gospel of Christ we overcome, as sin and death, so also the pabstacy and all satanic powers. Dr. Hölscher from Leipzig, who presented the annual report at the meeting of the Gustav Adolf Society, said quite correctly: "The only thing we have to oppose Rome is the Gospel of Christ. A congregation gathered around the gospel is invincible. Therefore fear not, little host!"

That most of the spokesmen of today's evangelical Christianity show such an unsatisfactory, even deplorable attitude towards Rome, is due to the fact that they themselves do not live in evangelical truth and are not certain of it. Yes, by undermining the divine authority of Holy Scripture, as much as there is in them, they have taken out of the hand of evangelical Christianity the right weapon against Rome. They have surrendered to "science," which is the infernal power of Rome.

is just as inadequate as all other human thoughts and means of power. Let those who are entangled in modern theology recognize by their miserable attitude toward Rome that they have been on the wrong track up to now. They see before their eyes that they can neither teach Christianity nor defend it against its enemies. They are knights of the saddest form, a joy to the pope and a great sorrow and dishonor to the evangelical church. May they remember from what they have fallen! If they return to the heritage of the Reformation, they will soon take up the right firm and certain position towards Rome and win one victory after another against Rome. F. P.

Modern theologians' attacks on God's Word.

(Continued.)

8. Difference of the new time of grace from former ones.

The victory of divine truth was therefore evident. Nevertheless, this time of grace is very different from other great times of the church. The Word of God met this Saul and that Saul, and proved to be the power of God in all classes. The wild waters of unbelief, which were rolling in scientific and other circles, were countered by the Spirit of God with many a dam. The much-vaunted "presuppositionlessness" no longer held good, according to which it was a foregone conclusion that the most finely educated believer in Scripture must be a fool and every blaspheming Cossack a light. Those impure spirits who were too clever to believe and too stupid to know anything about faith could no longer declare education and Bible faith to be incompatible. But the search for grace mostly affected individuals, not the people as such. The ruin was too deep-seated. There could be no question of a popular reformation. Everything pointed to a great divorce, as Provost Callisen wrote: "It is in the daylight, we stand in the birth pangs of a new development of time. The kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness, divorced and separated, face each other more sharply than ever. The signs of the times are on the one hand very serious and threatening, on the other very joyful, since the kingdom of heaven is breaking in with violence and the Lord is causing a new stream of His Spirit to pour through the realms of His Church." (Corr.-Bl. 1837, p. 176.) It is true that the spirits have always been divided in Christ, as Simeon said, Luc. 2, 34, and indeed very often in one and the same family, 12, 51. ff; but this has not always been so evident as since the days of rationalism. At times the Christians were able to exert such influence

that whole nations were overwhelmed and carried away by the gospel and seemed to be Christian, as they also wanted to be called. Dagon bowed down before the ark of the covenant. Only where judgment fell upon a people, as it did upon the Jews, did the inner division become so public as it now wanted to become in the whole so-called Christian world. Unbelief convulsively gathered its forces in secret and public societies for campaigns against God's Word. Out of necessity, the young Christians also drew closer together for witnessing. The spirit of the times and the newly awakened faith clashed, even where, as in Brunswick, the sleep of death lay so hard that even in 1854 five out of every six pastors paid homage to rationalism. (Kzt. 1854, p. 899.)

That church coexistence would continue to be an impossibility was no longer hidden on either side. The rationalist Prof. Gabler wanted to call the 19th century a "golden age of religion" when the free spirits openly left the Christian church and - endowed with all civil rights - formed a community together with the enlightened Jews. He rightly asserted that such a thing would only be "to the advantage of the Christian religion. Then the Christian Church would no longer have its worst and most harmful enemies in its own bosom; and whoever then still professed the Christian Church would also mean well and sincerely by it; for he would then no longer have any political interest in professing a religion which he did not regard as true and divine. (Kzt. 1828, p. 366.) The rationalistic Dinier, on the other hand, wanted the old churches for the rationalists, and wrote of the witnesses, of the gospel, "They may be respectable Christians; but evangelical Lutheran Christians they are not, since they teach what is in manifest contradiction with the symbolical books. They should be as honest as the Mennonites, should come out and say, We form a church for ourselves." (Ibid. p. 43.) Separation, then, this also wanted; it was only to leave Isaac to the Philistines the wells he had dug. Rude blasphemers of Christ and His Word, such as L. Feuerbach, Br. Bauer, D. F. Strauss, and others, did not deny it, a divorce must come. Free spirits, such as Giese, Wislicenus, and the like, wrote openly: "A divorce is necessary." "We are gladly obliged to get rid of the expressions 'God's word' and 'holy Scripture.' The word 'revelation' actually has an unbearable connotation for the formation of the times." - "I confess that I consider the Apostolic Symbolum to be entirely Scriptural; but that, because I do not recognize Scripture as an authority, many propositions of it do not express my convictions." (Kzt. 1846, p. 171. 238 f.) Many an un-Christian bore the brunt of the fact that the great multitude, which had nevertheless been formed through the press and in liberal, free-minded churches, was not willing to believe in the Scriptures.

He was always thinking only of what unchristian leaders had in mind for him, and was absolutely unwilling to follow them when they urged him to leave the Christian Church. "Let now at last all mediating, negotiating, uniting," wrote one in the "Leipziger Tageblatt," when at the Confirmation in Leipzig the apostolic symbol was to be reintroduced, which was condemned as papist, because it speaks of a congregation of saints, and which was also found among the Reformed, to whom a multitude wanted to turn. "Only in the breaking away lies the victory." (Zisch, f. Prot. 8, 55 f.) But the children of God, who followed the voice: "To the law and testimony!" also perceived that no harvest could follow the short days of spring, if no separation took place; for otherwise everything would again be corrupted and polluted. "It is a good sign of our time that it presses for decision," wrote a Christian who wanted to show the crossroads. "How long do you limp on both sides? If the LORD be God, walk after him; but if it be Baal, walk after him! Oh that thou wert cold or warm! But because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Such voices strike the ear of the spirit from all sides, and not only believers, but also unbelievers are disgusted by lukewarm half-measures and covering-up yes and no." (Kzt. 1846, p. 889.) "Christianity has indeed at all times its opponents, but so many and so dangerous as at present never. At the most one can compare the heresy of Arius with the present crisis; just as then, according to the expression of a great father of the Church, the whole world was astonished to have become so entirely Arian, so now the whole educated world must be astonished to see itself de-Christianized. If God has not determined to take the Gospel from us altogether, perhaps to give it to a savage race in America, a great divorce must take place. The rationalists, with their retinue of indifferentists, materialists, atheists, etc., must step out of the congregation of Christians, or, if you prefer, Christians must separate themselves from the non-Christians; and the time should not be so far off, - no one may now remain neutral. He that is not for Christ must be against him." (Corr.-Bl. 1827, p. 270 f.) Dr. Hahn at Leipzig, in 1827, publicly urged the rationalists to leave the Christian Church (Kzt. 1827, p. 74), about which great clamor arose. She likewise urged the Homilet.-liturg. Correspondenzblatt of 1829 urged them to take this step, because unification was out of the question and the internal division and fragmentation of the church would thereby be remedied. It presented their Unitarian unbelievers in Transylvania as an example and gave them advice on how they could begin the matter. (p. 118 ff.) One sighed: "Oh that you would unite, you destroyers and fragmenters of the

Scripture, and form your own church! No one would deny you that. But that you still want to be called evangelical Christians, still repeat after the Reformers: not the statutes of men, but only the word of God! since you tear up and dishonor the word of God that they meant, that is not to be listened to in silence. Half a Bible, no Bible! Whoever does not want it completely, does not have it at all." (Rautenberg's *Denkblätter* 1827, p. 1120.)

Because the rationalists did not leave voluntarily, the Christian conscience was in trouble. It was urged by God's word: "Pull not on the strange yoke with unbelievers: for what enjoyment hath righteousness with unrighteousness? What fellowship hath light with darkness? How does Christ agree with Belial? Or what part hath the believer with the unbeliever? . . . Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch no unclean thing." 2 Cor. 6, 14. ff. Again and again voices were raised, such as that of Prof. Thiersch, in favor of the absolute necessity of separation, which must take place as soon as possible; for one should not deceive oneself about the terrible consequences of a longer delay. Cf. *Ev. Kzt.* Luther's prophecies of the downfall of the orthodox church in Germany were also brought up here and there. One recalled warnings like that of old C. Spangenberg: "Despise not thy visitation! Truly great and terrible tribulations will come and suddenly overtake us, so that all Germany, great and small, will continue in the cruel and terrible contempt of the divine Word and its ministers and other great disgraces and vices. O Germany, O Germany, oh dear fatherland! Wake up, you drunkard, wake up, your joy is now over! Woe to thee, Germany, thou who art lifted up to heaven! Thou shalt be cast down to hell; for if such deeds had happened in France, England, Welsh, and the Low Countries as with thee, they would have behaved differently. But woe to thee, who thus despise thy gracious visitation! No admonition, no prophecy, no threat, good or bad, will help. All is thrown to the winds, and long inducias (truces) are made to them, and golden times are spun to them, there is no need yet, all is well. Well, dear world, if thou wilt be told no more, ei then look always to thy adventure. Thou shalt know whom thou hast despised." (*Ztsch. f. Prot.* 11, 304.) It was well perceived that the time was coming when the lampstand of the Gospel was to be thrust from its place, as it had once been among the Oriental peoples. "A similar judgment may, however, befall our peoples," wrote Dr. Höfling. "That that which at present moves and agitates the European masses of nations on the whole is not a Christian principle, we well know." (*Illumin.*

of the Daumerische Sendschr. 1832, p. 44.) Another complained: "I know this and have not the least doubt that Christianity will remain on earth as long as the earth stands; but just as it has left Asia and Africa in its time, where it was very flourishing, and a part of Europe where it stood with great glory, so it can leave all of Europe, and if Germany continues to canonize men like Voß and Richter (Göthe is already in his lifetime), . . . so Germany first throws off the yoke of Christ and does not tarry much longer." (Corr.-Bl. 1826, p. 820 f.) His Comforter said, "There will not be much more to do with the old race, that is true; but the youth will hear it (the Gospel) again, and their better leaders will gather out of them again a great people of God." (Ibid. 1827, p. 215.) But the word of God had not even dominion in the schools and institutions of learning, but remained under the bench; whence, therefore, was the new generation to come? The rationalistic professor de Wette, in his treatise on the moral spirit of the Reformation, expressed the hope "that the spirit of reason, which in Luther's time asserted its rights but poorly, and therefore received none, but was condemned unheard, will be happier now that it is armed with science." On the other hand, Cl. Harms could not assure that the Spirit of God with the Gospel would fill the old places again, even though he could confidently say against the Erasmuses: "I have not yet been afraid for a moment that the Thesis matter could be reversed or put down in Germany, as it has been in Russia for some time, and later also in Sweden and Holland. No, we are not yet finished, as one says, or as a magazine in Denmark says, according to which it is to be decided by the majority for reason and revelation. Thither it will now probably never turn out, but for one or the other." (Answer to Lehmus, 1819, p. 114.) With the children of God, of course, it could not turn out that way, nor with the honest enemies, but in the state churches and with the newer theologians, who wanted to have other sources of knowledge besides Scripture?

Many soon despaired of the revival of the faith in the German churches, because the Christians did not have enough strength to separate themselves from the open un-Christians. Therefore, as early as 1809, many Württembergers emigrated to America, whereupon the king, in order to prevent further emigration, arranged in 1819 for the formation of the Kornthal congregation, independent of the state church (Ztsch. f. Prot. 3, 284), whose members unfortunately do not possess a clear Lutheran recognition. The thought of fleeing from Europe settled in more and more. "An anxious foreboding has seized the people," preached Dr. Rudelbach, combating the flight as one forbidden by the Lord. "We shall

302 The attacks of modern theologians on God's Word.

We will stand still and not be challenged by the raging and tumult of the world. Though we sit in the midst of Babylon, and hang up our harps in sorrow against the willows that are therein, yet shall we speak, and not let it be taken from us: If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand be forgotten (Ps. 137:5.). For in our hearts is graven the old Zion with all her glory, but also with her deep fall, with her unnameable sufferings. How should we leave the mother in her old days, when she looks upon us as sons? We see it well, and feel it, so that all our bones crack, that the Church is subjugated; but for this very reason we consider it our duty to persevere with the subjugated one, still free sons of the eternally free Mother." (Kirchenspiegel, Vol. II, p. 359 f.) The reader will not fail to notice the self-deception and confusion of the dear man, whom we do not at all wish to blame when he spoke against emigration. How can the enslaved church have free sons, and how can they stand by or even help when the old mother is buried alive? Where God says, "Go out and separate yourselves!" his Zion cannot remain seated in Babel. Leaving the false church is not leaving the mother, but obedience to God's Word. Judgments may differ about the change of country, but from Sodom, from the harlot, every Christian should depart. Rudelbach, by the way, saw in the emigration of Lutheran Christians for the sake of faith a portent of the downfall of the German Church. We have a marker, he said, a most sad one, not to be lamented enough. "It is the unnameable fear which has seized so many believers in our day, that nothing can come of the ruins of the Church, and which drives them to leave the scene where the battle is now about to be fought, to flee across lands and seas with the patrimony which is oh so easily fragmented without an orderly ecclesiastical federation.... Yet this very fear is a sign that the hour is near when it will be said of the Gospel: We turn." (Ibid.) Thus Harleß also described the time of the gathering of the rebellious free spirits as "the opening hour of a decisive battle in the kingdom of God. It is to be determined whether the old world will once again allow itself to be rejuvenated by the law of freedom in Christ, or whether it is to collapse miserably, rottenly, putridly in its last convulsions, together with that idol of false freedom before which the apostates kneel". (Sunday Consecration, Vol. IV, p. 31 f.)

9. End of Grace.

When Harleß, Rudelbach and others were still waiting for a great battle, the decision had already been made. Without Concil and Synod it was decided in the State Churches that the Masonic Circle should rule over the

And the rejoicing should no longer cease: Philistines upon thee, Samson! As soon as God's word was heard again in the land, the enemy thought of his so often tried art of making contrasts. When the Gospel had overcome a heathen superstition, the chemist in the infernal apothecary usually prepared a mixture which became all the more dangerous the more pious it looked. Out of a union of the Arians with the faithful crept the Semiarians, and out of a union of the Socinians with the Church the Arminians. When rationalism was put down by the power of God, it was all the easier to mix the leaven of malice and mischievousness into the faith, as all the weaknesses of pietism still clung to the awakening testimony, and the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* rightly judged in 1836: "The most general infirmity is that the Scriptures are not the beginning, the means, and the end." (p. 10.) It was possible to see that the Scriptures were not the beginning, the means, and the end. (p. 10.) It was soon possible to write: "The rationalists have learned to understand that one must leave something positive for the people, and so they now speak more in the language of the Bible, praise the Word of God, although they do not consider the whole of Scripture to be so, but only that which looks and pleases them, and know how to give themselves a completely Christian appearance. (Corr.-Bl. 1830, p. 786.) "The more the respect for God's Word grew again in the urge of the times, the more the enemy saw himself compelled to return to the already tried artifice of putting on the old mask again. It is not at all uncommon nowadays to hear the most avowed nationalists pretending anew to be adherents of biblical Christianity and, on the other hand, to hear the defenders of evangelical truth pretending to be people who went by human statutes and were so blinded by prejudice for church doctrine that they taught straight against the Bible." (Ibid. 1831, p. 371 f.) After all, the rationalist grandfather Röhr thought that one would have to have "a general tenant's fortune" if one should now still confess one's faith (that is, unbelief) as openly as before. Therefore he instructed the foxes in the falsely famous art of going not straight, but around it, and yet reaching the infernal goal. The schoolmaster pope Dinier said: one must "accommodate oneself." "A too rapid enlightenment would blind you instead of enlightening you. ... I would like to shine with the torch of enlightenment, but not to light it." - The child "cannot be safely entrusted with the truth himself," but can only be pre-cut; for "not all that I need my people can bear." (Kzt. 1828, p. 28 f.) The ten virgins were awakened; one sought at once to put to sleep again the foolish among them. The foxes made a covenant with the power of the State, and by fusing reason and revelation, nature and grace, flesh and spirit, science and divine learning, world and

Church the Laodicea of the last times, from which the fear of God's Word has been banished, in which Israel has been brought under the Egyptian yoke, and instead of the shouting in the field against the army of the old evil enemy, the cry Peace, Peace! resounds.

The leader of these foxes has become the philosopher Schleiermacher, who is revered as "the church father of our century" (Kzt. 1846, p. 31). "Schleiermacher the Reformirte has carried off the palm of determining and sharply delimiting the correct starting point for the collected development of the ecclesiastical present and near future," says *Allerweltskirche*. (Ibid. 1855, p. 824.) "The newer theology is mainly based on Schleiermacher." (Schrecker: *Der Religionsbegriff bei Schi.* 1890. Vorw. S.V.) The latter, like all rationalists, denied the distinction of the three persons in God, and, as a pantheist, doubted the existence of a personal God at all; but he still liked to pose as if the rationalists were not his own flesh, and Ed. v. Hartmann is dissatisfied with him because he had stopped in the way of pantheism. (*Selbstzersetzg.*, p. 39.) Because the church "did not seem to be able to do enough in returning to the old," thinks his admirer, the reformed Hagenbach (VI, 358), therefore Schleiermacher had often to pretend to go along with it, when he wished to restrain it the more effectually from the full return to God's word. "I would like to show that the rationalists can be and remain in the church by their good right," he wrote himself. "I wanted to make quite a lot of room within the ecclesiastical." (Kzt. 1829, p. 773 f.) In the "Speeches on Religion," reviewed by his Jewish friend Henriette Herz, he asserted impudently enough that Christianity did not at all claim to be placed so exclusively opposite the other religions, and that Christ did not even wish to be the only mediator. (p. 419 ff.) If, in all this, he earnestly defended the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, let it not be forgotten that this false doctrine does not know the true triune God revealed in Christ, but only the Turkish god of destiny. "How hard does fate attack you!" wrote Schleiermacher also in a case of grief. "But the Ate (goddess of fate) also strides blindly over the heads of men." - "The death of children and of flourishing youth is in general something which I do not grasp; if I may not say, it still belongs to the wild, chaotic in nature, which has not yet been overcome by reason and art, and thus also chaotically and lawlessly soon strikes him, soon that one, so that often he who least deserves it must atone for the guilt of the whole." (Kzt. 1853, p. 372.) The man did not know the true God. He gave up the doctrine of creation, of the fall of man, of God's revelation among his people in miracles and prophecy, of Christ's person and office, of salvation in Christ, and of the whole efficacy of the Holy Spirit, and

- the conscience of the natural man. It is known that he seduced a Berlin pastor's wife as a man of 38 years and never regretted it. He wrote afterwards: "If only I had had her first, I would have appeased and banished the demon that made us both so unhappy. I was prepared for such relapses." The demon, however, was for him "her old anxious conscientiousness," by which, on the day before the divorce, she was "so violently seized that, after a few hours of terrible inner turmoil, she set out again of her own accord for her husband and united with him anew. To me," Schleiermacher adds, "she sent back immediately afterward what she had from me, and I have learned nothing further from her. The unfortunate woman!" (Kzt. 1853, p. 362.) The man was thus quite conscienceless, and still boasted of it; for he wrote, "since he found the consciousness of humanity, he had never lost himself; what they called conscience he no longer knew thus; thus no feeling punished him; thus none need admonish him." (Ibid. 1857, p. 1161.) This conscienceless knave is the Satan who has stopped the work of the Lord in the German Church. Cl. Harms, against whose theses he immediately wrote, addressed him in his answering letter (p. 111) as "demon," which may be ambiguous among heathens, but to Christians always means an evil spirit. The prince of darkness wanted to use him especially to "demolish the bulwarks of the gospel. When something of this was noticed, a witness also wrote: "Schleiermacher now justly bears his name; he makes veils which obscure to the sane eye the true outlines and colors of the word of God." (Corr.-Bl. 1833, p. 528.) The open blasphemer D. Fr. Strauß stood thus, that he wrote: "False attempts at mediation are now made enough; only divorce of opposites can lead further" (Ztsch. f. Prot. 5, 328); but he had to compliment the mischievousness of the master in making sausage: "Not everyone possesses the apparatus and the perseverance with which Schleiermacher so finely pulverized Christianity and Spinozism for the purpose of mixture, that a sharp eye is needed to distinguish the mixed constituent parts." (p. 325.) Through this fox, the old evil enemy's cunning brought about a union of Christianity with the modern world of culture before the faithful had even realized what was involved. This is what his biographer Auberlen calls his mission in church history.

The union between reformed unbelief and the Lutheran faith was proclaimed in Prussia in 1817, and thereafter also in other countries, by the state authorities; but these acted only in agreement with the school foxes, of whom Chr. M. Pfaff and Chr. Thomasius, in connection with many Pietists, had already done their part in the previous century. Schleiermacher was the most active in this. His friend Gaß wrote to him: "The people want to be worse.

dingS also a union in faith" in spite of all talk against it. He complained, however, about the leniency of the state authorities and said: "If the matter is so lame, one should only favor the union of individual congregations by special commissions, then the matter would gradually grow over the head of the others. (Kzt. 1853, p. 373 f.) Harms wondered how Schleiermacher, who nevertheless remained a reformer, could play the spiritual superior in the Lutheran Church; but - the times had just become different. Even where the Union was not formally introduced, one nevertheless acted according to the advice of Herr v. Loen: "The authorities should establish a general country church, which must be so constituted that all and every Christian, they may belong to a sect to which they wish, if they only set the Scriptures as the standard of their faith (?), can find in it their devotion and their necessary instruction." (Trinius: Freidenker-Lexicon. p. 550.) Henceforth, the state authority was to have the supreme authority in the church, but always to act in accordance with the lords of science. "The right help must, after all, ultimately come from science," wrote Prof. Gaß to Schleiermacher, who declared it to be his chief concern to make Scripture dispensable. (Kzt. 1853, p. 364.) He threw away the Old Testament, and instructed the learned theologians how they should let the so-called Christian consciousness and feeling, or inner experience, judge the Scriptures, instead of submitting to their judgment, which his pupil A. Schweizer thus expresses: "A letter of the Bible, which never wants to become spirit in me, cannot, although it is in the Bible, be the Word of God. A letter in the Bible to which the Spirit of Christ living in me (?) never wants to give an answer, hardly belongs to the Word of God in it, but is a shell formed out of ideas of time, an enclosure of divine truth, or an outflow of the merely human, that is, sinful way of thinking of the apostles." (Kzt. 1845, p. 774.)

Schleiermacher takes "a reformational position" in the church for such spirits, because he did not want to know anything at all about a faith that was given to the saints in Scripture once and for all, but let everyone make his own Bible. He himself was astonished that he was not at all accused of approaching Catholicism, although he openly maintained that the Church would lose nothing essential with the Scriptures and was still in the process of forming the canon. (Kzt. 1845, p. 768. 773.) When Lic. Schulze, in Breslau, in a lecture on the meaning of the Scriptures, delivered in 1894, said that the people should rather be restrained from reading the Scriptures, and that they should be made acquainted with their contents only through religiously educated personal wedges, because, from lack of education, they take everything literally, and therefore take it wrongly, he was only speaking in Schleiermacher's sense.

talked about. The latter not only declared the Scriptures to be a purely human book, but the Old Testament to be downright harmful, and also of the New Testament he wrote: "We must by and by get rid of all that is evidently only secondary work, and rests on presuppositions which can no longer be valid." (Ibid. p. 766. 768.) To the secondary works he reckoned all miracles, as one of his successors exults: "Science has given the Christian world a Christianity without miracles." (Lang: Leben JEsu und Kirche der Zukunft. p. 53.) Yes, even the doctrine of resurrection, judgment, and personal survival he reckoned among them, as he wrote to his wife, "There is no personal survival; one must be content with the spiritual return into the universe." (Kzt. 1859, p. 860.) Above all, all remembrance of a wrath of God should be gone, which is why he never preached of a repentance on days of penance, but only boasted that all was so good. (Ibid. 1886, p. 1078 ff.) Only against those Christians he became bitter who "cling to the letter, which has become a snare to many," that is, who abide by the written word by which they have been seized by Christ JEsu. In a letter to Cölle and Schulz he said: "I would rather be in church fellowship with all rationalists who admit only a confession of Christ and continue to call themselves Christians out of conviction, even with those against whose doctrine I have most definitely declared myself, ... than with those shut up in a fortress which the rigid letter forms." (Ibid. p. 1076 f.) He referred to the Herrnhutervater Zinzendorf, who, in spite of all pious playfulness with the Scriptures, said: "I have often been concerned that Bible reading, if it is connected with an exact collation, exploration, and kind of study, could be more harmful than useful to the congregation before now." (Ibid. 1845, p. 435.)

G. G.

(To be continued.)

Miscellany.

In his church newspaper of September 19, Stöcker points out **how the shyness of confession often hides behind "prayer.** He says, among other things: "There are prayers who think that an unholy spirit, false teachings on the pulpit and in the church, fear of men before the rulers, lack of discipline and regiment can prevail, and that all this is none of the business of a believing Christian; if one only prays right, everything will be all right. How often one hears in pietistic circles, who have no desire to lift a finger to repair the obvious damage in the church, the word seem-

They have no faith: God is in control. They are too despondent to fight for the church, but they want to pray so that God will do the miracle and help Christianity even without doctrinal discipline, without moral discipline, without fighting against the world, without deeds of faith. We must, however, regard this kind of sentiment as unfruitful superstition. In the kingdom of God, too, it is true: Pray and work! God has done the miracle of sending His Son, of founding the Church through Him, and of pouring out His Holy Spirit, bound to the right faith. If now in the church the Son of God is denied, the foundation of the church destroyed, the Spirit of God dampened by worldliness and reason of state, and if all these evils are not fought against out of false piety or weak fear of man, then one may not expect any new miracles from God. Yea, we cannot even hope that he will fulfil his old promises, which are given only to faith, not to despondency. No prayer will help the Church that is not accompanied by a valiant struggle against the world. But this very struggle is shunned by Protestantism, which, as in praying, has become so unlike Luther also in fighting." This is very true speaking. It is an abuse of prayer to substitute it for the confessing of the truth as commanded by God.

F. P.

Archaeology and the "Higher Criticism". The "D. E. K." writes: "Archaeology continues to furnish irrefutable evidence by which the results of the so-called 'higher criticism' of the older biblical books are overthrown. The Pentateuch and Joshua were absolutely supposed to be of much later origin. One reason given for this was that the precious stone jasper, mentioned in the high priest's shield, was not known at all in the time of Moses, and was not mentioned until much later by the Greeks. Now a scholar in the New York 'Observer' has thoroughly refuted this assumption, and given scientific proof that the Greeks borrowed the word 'jasper' from the East, and that the stone and its name were in use long before the Exodus. Thus one objection of criticism after another is dismissed as unfounded." - Unhappy, however, is he who allows his belief in the Scriptures to depend in any way on archaeological finds. F. P.

At the opening of the "Theological Course" in Weferlingen, by which one wants to work against the evil influence of the unbelieving university theology, Superintendent Holtzheuer held an address, from which we report the following: "This course is a new phenomenon in our church and theological life. With this new thing the first attempt is made here. For the initial stage in which the whole thing is, the number of participants is surprisingly large. Compared with the number of those for whom such curses as this one,

...will hopefully gain in importance in the course of time, it is admittedly small. . . . This theological course and the movement connected with it in general stand in contrast to the development which theology has largely taken at our universities. Since the General Synod of 1879, the representatives of our national church have been struggling to gain any influence on the filling of theological professorships. In vain. The plight of our church, which is caused by the wide spread of negative theology, led to the regional church meeting of last year, whose decision to declare it desirable that academically qualified clergymen should be enabled to participate in academic teaching, is generally known. The difficulties which stand in the way of the execution of this idea are not so much the question of persons as the brittleness of the theological faculties and the question of cost. What will become of the matter will be seen at the forthcoming Provincial Synods and at the forthcoming General Synod. Even before the plan that emerged at the regional church meeting, the plan of Pastor von Bodelschwingh had become known to found a free theological faculty in Westphalia, for which the license to replace a part of the academic triennium was to be obtained from the state. The plan seems to have failed, however, because such a privilege cannot be obtained in the foreseeable future from the state authorities, which are willing to protect the exclusive privileges of the state universities. What brings us together here today is a third plan, which, while the first two will, in the best case, only be realized after a long time, is already in the process of realization today, after it was discussed for the first time about ten weeks ago in a meeting of those called upon to do so. This latter plan has the advantage that it cannot be prevented by any jealous theological faculties, and that it does not require any state privilege. It is an act of ecclesiastical self-help, which, without claiming the granting of rights from the State and without crossing the legally assigned paths of the existing theological educational institutes of the State, uses the vacation time released by them for the cultivation of a theology pious to the Church and, God willing, will use it much more extensively in the future. Our actions are legitimized before the people by the principle of the Prussian Constitution: Science and its teachings are free. At least for this time, no professors of theology have been asked to take over lectures at the institute founded here, although there are also enough positive theological professors" (but what professors!), "and although their cooperation would in itself be very welcome. But the principle of self-help, to which this institution owes its existence, made us refrain from it at first. Perhaps

In the progress of this beginning, positive professors will later also stand here with us. This time, then, only clergymen who are in practical office and working scientifically will teach here. And in this way, such clergymen will be given more and better opportunities than is otherwise the case to train themselves for the academic teaching office. Our whole enterprise will be especially aimed at the training of positive forces for the academic teaching office. We want to make it our concern here to encourage independent studies. There is much that is important for the church in our time apart from the actual pastoral activity, which remains the most important thing for the church. But nothing is as important as scientific-theological work of the right kind, apart from the activity that directly edifies and provides for the congregation. For nothing causes so much mischief in the church, directly or indirectly, as theology which evaporates or falsifies divine revelation.

"We are here in a free theological arena. Those of us who are presently waiting in this place of the Magisterium are in no way jealous of the possible participation of others from our circles. Those of us who are presently waiting in this place of the teaching office are in no way jealous of the possible participation of others from our circles. The need for free participation in scientific instruction, which in the realm of state events encounters a *rocher de bronze* that cannot be shaken, or cannot be shaken easily, will be opened the door to collaboration here by this collegiality of our teaching authority, if it comes forward and has a capability behind it that can be recognized by our college. A study submitted to us, which is held in a positive sense, documents scientific method, and is capable of furthering knowledge on some point of theology, will in the future entitle the author to be a doctor here, at least to the extent that it will be possible for him to first become a contributor in a smaller circle.

"We have the right and we have the will, not called by any human authority, to represent ecclesiastical theology on our part by means of continuous lectures. But the freedom which is to be useful to us for such representation of ecclesiastical theology knows itself, because it is to serve ecclesiastical theology, to be bound, like all true freedom, to truth, to objective truth. The objective truths, that the God of salvation history is the triune God, that Jesus, the Savior of the world, is truly God, born of the Father in eternity, and also truly man, born of the Virgin Mary, that the atonement is the expiation of our guilt through the blood of the Son of God, that man becomes righteous without the works of the law through faith alone, that the holy Scriptures are really God's Word, that the miracles reported in the holy Scriptures are miracles, and that they are the truth of the world.

The truth that the essence of the sacraments is what the confessions of our Church understand it to be on the basis of Scripture, these objective truths, these are the pillars on which our activity is built. We want to and will hold on to these.

"In thus professing ourselves to be a theological society faithful to the confession, we testify at the same time that we recognize all genuine spiritual work of newer theologians, wherever it may be found. But whatever has something of naturalism about it, whatever breathes the spirit of this-worldliness, that we fight." At any rate, this "Theological Cursus" is well-intentioned. But as soon as one makes progress in right knowledge, he will see that he cannot live under the same church roof with the representatives of unbelief and erroneous faith. F. P.

To the battle against Rome. Superintendent Holtzheuer, editor of the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung," writes, among other things: "What could the church of the Gospel be to our time, to our people, and also to our state, if it were quite united in spirit! An evangelical church, united in the living faith in the Son of God, who came in the flesh, is after all alone able to offer the head to the uniform power of the anti-Christ, this all-poisoning, all-destroying, all-ruining evil power." True! But why does one not set to work to establish unity in the Spirit? This includes, above all, that one closes the columns of the "Kirchenzeitung" to such open destroyers of spiritual unity as Prof. Zöckler. Prof. Zöckler has only recently again in the columns of the "Kirchenzeitung" advocated the "Jrenkönnen" of Christ, and has given the word to the deniers of the inspiration of Holy Scripture. F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Pastor E. A. Brauer, † On September 27, Pastor E. A. Brauer died at Crete, Ill. The same was born April 19, 1819, at Northeim, Hanover, attended the Pädagogium at Jlefeld, and studied theology at Göttingen and Berlin. In 1846 he took his second theological examination. In consequence of the well-known call of Wyneken, Brauer came to America in 1847, was pastor at Addison (1847-1857), at Pittsburg (1857-1862), professor at the theological seminary in St. Louis (1862-1872), pastor at Trinity Church in St. Louis (1872-1878), pastor at Crete, Ill (1878-1896). The deceased was characterized by a particularly clear grasp of the Gospel and an outstanding gift of vivid exposition. His sermons were therefore as instructive and edifying as they were captivating and interesting in a good sense. In the struggle for the right doctrine of church and ministry, he was in the front ranks, and he has rejected the pretensions of a parochial priesthood from the right evangelical

Reason exposed and duly scourged. In general, the deceased took the liveliest part in all doctrinal struggles of the church until the last time, although he could read little himself due to his weak eyesight and therefore mostly needed the services of a reader. At conferences and synods he belonged to the leaders according to his talent and rich spiritual experience. He was a heartfelt prayer for the church in general and a faithful intercessor for the individuals of whose spiritual and physical need he had knowledge. God be praised for the rich spiritual blessing which he bestowed on his Church through this gifted and faithful servant. F. P.

General Council. Three ecclesiastical papers heretofore published in the General Council, the "Lutheran," the "Lutheran Church Messenger," and the "Workman," have been merged into one paper, which shall be called "The Lutheran," and shall be the general and official English church paper of the Council. Hereby is executed a resolution of the last meeting of this church body. Dr. Krotel is the principal editor. The new "Lutheran" in its first number professes the official doctrinal confession of the Council. This official confession is correct. In it the Council confesses the whole of the Holy Scriptures as God's Word and all the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church as being in perfect harmony with the Holy Scriptures. In fact, the doctrine in force in the Council does not yet agree with this confession in many cases. Whether the new "Lutheran" will succeed in promoting unity in doctrine depends on how it will be edited. If in its columns only the right doctrine is confessed and defended, and every doctrine that deviates from Scripture is fought as error, then its appearance will be of great blessing to the Council. The present state of doctrinal unity in the Council is evident from the fact that the editors of the new "Lutheran" do not wish to be responsible for "all opinions expressed by the writers for its columns. But the editors claim for themselves the right to "freely criticize what they have had to include in their columns." We permit ourselves to ask: Why not begin the promotion of doctrinal unity by refusing to admit into the columns of the "Lutheran" all "opinions" which are not in harmony with God's Word? The erroneous opinions are there, of course, and they cannot be eliminated by a power ruling. But why not make these opinions the subject of discussion at pastoral conferences, instead of bothering the congregations, for whom the "Lutheran" is chiefly intended, with the erroneous opinions? F. P.

Seminary in Philadelphia. Fr. W. A. Schässer is having a church built out of the seminary grounds at his own expense. It will be 100 feet long and 60 feet wide. This church is to be a memorial in honor of his deceased father, the well-known professor of theology at the seminary in Philadelphia.

The "Lutheran Herald," the organ of the New York Ministry, gives unambiguous testimony **against** church fairs, raffles, etc., as a means of raising money for church purposes. It recommends "the better way" of direct voluntary gifts as Christian and befitting a Christian congregation. How the fairs were abolished in an eastern community is reported in the above-mentioned paper: "We know of a community, whose name need not be mentioned, which every year at this time sought to restore its finances by holding a large fair. As often as the time approached again,

and the preparations for a new fair had to be made, the brave women of the congregation really had their work cut out for them, especially during the last week, when the fair was in progress, and when they had to neglect their homes and their children from Monday to Saturday, in order to be able to perform their duties at the fair, often until late at night. When the lazy week was over, the result was added up, and the church council was again paid about 600 dollars as profit, - truly, hard-earned money! The year was again drawing to a close, and already various men had raised the question, "Is there no Fair this year?" when one Sunday the pastor astonished the whole congregation by announcing, after the sermon, that he had determined to ask the congregation heartily and urgently to refrain from having a Fair this year, and to try a better way, which he would advise them to do. He added, that he well knew his suggestion would not meet with general approbation; but he might at least expect an honest attempt to be made at it. He made this proposal: that every family in the parish should hold a small family council and make an estimate of how much they were likely to contribute to the fair this year. The housewife should calculate how many cakes and victuals she would probably supply, and then add up exactly how much all this would be worth. The father should calculate how much cash he would have to give, and the children how much they would spend on candy, oranges, ice cream, and the like. Then an equivalent in money should also be fixed for the sour work of a whole week. All these sums were then to be honestly added up, put in an envelope, marked with the name, and brought to church as an offering on the next Sunday. The congregation did exactly as the pastor had indicated, and the next Sunday a large crowd came together, the offerings were collected, and after the collection the pastor made it known that after the benediction the money was to be counted, and whoever wished to wait for the result might remain. At last the pastor came forward and reported that the Collecte was over 1400 dollars. No Fairs have been held in the congregation since, but they (and especially the dear women) thank the Lord that they have found a better way. At the end the "Herold" remarks: "There are churches today that really seem to be inspired by the desire to strip away as much of the religious as possible and to make all arrangements in such a way that even the most shallow worldly person can feel at home in them, or at least undisturbed. This is especially evident in all such events of fairs and the like.

F. P.

Unbelief among Baptists. It is well known that President Harp er of the University of Chicago does not believe the Bible to be the Word of God. We have repeatedly written about this in greater detail. The much money given to this university is pretty much in the service of unbelief. It was new to us that the president of the Baptist Seminary at Rochester, N. Y., Dr. Strong, also so emphatically rejects the divine authority of Scripture. A writer in the "Lutheran" reports as an ear-witness the following sayings of Strong, made at the opening of the new academic year: "Neither the Bible nor the Creed is perfect." Both are but a "broken light"; from them we must go back to Christ. "The error of theology is that it treats the Scriptures as the source of truth." "It is not the Bible, but Christ, that is the source of truth." "The

Philosophy and science are just as likely to represent Christ (are expressions of Christ) as Scripture. Scripture is at best an imperfect revelation of Christ. We need not first inspiration or Scripture and then Christ, but first Christ and then inspiration and Scripture." At bottom, of course, this is just the old hogwash of wanting the "Spirit" before and apart from Scripture. F. P.

Episcopalians and body burning. A Milwaukee newspaper reports: Funeral services were held this morning at half past noon in honor of the late editor of the "Sentinel," Horace Rublee. Rev. Charles Stanley Lester, of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, conducted the services at the house on Prospect avenue, and the body was then taken to Forest Home cemetery, where cremation was privately performed. - In England and Scotland it is the "highest clergy" who seem to take cremation under their protection. There the crematoria are already inaugurated by speeches of "clergymen" of the state church, as the God's Fields were in former times.

F. P.

Ordination of Ballington Booth. Ballington Booth, the Commandant of the "Volunteers," that is, of that part of the Salvation Army which separated from the "Command" of William Booth, has been "ordained" as a "Presbyter of the Protestant Church" in Chicago. The ordination was performed by Bishop Fallows of the Reformed Episcopal Church "in the presence and with the approval" of Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregationalist pastors. That the pastors were commissioned to this ordination of Christian congregations is not reported. Ballington Booth had himself ordained because he wanted to serve the church with his "volunteers", while the old branch of the Salvation Army is active outside of all external church fellowship.

F. P.

German - Reformed Church. The Central Synod of the German Reformed Church meeting in Cleveland, O., voted for the transfer of the mission house and theological seminary from Franklin, Sheboygan Co., Wis. to Cleveland, O., where it is to become a part of Calvin College.

Necrological. On the 9th of October died at Columbus, O., at the age of 56 years Joh. Heinrich Spielmann. The deceased was for a long time professor at the "Capital University" of the Ohio Synod.

II. Abroad.

The Gustav Adolf Association and the Catholic Bonifacius Association. The A. E. L. K. reports: According to the annual report submitted at its last general meeting in Dessau, the Gustav-Adolf-Verein at present numbers 1849 branch societies and 538 women's societies, as against 1832 and 526 in the previous year. The total income amounted to 2,056, 153 Mk., 351,346 Mk. more than in the previous year. The total expenditure amounted to 1,212,912 Mk. Of the 45 main associations, 20 had a reduced, 25 an increased income. 8543 receipts were booked at the Central Board. 50 churches and chapels were completed; 53 congregations left the care of the association, 54 new ones joined. The German Bonifaciusverein had an income of 3,073,579 Mk. in 1895, which is about 700,000 Mk. more than in 1894. 705 mission stations were supported with 1, 160, 166 Mk. By the end of 1895 the Bonifaciusverein had spent nearly 21 million for the erection and maintenance of schools and churches in predominantly Protestant places. Compared to these figures

the Gustav-Adolf-Verein, to which the Bonifaciusverein forms the Catholic counterpart, must take a back seat; the Bonifaciusverein has overtaken it.

Corpse burning in Basel. The A. E. L. K. reports: The question of the burning of corpses has entered a new stage in Basle. An association for the cremation of corpses has existed there for a long time, but on the whole it has had little success, and in the course of the years it has collected 15,000 Frs. with difficulty, which was not nearly enough to erect a mortuary. Recently, the government was approached for support. The Great Council willingly decided to contribute the necessary rest (approx. 67,000 Frs.) for the construction of the crematorium. The opponents, however, made a noise and collected more than 1000 signatures, so that the decision had to be submitted to a referendum. Since there was little sympathy for the enterprise among the people, the friends of the cremation feared that the resolution would be rejected, and offered popular meetings, appeals to the press, etc., to change the crowd's mind. Much more lukewarm were the opponents. The conservative papers treated the matter more from the point of view that the state could not be expected to pay a few people for their amusement. That the burning was not to be desired in the interest of Christian and ecclesiastical morals was also occasionally asserted; but in general one kept quiet on this side and counted on the common sense of the people. On the other hand, from the liberal side this "progress" was praised as a matter of honor and principally demanded, because the pietists and orthodox did not want to know anything about it. In short, the friends of cremation won. With 3376 against 3197, i.e. with a majority of 179 votes, the bill was accepted.

Preaching and social policy. The socialist pastor Göhre of Frankfurt a. O. will resign from his office on April 1 of his own free will in order to devote himself entirely to social-political activity. In his book on the history of the Protestant Social Congress, Göhre has stated that social-political activity is incompatible with the office of a pastor; if a pastor wants to be seriously active in social policy, he must resign from his office. It deserves recognition that Göhre himself acts according to this principle.

(A. E. L. K.)

Theory and Practice among the Social Democrats. The "A. E. L. K." writes: "The Social Democratic Party has recently had to endure a sharp attack from among the workers in the book published by the shipyard worker in Kiel, Theodor Lorentzen, 'Die Socialdemokratie in Theorie und Praxis. The blow seems to have hit home; at least the bitterness among the shipyard workers was so great that Lorentzen himself received advice from the police that he should always arrive at the shipyard after work had begun in order to avoid the maltreatment of his comrades, and that he should always return home before the end of work. In his writing Lorentzen goes through all kinds of abuses and follies of the Social Democrats and their leaders: In theory the Social Democrats demand the eight-hour normal working day, which the author derides as a 'normal system' and as 'colossal nonsense' invented to incite the workers. In practice, in their own factories, they have working hours of 10, 13^h, even 18 hours, and treat their workers worse than the 'bourgeois', so badly that the workers have even had to resort to walkouts to protect themselves. The capitalists among them, such as Singer, who has paid 'his poor overcoat seamstresses miserably badly', Dr. Arons, Dietz, Friedländer, etc., do not even think of putting their doctrines into practice. The chief spokesmen, who always emphasize the necessity of equal de-

They emphasize the reward of all labor, allow themselves to be paid large salaries, etc. The Social Democrats speculate only on your purse,' Lorentzen calls to the worker. 'To fulfil their demands, in so far as they are justified, already in this State, does not occur to them; nothing is more repugnant to them than if the present State were to meet their demands!' Lorentzen demonstrates how things stand with the 'freedom' which Bebel and his comrades talk about by means of the conduct of Social Democracy in elections and strikes. Those who know the conditions to some extent will agree with the author when he says: 'Countless events in the course of the last few years have strengthened the perception that social-democratic "freedom" is identical with social-democratic "party terrorism" which constricts all and every individual action and thought with iron clamps even in its own camp!' The conclusion of the verse reads: 'The Social-Democrats demand of us that we give up religion, the family, the love of parents and children, free property, personal freedom in the choice of work, and love of the fatherland!' And what does Social Democracy offer in return? 'For religion, for the family, for the love of parents and children, it can offer us no substitute at all; for personal freedom and love of the fatherland it gives us the slave chains of the social future state!'"

Gay marriage in England. On the 23rd of June, the House of Lords of Parliament, by 142 votes to 113, passed on second reading the bill declaring permissible the marriage between a widower and the sister of his deceased consort. The Prince of Wales, the Dukes of York and Fife voted for this measure. Similar proposals had been repeatedly adopted by the House of Commons, but rejected by the House of Lords; hence the new resolution was regarded as an important event in British legislation. But the subsequent reading, which was made by the Commission on June 30 and July 7, considerably weakened this impression. At the instigation of the bishops belonging to the House of Lords, the Lords decided that the clergy of the national church should neither have the right to enter into such a marriage themselves, nor to consecrate such a couple; in case of transgression, church punishments are threatened; on the other hand, they should have the right to exclude from the Lord's Supper those of their parishioners who would have married each other in spite of this relationship; they can refuse baptism to their children. - What the Lords have decided here goes in part beyond the right goal. In general, it is wrong to want to regulate ecclesiastical discipline by parliamentary resolutions.

F. P.

Finanrielles from the English State Church. If, at the death of the Archbishop of Canterbury, it was reported that he drew an annual income of \$75,000, no inference should be drawn from this as to the salary of the ordinary parish priests of the State Church. The "Dean of Norwich" recently reported the following as to the amount of salary in the English State Church: 400 parish priests receive less than \$250 annually, 3500 less than \$500, and 7000 receive less than \$650.

F. P.

About the maintenance of the missionaries of the English Church Missionary Society we find the following interesting information in the "A. E. L. K.": "The English Church Missionary Society has 730 missionaries, of whom only 481 receive a salary from the actual missionary fund. 67 live from their own means, 23 are paid by the missionary societies in Australia, South Africa and Canada, 40 by individual congregations or local societies in the home country, 28 by the society of the so-called "Aehrenleser", 31 by other societies,

60 from individual private persons. Of the circa 80 Sendlings who are to leave this late year, 55 have also already been taken from the Geyeralkasse in a similar manner: 7 accept no salary at all, 43 are taken from individual private persons or families or associations, 5 from the missionary associations in the colonies."

War at the Peace Congress. The International Peace Congress was in session in Pest on September 18. A report on it says: "The solution of the Oriental question was discussed, and the chairman, General Türr Patte, moved that the congress should send addresses to all the heads of state, demanding in them the establishment of an arbitration tribunal. "To the Pope, too!" said a Catholic delegate. "I protest against that!" cried an Englishwoman, Mrs. Vincent. "But he is the head of Christendom!" retorted the Catholic. There was a confusion, as many wanted to speak at once. At last the Baroness Suttner took the floor, and declared that she thought it lawful to address the Pope also. Now another Englishwoman, Miss Ellen Robinson, also wanted to address the Freemasons. When again there was confusion, General Türr said: "But please, ladies and gentlemen, this is anything but a peace congress!" It was finally agreed that, in matters of the Oriental question, addresses should also be addressed to the heads of all "confessions," and especially to the chief rabbis.

A learned dispute in the Roman camp. About the authenticity of a signature of the devil a violent dispute has broken out between the "Köln. Volksztg." and the Catholic Director Künzle at Feldkirch in Vorarlberg-Tyrol. The latter is head of the Congregation of Priests of Perpetual Adoration and editor of a theological journal "Pelikan" dealing with the cult of the Eucharist; he reproaches the "Köln. Volksztg." the reproach that it has suffered shipwreck in its correct Roman Catholic view. The matter is this: The publishing house of the "Pelikan" has recently published a pseudonymous work, but at any rate inspired by Künzle: "The Mysteries of Hell according to Miss Vaughan. By Dr. Michael Germanus." In this writing it is related that the devil Vitru appeared on October 18, 1883, in a Roman Masonic Lodge, and testified, under the authentication of eminent members of the Order, such as Crispi, Lemmi, and others, that Sophie Sapho, **alias** Wälder, who was present, would give life to the grandmother of the Antichrist on September 29 of this year. In order to authenticate the event, a document with the signatures of the witnesses was recorded, whereby the aforementioned devil signed himself as **Sanctus Daemon Primarius Praeses** (first presiding holy demon). The signature of the devil Vitru is accompanied by all kinds of symbolic objects referring to the activity of the devil and his nature, such as an oven fork, a cock, etc. Künzle now believes, as a Künzle, that the devil is the first presiding holy demon. As a Catholic, Künzle now believes he must defend the possibility of the authenticity of the devil's signature, because the doctrine of the Catholic casuists in morals asserts the possibility of devil's covenants and their written fixation. The "Köln. Volksztg.", on the other hand, declares it bad that Künzle believes in the authenticity of the document, even though it does not deny the possibility of human connections with the devil for the purpose of shameful deeds. Künzle, however, can refer to a decision of the Cardinal Congregation of Poenitentiaries in Rome for the Catholic orthodoxy of his view, which has given confessors the authority to absolve from the sin of devil worship and the alliance with the devil, from the latter, however, only after any scriptural and legal claims have been made.

The Catholic Church in Germany has already filed a complaint on behalf of the Director Künzle against the "Köln. The permanent Commissary for the General Assemblies of the Catholics of Germany, Prince zu Löwenstein-Kleinheubach, has already filed a suit for Director Künzle against the "Köln. Volksztg." has already taken a public stand on behalf of Director Künzle.

Papist way of obtaining forgiveness of sins. The "D. E. K." reports: In the church of the Madonna Degli Angeli, near Assissi, a Protestant visitor saw a man sliding on his knees from the church door to the altar, licking the floor with his tongue. - Traces of blood marked his path. When asked why he was submitting to such mortification, the man replied, "I come from Naples to ask forgiveness for my sins from St. Francis of Assissi; I cannot find it at home."

The chief enemies of Christian society. With the approval of three. Archbishops, a spiritual congress has taken place at Rheims, attended by 700 priests. In the principal address, delivered by a Canonics, the dangers threatening Christian society were named as: The resurgence of paganism, the Jews, Freemasonry, and Socialism. - There the chief enemy of Christian society, Pabstthum, is omitted. F. P.

The "holy" orders in the kingdom of Antichrist. At the General Assembly of the Catholics of Germany, the Roman orders were thus praised: "Sensuality must blush before the radiant purity of the order" (O the holy monks!). "Selfishness should have marveled at the humble submission to a higher authority" (namely, to the authority of the Antichrist, cursed by God). "Voluntary celibacy had become the protection and refuge of marriage" (to the extent that even Catholics have carried misgivings about letting their wives and daughters go to confession). "Religious life only seeks to ennoble and sanctify the world's shas" (of course, the pope's orders and estates are much more noble and holy than those created by God). "What Sunday is in the division of time, let religious orders be in the division of society" (certainly, monks are the nobility of human society). So impudently and unashamedly do the Romanists extol the malodorous sanctity of their religious in opposition to the estates ordered by God! It says further in the report before us: "So then, with stormy applause, the motion was adopted that the assembly should express its regret that the renewed Reichstag resolution of February 20, 1895, concerning the abolition of the Order of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, was not accepted. On the other hand, the Assembly welcomes the fact that on June 17 in the Reichstag some parties, which had hitherto been completely averse to the abolition, have at least shown an inclined concession; it expects that the very surviving, completely groundless prejudices will disappear. But the Römlings dare to boast of her shameful sanctity in this way because the Protestant Church of Germany no longer has the light to judge Rome rightly. All that the Stöckersche Kirchenzeitung opposes to the Roman glorification of the orders is this: "That this is really only a matter of prejudice, not of justified opposition to some harmful human statutes, was, of course, not proved in the meeting." O how the salt of the Protestant Church of Germany has become stupid!

F- P-

The papist anti-Masonic Congress in Trent was placed under the protection of Mary by the Prince-Bishop Valussi in his welcoming address. Valussi concluded

and the assembly responded with a **Hail Mary** ("Evviva Maria"). This is how they fight the Freemasons in the Pabbacy!

F. P.

Suppression of the Slave Trade in Africa. The "D. E. K." reports: The suppression of the slave trade in Africa has made important progress. The English Commissary Johnston has gradually subdued all the Arab slave traders in the south and north ends of Lake Nyassa and destroyed their villages. The last decisive blows fell in December, 1895. The old notorious robber chiefs fell in battle or were hanged. 1184 negroes were liberated. With these successes the Nyassa country, formerly one of the main strongholds and military routes of the curse-worthy trade, may be regarded as cleansed.

Punishment of the slave trade in German East Africa. The jurisdiction in matters of slavery has been tightened in various points by the Deputy Governor of German East Africa von Bennigson: "1. whoever seizes a free person in order to bring him into slavery shall be punished for human robbery with chain labor for up to five years. 2. commercial or habitual kidnapping shall be punished by life imprisonment in chains or by death. The same penalties shall be inflicted on any member of a gang who commits the armed robbery of human beings. (3) If, in the course of the execution or attempted execution of a robbery, the death of one of the persons whose robbery was executed or attempted, or who came to the aid of the robbed or threatened person, is caused, the organizers and leaders shall be sentenced to death, and the other participants to chain labor for not less than three years. - Whoever engages in slave trade on a commercial basis shall be punished with hard labor for not less than three years. - Whoever intentionally participates in the transport of slaves in execution or completion of a human abduction, or in the transport of slaves serving the commercial slave trade, shall be punished by imprisonment in irons for not less than three years. The commercial or habitual transportation of slaves shall be punished by chain-labor not less than three years." In addition to the above threatened punishments, "fines and corporal punishment" may be imposed.

(A. E. L. K.)

Marriages in France. Because of the continuing reduction in the number of marriages, a law was passed (on June 20, 1896) at the request of the deputy Abbe Lemire, by which the judicial summons to parents to consent to the marriage of their children must henceforth take place only once (instead of three times). The Minister of Justice now issues an explanatory circular to the public prosecutors to urge them to simplify all formalities and obstacles to marriage as far as possible; to eliminate them. - Whether this will stop the aversion to marriage among the French people is doubtful. The root cause, at any rate, lies deeper. It is the aversion of a people more and more detached from God to a divine order. (A. E. L. K.)

The "fixed salary" of the Popes the only salvation of the Russian Church. In the A. E. L. K. we read: Prince N. Yenikejev in the "Grashd." severely reproaches the Orthodox national clergy for filling their own pockets by cultivating the many Russian holidays, but bringing the congregations down morally. The complaint about these "chapel festivals," about the celebration of the "ninth and tenth Fridays," Yvant's Day, Elijah's Friday, Elijah's Day, etc., are already old. But what is new is this connection between the abundance of holidays and the priests' salaries: "All the

These customs of the peasants, both the chapel feasts and the appointed days, are established and consecrated by the clergy because they have great merit in this, since the holding of the church services is paid for with money and grain. The customs and habits will change completely as soon as the clergy receive a sufficient fixed salary. Then the clergy will preach that work is not a sin, but idleness and sloth are great sins. Now these clergymen resemble pagan priests more than orthodox Christian shepherds of souls, for since they do not receive a fixed salary in money, they are naturally very anxious to support the peasants with all spiritual and mental means in the choice of those days; there have been examples where the parishioners, with the permission of the clergyman, cast lots as to which saint in the village a chapel should be built - first the permission was obtained in due place - and then the chapel was built. As soon as it was finished, there was also a chapel festival. It was also agreed on which days no work was to be done, and the agreement was kept. If someone wanted to work on such a day, the community assembly would impose a fine on him; on these agreed days, church services were held and afterwards schnapps and beer were drunk and strolled around. The more such 'chapel' and 'appointed' days are celebrated in a village, the better and more profitable it is, of course, for the clergy. Therefore, it is desirable that the clergy receive a fixed salary in money as soon as possible, so that he does not live on pittance and does not take pains to fix new appointed holidays over and over again, which in the eyes of sane people are only a disgrace for the clergy. With a fixed salary, the clergy will stand in the eyes of the entire congregation at the height of their great and holy task, and these clergymen will be given due honor as worthy men who are completely worthy of respect, but now they are little respected by the congregation. Very often the expression is used of them, "They rob of the living and the dead." If the clergy receive a fixed fee, the morals of the peasant members of the congregation will also undoubtedly be raised, their souls will become accessible to honour, conscience, and shame, they will not get drunk on liquor and beer, they will not saunter and loaf. All this the fixed fee of the clergy can do." Russian "clergymen" will resemble "pagan priests" as long as they are essentially Mass monkeys. "Christian shepherds of souls" they can become only by preaching the Gospel.

F. P.

Also a closing of the century. For the end of the 19th century a great Catholic world demonstration is to be organized. A preparatory committee, which has its headquarters in Bologna and is headed by Count Aquaderni, has already sent a letter to the Pope to this effect. It says: "We want to found an international committee in order to spread our action early and to prepare the Catholics of the whole world to close the nineteenth century with a solemn and general act of gratitude to Jesus Christ, our Redeemer, and of love, obedience and devotion to His exalted Vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff." The Pope, in his reply, expressed his joyful approval and gave the apostolic blessing to the Committee.

Necrological. On September 30, the professor of philosophy Dr. Moritz Wilh. Drobisch, known as one of the main representatives of Herbart's philosophy, died in Leipzig at the age of 94.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42. November 1896.

No. 11.

A word of warning against overestimating antiquity research.

Every Christian rejoices over the testimony of the biblical reports by extra-biblical sources. He especially takes note of the Assyriological researches of our time, insofar as they testify that the first part of the first book of Moses contains real history and not mere legends, as an unbelieving theology has claimed and still claims. News such as that which the "Lutheran Church Gazette" of Philadelphia brings about the researches of the Assyriologist Dr. Hilprecht is of the greatest interest not only to theologians, but to all Christians. The "Kirchenblatt" reports on a speech by Hilprecht, who recently returned from the Orient, as follows: "He (Hilprecht) gave a concise overview of the results of the magnificent excavations in Nippur, the ancient sanctuary of the god Bei in Babylonia, in which he especially called attention to those points which are of importance for the research and understanding of the Old Testament. Perhaps it will not be without interest for the theologically educated reader of the 'Kirchenblatt' if we briefly call attention to one or the other point here. In Genesis 14, as is well known, the story of the four kings against Sodom and Gomorrah is told. The names of the four kings are Amraphel, Arish, Kedor-Laomor, and Thideal. This biblical report is now, as Prof. Dr. Hilprecht informed us, confirmed in a wonderful way by a cuneiform tablet found by him, which also shows the names of three of the kings mentioned in Gen. 14. Likewise, the Babylonian finds shed a surprising light on the 'ethnology' of Gen. 10. The existence of those ancient cities of Babel, Erech, Akkad and Kalne in the land of Sinear, of which Gen. 10 speaks, can now also be proven by extra-biblical sources. About

In the main, the results which Assyriology has so far brought to light serve to confirm the biblical accounts of the Old Testament at every turn." So far the "Kirchenblatt". - Oriental archaeology also supplies weapons against modern "higher criticism," which now has - admittedly quite undeservedly - scientific prestige in our time. This is interestingly argued by Pros. A. H. Sayce in an article in the "Contemporary Review," an extract of which is before us in the "Public Opinion" of November 19. According to this, Prof. Sayce says: "I expressed the conjecture years ago that if excavations were made on the sites of the ancient cities of Canaan, libraries of clay tablets with cuneiform inscriptions would be found, similar to those in the libraries of Assyria and Babylonia. Of course, the critics laughed and scoffed at me. Had they not proved that there was no writing at all in Israel before the days of Samuel and David, and that consequently what was thought to be history in the five books of Moses was nothing of the kind? But in spite of the critics, the Tel el-Amarna tablets were found, and soon after Mr. Bliss discovered a cuneiform tablet of the same period among the ruins of ancient Lachish. The bravest defender of the illiteracy of the ancient Orient was forced to concede, and the critics were forced to admit that they were at any rate mistaken on this point. The really strong argument of the critics against the Mosaic age and the Mosaic writing of the five books of Moses was this, that neither Moses nor his contemporaries could read or write. The Tel el-Amarna tablets have overturned the assumed fact, and have shown that the Mosaic age was highly developed literarily. In regard to this point, therefore, I see that a decisive silence has been observed." Of such and similar results of Oriental archaeology the Christian Church takes note with pleasure, and utilizes them to beat an infidel science with its own weapons.

But it is also appropriate to warn against the improper use and overestimation of this archaeological research. Let us remember three things.

The first is this: To a Christian, before all Assyriology, etc., the historical character, that is, the historical truth of all biblical accounts is certain. The simple fact that a historical account is found in Scripture is proof enough for a Christian of its truth. No less authority than Christ Himself stands up for the unbreakable truth of the entire Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament when He says John 10:35, "And yet the Scriptures cannot be broken," and the apostle of Christ, St. Paul, when he testifies in 2 Timothy 3:16 that all Scripture is inspired by God. Also the fact that Moses not only knew how to write, but also really wrote.

wrote, is established for us before the tablets of Tel el-Amarna by the authority of Christ. Christ testifies quite explicitly to John 5:46: "Moses wrote of me." In short, the Christian Church has for all the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and all parts of them, the authority of Christ and His apostles. What belongs to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, she knows to be inspired by God and to be unbreakable truth. Thus it accepts as historical truth the historical account given in Genesis 10 and in the account of the battle of the kings in the Valley of Siddim in Genesis 14, because it is an account of the Holy Scriptures. The Christian Church does not in any way make its belief in Scripture dependent on the research of Oriental archaeology. Where would that lead either? This research is in no way completed, but is still very much in its infancy. Should Christians now suspend their faith in the Scriptures until the antiquarians have given their proof of the historical character of the Old Testament, or at least of certain parts of it? Furthermore, the fact is before us that antiquity research in *concreto* arrives at contradictory results, which is not at all surprising in view of the difficulty of deciphering the cuneiform and other inscriptions. Should Christians now wait with their faith until the scholars have come to an agreement? Thank God that He has provided best for His Church, that for her the debate is closed as to the truth of the Old Testament Scriptures by the authority of Christ and His apostles. This faith we have to nourish and cherish in the Christian Church. We must carefully avoid all statements that could distort the Christian viewpoint and lead Christians to believe that the Bible needs extra-biblical sources for its confirmation. When, therefore, the "Lutheran Church Gazette" not only says: "This biblical account is now, as Prof. Dr. Hilprecht has informed us, miraculously confirmed by a cuneiform tablet found by him, which also shows the names of three of the kings mentioned in Genesis 14," but also adds: "so that the authenticity of this biblical account is now no longer to be doubted": this is, of course, to be understood with a qualification. The authenticity of this report is not proved by that cuneiform tablet for the *fides divina* of the Christians, for this faith is based on the report of the Holy Scriptures, and has enough in this report; but only the *fides humana*, that is, especially the unbelievers, to whom the Holy Scriptures themselves, as well as Christ and his apostles, are as yet no authority, can be thought of here. To the Christians, before all the cuneiform tablets, the genuineness of even that report has always been certain. This is also the meaning of Dr. Hilpert. The same has, as the "Kirchenblatt" also reports,

In his longer speech he said, "that he considers it the most beautiful profit of his researches, if through the results of the same the old Bible word is proven in its unbreakable truth". Hereby he says that the Bible word itself is "unbreakable truth" for Christians. When, therefore, he still speaks of a "proof" of that report, he thinks only of a proof of the *fides humana*, which even unbelievers, to whom the Scriptures are no authority, must acknowledge. What is the value of this purely human faith, which is wrought even in unbelievers by human research? It has a certain value. Through it an unbeliever, who hitherto has not wanted to know anything of the Scriptures, can be induced to read the Scriptures outwardly and to approach the church outwardly, in order then to be converted righteously to Christ through the Word of God itself, as it is found in the Scriptures and preached by the church, and thus to become a Christian. But one must always resist the idea that belief in the truth of the Bible, which is based on archaeological and other human researches, is already the Christian faith and makes a man a Christian. This is a widespread and pernicious delusion, especially in our day. People count themselves Christians because they generally hold that Christianity and the Bible are historical truths. But we say, following Luther, God grant us not much of such "Christian faith"! Christian faith enters a human heart in only one way: by conversion, that is, by the proud, self-righteous human heart being crushed with the hammer of divine law and then enlightened by the preaching of Christ crucified to the knowledge of the Savior of sinners. No one becomes a Christian otherwise. Not even an educated man. If human research is misused to nourish human pride and scientific conceit, as is unfortunately usually the case, it becomes an obstacle to man on the way to salvation. There is no substitute for repentance and faith. - We would also like to remind you here that scientific research, which is related to Scripture, is also very slippery ground for the researchers themselves, as experience shows. To this research belongs a very firm Christian character. A character which, no matter how dear the "results" of its researches may have become to it, immediately draws a big line under them as soon as it comes into contradiction with Scripture. If a Christian investigator does not do this, he touches the majesty of the Word of God, he loses faith and a good conscience. His researches then no longer serve the Christian Church, but are a blasphemy against it, because the majesty of the Word of Scripture, on which the Church stands, is touched. We do not expect that Dr. Hilprecht will carry out his researches against the Scriptures.

will assert. He testifies, after all, that he considers the "old Bible word" to be "unbreakable truth". But he will have to defend himself vigorously against others touching the Scriptures with the results of his research. We have just read the following bookseller's advertisement from Rudolf Merkel in Erlangen: "For exclusive distribution in Europe I received: Hilprecht, H. V., **Old Babylonian Inscriptions chiefly from**

Nippur. The author gives in the just published second part of his work for the first time an overview of the epoch-making results of the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania engaged in the systematic excavation of Nippur since 1888. To an even greater extent than the first part, which has been described by the entire scientific community as a work of the first rank, the present part is likely to attract the attention of Semitists, Old Testament theologians, archaeologists and historians. The editor makes important contributions to the oldest history and to the beginnings of civilization in Babylonia. Above all, he gives an insight into the earliest Semitic state formations on the basis of the oldest cuneiform texts which he has critically produced and analysed with great effort - among them a historically extremely important one of 132 lines and far older than the famous vulture stele of Tello. On the basis of the most extensive excavations in the lowest layers of rubble of the Bél temple at Nippur, combined with detailed palaeographical studies, he determines the chronological relationship of Sargon I and Narām-Sin to the kings of Tello and shows that the history of Babylonia must go back to the 7th or 8th millennium B.C." One cannot speak of the 7th and 8th millennia B.C. without attacking the historical character of the Old Testament Scriptures. There is no room for so many millennia in the Bible's dates. This use of his researches will therefore have to be very vigorously resisted by Dr. Hilprecht. How a Christian takes a stand on human chronological researches when they are unwilling to agree with the chronological data of Scripture is shown by Luther's own example. Luther is known to have studied biblical chronology in great detail. He "diligently brought together and reckoned the years of the world." 1) Compare his *Supputatio annorum mundi*. 2) In the life of Abraham he encounters a difficulty. He seems to be sixty years short. 3) But what declaration of his principal position does he make on this occasion? He says: "It is absurd to follow the bold spirits who, when such a difficulty arises, immediately cry out that there is a manifest error, and who without shame dare to ignore other people's books.

1) St. Louis ed. I, 721. exeg. opp. lat. erl. Erl. III, 71.

2) Jen. 4, 673. Walch XIV, 1110.

3) In ipso Abrahamo nobis intercidunt anni LX. Ex. opp. lat. III, 71.

to improve. As for me, I do not yet know how to answer this question, although I have carefully counted up the years of the world. Therefore I now conclude with a humble confession of my ignorance (*ignorantiae*), as is reasonable (for the Holy Spirit alone is the one who knows and understands all things)," etc. 1) In every case in which extra-biblical accounts come into conflict with the accounts of Scripture, the truth is - according to Luther - on the side of Scripture. He says that he "does not entirely despise the *Historicos*, but nevertheless prefers the Holy Scriptures to them." "I use them thus" - he continues - "that I may not be urged to be contrary to Scripture. For I believe that in the Scriptures God speaks who is true, but in other histories that very fine men apply their best diligence and fidelity, yet as men, or even least that their copyists could have erred." 2) This position of Luther is that of every Christian and every Christian theologian. If extra-biblical historical accounts contradict the Bible's report, the former are false. Applied to the present case: if Assyriology takes Babylonian history back to the 7th or 8th millennium before Christ, this is an error. Either the error is already found on the ancient tablets, etc., or the Assyriologists have erred in deciphering them.

The other point which necessity requires to be pointed out is this: one does not overestimate the importance of archaeological research in relation to the understanding of Scripture. The "*Kirchenblatt*" says: "He (Dr. Hilprecht) called special attention to those points which are of importance for the research and understanding of the Old Testament." Through archaeological research some light may be thrown on historical notes of Scripture, individual external circumstances which it reports, etc. And this the Christian Church does not despise, but gratefully accepts. But in our day there is a widespread delusion that the understanding of Scripture, including its doctrines, has only been properly opened up by recent historical research. Only recently we were prompted to reject a remark to this effect in an English Lutheran church bulletin. The fact is that all the teachings of Scripture can be clearly and surely discerned from Scripture itself. We do not need to explore "extra-biblical sources" for this purpose, which may only have become available to us in the 19th century. If it were otherwise, the church in the earlier centuries would have been in a bad way, and the church of the present day would be in a bad way with respect to the right knowledge of Christian doctrine from the imperfect sources.

1) I. c. III, 71st St. Louis ed. I, 721.

2) Walch XIV, 1117.

The "science" would actually become a mediator between God and man. Science" would actually become a mediator between God and man. No, thank God, the Scriptures are perfectly clear in themselves. It does not need to be made clear by the latest and most recent researches. The lamentation of the church of the present day is that people turn their eyes away from the light which shines so brightly in Scripture, and run after other gods, namely the god "science." Here applies what Luther says against the assertion of the papists that the understanding of Scripture is only opened up by the interpretation of the Fathers: "But if any of them assail you, and say, One must have the interpretation of the fathers, that the Scriptures are dark: ye shall answer that it is not true. There is no clearer book written on earth than the Holy Scriptures, which are to all other books as the sun is to all lights. They speak such things only to lead us out of the Scriptures, and to make themselves masters over us, that we should believe their dream-sermons. It is an abominable, great dishonor and vice against the Holy Scriptures, and against all Christendom, to say that the Holy Scriptures are dark, and not so clear, that any man may understand them to teach and prove his faith." 1) In general, if the whole situation is not to be perverted to the great detriment of the Christian Church, we must counteract the delusion as if there were still all kinds of doctrinal mysteries in Scripture which still awaited solution. We say with Luther: There is only one mystery in Scripture. That is Christ and the grace and salvation in him. He who has recognized Christ and salvation in him from the clear passages of Scripture has thereby recognized the whole mystery of Scripture. There are no more mysteries behind. Luther writes against Erasmus, who also spoke of all kinds of mysterious things in Scripture, the understanding of which had not yet been made clear, among other things as follows: "That some things are supposed to be hidden in Scripture has indeed been proclaimed to the world by the godless sophists, with whose words you also speak here, Erasmus, but they have not yet brought forward, nor could they bring forward, a single article by which they would like to prove their mad delusion. ... For what can be left in Scripture that is still deeply hidden, after the seals have been broken and the stone rolled away from the door of the tomb, and the supreme mystery has been revealed, that Christ, the Son of God, has become man, that God is triune and united, that Christ has suffered for us and will reign forever? Is not this also the most well-known thing in all the world, and is sung everywhere? Take Chr istum from the Scriptures, what can you then say further in

1) St. Louis issue V" 334.

ye find?" 1) Even through the legitimate exegetical studies of God-blessed interpreters of Scripture, through whose ministry more difficult passages of Scripture are explained from Scripture itself, no new, hitherto unknown doctrines, nor even parts of them, are brought to light, for in the more difficult passages of Scripture there is nothing different than in the perfectly clear ones, to which access is equally open to scholars and unscholars. How much less will the understanding of Scripture be made accessible to us only through the investigation of extra-biblical sources, since this is only a matter of the human testimony of individual historical facts that are already known to us from Scripture itself. We do not say this to belittle the relative value of this research. The purpose of this discussion is merely to point emphatically to the truth that all Christians can draw from Scripture itself a complete and certain knowledge of the whole Christian doctrine. If this confidence in Scripture is shaken in Christendom, great harm is done.

The third point we wish to make is closely connected with the points already discussed. It has become fashionable in our time to refer to men engaged in scientific research as the real "ornament" of the Christian Church. This is connected with the wrong modern direction in the church, which regards the Bible and Christianity primarily as interesting historical phenomena and pushes the teaching, the beatific teaching, of Scripture into the background as less important. For this reason, men whose researches relate to the historical accounts of Scripture as history are held in high esteem. On the other hand, we hold, on the ground of Scripture, that nothing is reported in Scripture as mere history, but everything for the purpose of doctrine. "But whatsoever things were written aforetime," - says St. Paul Rom. 15:4, - "these are written unto us for doctrine." The real "adornment" of the Christian church, therefore, is to us the many noble men who, by God's grace, can preach the beatific Christian doctrine, reveal Christ, preach law and gospel rightly. These are the people who do the real work in the kingdom of God. They make sinners blessed. They build the church. Therefore, according to Luther, these people should be placed first and be called Doctors of the Holy Scriptures. 2) All scientific research is of value to the church only in so far as it serves the ministry of preaching. Christian researchers willingly recognize this subordinate relationship. According to the report of the "Kirchenblatt", Dr. Hilprecht also said "that the focus of his work and research in recent years has not been in the theological area,

1) St. Louiser Aug. XVIII, 1681.

2) E. A. 19, 236 f.

that nevertheless theology remained his 'first love', and that he considered it the most beautiful profit of fine researches, if through the results of the same the old Bible word was proven in its unbreakable truth". But most archaeologists, alas! do not stand thus. And it is in the whole character of modern theology to exalt scientific research at the expense of the simple teaching of the gospel as it is found in Scripture. The scientific investigators are theologians of the first rank; men, on the other hand, who can only preach God's Word, are considered theologians of the second rank, if the appellation of "theologian" is granted to them at all. Now it is not the name that matters. But it still seems to us the most fitting thing to reserve the designation "theologian" for those who possess the ability ($\chi\alpha\alpha\text{-}\eta\varsigma$), wrought by the Holy Spirit, "to conduct the ministry of the New Testament," 2 Cor. 3:5, 6. Scientific investigators would then be "theologians" if and in so far as they also possess incidentally that ability for the direction of the Christian ministry of preaching. But be that as it may! In any case, we ask God first of all for many capable, simple preachers of the gospel. If, in addition, he gives us people who, through scholarly research of extra-biblical sources, testify to historical accounts of the Bible for the sake of *fides humana*, we will gratefully accept this gift as well. But we consider the most necessary and excellent gift of God to be those people who can teach God's Word well from the Scriptures. F. P.

The attacks of modern theologians on God's word.

(Continued.)

All confessional writings that bound people to the doctrine of Scripture should also be done away with, as he wrote: "Everything that is held together by the unholy bonds of symbols will be driven apart and divided. If there is no longer any point of union of this kind, . . . this seems the only means of ending that mischief." (Ibid. p. 794.) He wished to "reconcile" Christum and Spinoza, Gospel and Formation of Time. To this end, the Unirte, or, as the Uckermärker more correctly said, ruinirte Kirche, was to help; for with the Union, through which the door was thrown wide open to the spirit of the abyss, it was intended only to completely eradicate Bible faith. In particular, the universities were to remain independent of the firm prophetic and apostolic word, in order further to be able to breed out the vultures of the last time; and all those who stood between faith and unbelief, like Prof. Neander in Berlin, agreed with him. "What kind of a science would that be, to which everywhere the results of research were to be pre--

In its "Memorandum on the Present Crisis of Church Life" of 1854 (p. 16), the University of Göttingen warned, for the sake of "doctrinal freedom" or "free scriptural research," that "sooner or later Lutheran party men" who stood on the Concordia formula rejected by science would be appointed to Göttingen; for the universities must be "free places of science. (pp. 18. 20. 26. 31.) Science, even theological science, said the Schleiermacherian Marheineke, "has not to serve the church directly, but first of all free knowledge; thus it is itself absolutely free; and if this freedom is destroyed, it is itself destroyed. It is for this very reason that the appointment of theological teachers in Protestantism is not, as in Papism, an act of the church, but of the state." The Church had "freely released science from itself and declared it to be of age." It must not "begin to judge theologically from faith," but must run as if toward the uncertain and "steer toward the ever-recurring superstition, as if the spirit and eternal truth depended on the authenticity of this or that passage of Scripture, or of this or that book of Scripture, or on the letter in general." "It must lead the youth itself through the sea of errors; for he would certainly be a bad theologian who wanted to deal only with bare, unadulterated truths." False teachers are as necessary as God's prophets. (Cf. Introduction to Lecture on the Significance of Hegel's Philosophy. 1842. pp. 47 f., 65 ff. 83.) - According to this, a professor is to be permitted to do everything, as the old rationalists already did when they cried: "Test everything!" with the silent reservation: only not a professor's soUsAia! When Hengstenberg published in his church paper the blasphemies and ungodly jokes of Professors Gesenius and Wegscheider in Halle, taken from the college notebook of a student (1838, p. 38 ff. 117 f.), such an uproar arose in Halle that the police had to protect all serious Christians and their windows against the stone-throwing of the future preachers; for, although no one disputed the truth of the communications, it was still considered sacrilegious to permit the people to gain an insight. "It would be a curious and strange thing," said the Correspondent of the Rev. Brandt, "if one had to let the professors of divine learning teach, say, and do everything that seems good to them, and one would be doing a great injustice if one were to call out to them: do not corrupt our youth; do not teach them a doctrine that is contrary to the Scriptures; do not make them believe in the Scriptures; do not make them believe in the Scriptures. Do not make God's word suspect, contemptible, a poor collection of legends, a childish book of fables; do not trot out jokes and jester's tales before it, of which it is to be lamented if they are heard in the drinking house and in the guardroom; be honest, rather renounce, rather feed on splitting wood and beating stone than on teaching unbelief, since you have been appointed and paid for.

...to teach the faith. Look, gentlemen, a Balbir man who cuts off his nose instead of his beard, I may throw down the stairs, and a high authority will receive him downstairs and talk to him in confidence; an innkeeper who does not serve beer according to the tariff, the police will take him by the ear and put a stop to him; a baker who sells bread that is too light or unhealthy will be rapped on the long fingers; a butcher who interferes with the master of the case will be expelled from the guild; a tradesman who wanders a different way than his passport prescribes will be brought to the thrust; a grenadier who fires at his captain instead of at the enemy is court-martialed; an apothecary who mixes coriander with mice droppings is compelled not to do so; and if he were to add mice poison to his magnesia, I do not think he would ever again have anything to do before his reception table; - Behold, every thing under the sun, at least with clever people, has its certain rules, its certain limitations" (even where the circumstances are different). "But only to a professor, employed, bound, and paid, to teach God's word pure and true, shall I not be allowed to inquire whether he also does what he is commanded, to which he has committed himself to the church and to the state; shall I not be allowed to refuse, if he makes bad jokes about the holy scriptures? A teacher who is employed to educate capable, faithful, conscientious, serious-minded, pious youth educators, preachers, and pastors for the state, the school, and the church, I am not to be allowed to persuade him of anything if he does the opposite; I am to let him have his way according to his heart's desires, if it pleases him to make Bible-deniers, learned tightrope walkers, pompous, unbelieving, miserable windbags out of the young people? Shall he be at liberty, without any argument, to mix his filth with the heavenly manna; to turn his gun against the Lord in whose service he stands; to mix his Hebrew root-pulp with deadly sausage-poison, and his dogmatic water-soup with corrosive sublimate? I may take a goat that offers himself to me as a gardener by the beard and carry him out of the garden door; but against a doctor or magister who seeks to deprive my children of their Christian faith at college, I should not even be allowed to protest; I should let him gnaw my heart leaves without protest? See if you do not pretend a little too much to us! . . . Is it then quite cannibalistic and shy of us to say that you should not make unworthy jokes about sacred things to our children; that you should not pour oil on the fire of careless youth; that you should not make such people of our sons who afterwards climb their pulpit stairs with a worse conscience than that with which the thief enters his neighbor's house?" (1830, p. 819 ff.)

The Christians, however, could complain as much as they wanted, the so-called science was declared "absolutely free" and independent of God and man. Schleiermacher helped rationalism to erect a pabstacy. One "makes a secret laboratory out of the academic lecture hall, and, otherwise always scolding the sinister, one nevertheless draws the curtains of the hall, locks the door, and takes a vow from everyone who goes outside not to betray a syllable of what has been discussed within these walls. What for? So that the professor, sitting on his lectern, can work quite unhindered and undirected on the souls of his listeners and, in the secret silence of this artificial night, scatter the seeds of weeds in their hearts. The professor then boldly turned the Bible book to his liking and said: "Away with this Psalm! It is, after all, a prayer-sister's song. Away with that one! It is a night watchman's song, etc. But he who says it again outside is a wilful denunciator, not worthy to have the sun shine upon him. . . The Bible is not fit for the people. The Catholics are quite right in allowing only the clergy to read it. The people cannot examine as we do; therefore they should not dare to examine, but leave it to us. We will tell them what the result of our research is. (Ibid. 1832, p. 229.)

In the theological faculties, none of which fought the battle against rationalism, a scientific theology was cultivated which did not submit to the faith, but remained the whore of the spirit of the age. Its first condition is that one may bring to the Bible only the "presuppositionlessness" of Arminianism, that is, Laodicean lukewarmness and indifference. Some of its representatives are directly zealous against the authority of holy Scripture. As Lessing, out of mere belligerence, fought against making the Bible the source of knowledge in the Lutheran Church, so Prof. Deldrück wrote against it in 1826, and Prof. Daniel in Halle wanted to do it himself in 1843 out of pure love for the Scriptures. In his "Controversies" he asserted: "He who elevates the Scriptural word of the new covenant to the highest, more properly the sole source of knowledge of faith, declares it to be something which by its nature it cannot be, which according to the intention of the Lord it ought not to be, which according to its own testimony it does not want to be, which it was not valid for in the first centuries and which it has never been in practice. (Kzt. 1845, p. 90.) This secret Papist was most hostile to the Epistles of Paul, and would thank God on his knees if he could oust them and the whole New Testament from their high position, although in the ruined Church they were not held in high esteem at all, but appropriated that confession of a silly boy who answered the question, "In whom do you believe?" "I believe in the King of Prussia." The Giessen professor Schürer wrote

In recent times: "To teach this conviction to our young theologians" (that a well-founded theology is possible "with the freest position towards the holy Scriptures"), "seems to me even today the most important task; for the hereditary evil from which we suffer is the unfree position of the great mass of clergy and believing laity towards the holy Scriptures. (Zimmer: Bücherkleinode 1888, p. 152.) Hatred and struggle against God's Word is thus the infernal profession of these spirits. - Others direct their projectile against the Christ of Scripture as its center, with which D. F. Strauss began in 1835, who in his "Leben JEsu" mocked all that is holy. He undertook "the regular siege of the castle," writes H. Lang in Zurich (Leben JEsu und Kirche der Zukunft. 1872, p. 3.), to whom it is "a real pleasure to follow the triumphant march of science" (p. 16), in that Strauß treated the Bible in such a way that the old world "emerged again, as it were, with the whole" (the dogs and sows) "so infinitely pleasant earthy smell." (p. 22.) Strauß made scholars courageous to throw away the Gospels, and roused the impulse to write "Lives of JEsu," which, as Lang himself says, are made, but yet contrary to Scripture, and therefore help to redeem the "Protestant Church" from Bible bondage, which to him is "the ugliest thing that clung to it," and give it an image of Christ which is "yet something quite different from the God of the Church." "The New Testament is the foundation of the Protestant Church; so it declares itself. But the New Testament we now know is a different one from that which Luther and Zwingli knew. Well! if the foundation changes, the whole structure must become different." (pp. 56 ff.)

Most of the anti-God theologians threw themselves on a Bible criticism that lives only on hatred and attacks on the Scriptures. Starting from the fact that the New Testament contains some contradictory writings (Antilegomena), about which sufficient testimonies of the first church are missing, because not all congregations agreed about the authors of the same, one claimed that the church had "reserved the examination of its canon of scriptures for all time". (Neuß: Gesch. der hl. Schriften N. T. 1842, p. 2.) By the way, one did not get involved much in the historical criticism, because there was not much to do against the word of the Lord. One threw oneself more on the so-called inner criticism, which wanted to search for errors and contradictions in the holy Scriptures. It would be of no service to any reader if we were to go into details; for what these spirits call scientific criticism are always the ideas of some children of wickedness who change with the fashion. It should only be mentioned that they have made it more and more colorful, because, as Prof. Hahn said, criticism is the most important field of theology today, and no time was better suited for criticism than ours. (About the

gw. state of criticism. 1848, p. 6 ff.) Everything sought to be made uncertain in Scripture. "Books and history of the Old and New Testaments are shifted back and forth and thrown about in such a way that the holy Scriptures are turned into a veritable chamber of rumblings, in which only he can find his way who is at the moment rumbling." (Münkel: N. Ztbl. 1880, p. 281.) The godless Br. Baur rejoiced: "Jehovah, who wanted to refute all the gods of the earth, has had to quietly surrender to the fact that Zeus with his Olympian Round Table upholds the laws of ideal beauty and that the Capitolian God still decides the legal disputes of the civilized world by his sayings. Zeus and Jupiter have survived his most terrible threats; he has not been able to refute even the basest fetish." "The dissolution of the Christian world will take its course." (Critique of Evg. 1850. Vorr. p. III. XI.) Who is not reminded by this of the scoffers under the cross of Christ? How correctly a philologist answered the theologian who asked him why, after all, they were more reasonable in criticizing the writings of heathen classics than modern theology is in criticizing the Bible: "Because they have no need to depose a Lord Christ!" (Ztsch. f. Prot. I, 151.) The raging hostility to Christ makes as blind as can happen only just before the judgment. The wisdom of hell, fattened in the universities, is just one of the three frogs which the dragon, the world power hostile to God, and the antichrist, according to Revelation 16:13 ff., send out once more to gather the whole world into the conflict for the great day of God Almighty. Do not be deceived, God will not be mocked.

An end of the critics' quarrel is not to be expected, as also Reuß thought (*loc. cit.* p. 132 ff.). He did, however, see one success of hell. The German Church has been gradually brought into a condition wherein even the elect are scarcely preserved from destruction. The newly awakened Christianity suffered from spiritual consumption; for it was not guided by the fear of God's Word, but by the flesh. It helped to dig up the ground by entering into parliament with the unclean spirits, welcoming the false union, and celebrating peace festivals with the world. Relatively few Christians were able to bear witness to the truth against the Union and to suffer for it. Hengstenberg often emphasized that the enemy came just as the people were sleeping; its essence was also that no one knew what it was; for it was a patchwork, a Babylonian construction, the fruit of an unhappy marriage of church and state. With this he wanted to excuse remaining in it. But what excuse is this? Did he not himself have to admit that the Union resulted in a change of Lutheran doctrine? (Kzt. 1844, p. 4 ff.) Or that the church is divided by nothing more than

by the Union? (1856, p. 372 f.) If the masters of the Union had brands in their consciences and only practiced tolerance against the expelled Lutherans as long as they had to, but never without declaring the wrong to be right, as Hengstenberg himself wrote, how could he then still babble about a "heavenly origin"? Quite correctly the Erlangen journal once showed that the Union at best resembled that Cossack who recited the Abc as his morning prayer and left it to God to make up a prayer out of it, but mostly resembled that mother who threw one child after another to the wolves. (11, 226 f.) The pope Dr. v. Medem declares her to be the best missionary of Rome and the worst enemy of the Lutheran Church, because she makes the firm word of the Bible, the certain ground of faith, doubtful in the eyes of Christians. (J. Freik. 1889, p. 181 f.) Hengstenberg and his friends gradually saw the misery of the Union, but they had become incapable of following the commandment of the Lord: "Pull not on the strange yoke with the unbelievers. Come out from among them and separate yourselves," 2 Cor. 6. Now it was said: "Belonging to the unrighteous church is like a marriage. What God has joined together, let not man put asunder. We are not in the case of choosing a church; we are born into it, and must send ourselves into it in Christian fidelity as best we can." (Zisch, f. Theol. u. Kirche 1849, pp. 770 ff.) With such outrage infidelity thought itself excused. To this the prophet would have said, "Is it too little for you to offend men, you must also offend my God?" Isa. 7:13. By this rule might not all sinners and heathen remain as they are? But the reader will agree with the letter of two pastors, with which, some years ago, they answered a request for support addressed to us by the friends of the court preacher Stöcker in Berlin. It says: "You are not content with the Noah's Ark, I. gentlemen. Dissatisfied that only the children of God, whom the Lord has kept for himself in this last time, are to be protected, you also want to ride the ungodly world, to whom the gospel of Christ is foolishness, in the flood of sin, and you think you are doing it by keeping the masses in the outer church fellowship. That is why you need a state church. You may think that fleeing from Sodom and Jerusalem and going out of Babylon is cowardice, but it is God's command, 2 Cor. 6:14 ff. Therefore to abide is but carnal presumption. In judgment your works will be according to the words of the apostle, 1 Cor. 3:12 ff. It is evident from the whole theology of Germany, how those who despise the word of the Lord, "Come out, my people, and save every man his soul," Jer. 51:45, have their hearts softened and despondent; for what divine truth is actually still fixed in their minds? Leave off, I. gentlemen, the high plans, and gather the super-

who still delight in the word of the Lord before the last storm comes. . . . One may not expect, of course, that one pays any attention to such testimonies in a German state church; for unfortunately the gentlemen in soft clothes are too distinguished for that, and the friends of Aristotle too learned. What good can come from America? they say in Berlin and Leipzig." - Yes, they deluded themselves that they would win the masses to Christ, if only they would cling to them against God's word; for the flesh thought the commandment to exterminate the Canaanites too cruel. The course of the gospel is thus to be made possible. He that is in us is greater than he that is in the world! one insists, after having pushed him aside with his word. The leaven of wickedness is still to be swept out after one has been leavened himself. The longer one put off obedience to God's Word, the heavier it became. Witnesses who leave the Union always find their worst enemies in the false brethren within the state church.

Where else? Hengstenberg asked. "There can be no talk of a Lutheran church anywhere now." (op. cit.) The Uniate Church was no worse than any other state church. "But to want to separate the church entirely from the state, because all kinds of temptations arise from its connection with the state, that" - the Erlangen Journal thought - "would be the same as if the individual Christian wanted to flee from the world for fear of the world." (5, 219.) "If the Church were to fulfill her purpose of penetrating as leaven the mass of the human race, she could not remain indifferent beside and apart from the state; she must engage with it, receive it." (12, 27.) "We would consider separation of Church and State as the greatest calamity that could befall our people and our Church." (P. 316.) "The State cannot exist without the Church, nor the Church without the State." (P. 319.) "Her connection with the State is to us as the crown, so also the fundamental condition of her world-historical efficacy." (p. 321.) Self-chosen doing, even a quarrel against God, the humble obedience to God's word is scolded by the "faithful" who have fallen in love with the regiment of the world. God would have to intervene directly, at least send a Gideon or Nehemiah, if one were to leave the national church, think at least others, while some, in blind zeal, maintain that it is altogether un-Lutheran to separate state and church. Of Luther, however, Melancthon writes: "He wisely distinguished the heavenly different offices, namely, of a bishop, who teaches the church of God, and of the authorities, who hold the people in their place by the sword. . . . But when I consider with myself how many great men in the church have often erred therein, I firmly believe that his heart is

was not merely filled with human wit, but with divine light". (14, 67.) When it was evident that the Scriptures would no longer become princess in the state church, one consoled oneself that one would not yet be thrown out and that the rationalistic doctrine was not forced upon one as a confession. "It cannot be our intention to apply for the exclusion of those who have fallen out with the doctrine of the Church, since this would certify too painful a doubt in the inner strength of our Church to overcome even the most hostile." Thus the Erlanger Zeitschrift (5, 328) wanted the carnal self-confidence to be preserved, and held it to be faith. The expulsion of the rationalists "would be one of the saddest events which could befall our church," lamented the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung as early as 1827. (p. 75.) "We live once in a house with the rationalists, and it would be a misfortune if they threw us out or we threw them out." (1844, p. 54.) A "threefold expert opinion together with a princely final judgment on the question: are rationalistic theologians to be deprived of their offices?" published in Leipzig in 1830, while acknowledging the right of the faithful against rationalists, warned seriously against intervention, lest "well-founded doctrinal freedom" be suppressed and "the minds themselves be taken against the truth and embittered. One should only bring in better theologians little by little, so it would already become better. Of course, protests of the faithful against free spirits are already "one of the most alarming phenomena of the time," through which the ecclesiastical rift is made known and the blind rage of the theologians is awakened, wrote Lücke afterwards in agreement with the church regiments. (Kzt. 1845, p. 366.) These rationalists were now commonly called "the left," "Christians in the broader sense, who represent the right of science," and flattered that if it pleased them to belong to the church "they are twice welcome to it. In it there is room for all who in humility, even in the most attenuated sense, seek God's fellowship through Christ." This alone is declared to be a misfortune, that a rupture can only be thought possible (Gemberg: Kirche der Zukunft. 1846, pp. 6. 42. 56), while formerly he who spoke of a left was met with the reply, "Do you not know who is on the left in the kingdom of God? Shall I tell you? The goats! (Matt. 25:33.) And do you also know what the Saviour will say to those on the left? Depart from me, ye cursed!" (Corr.-Bl. 1829, p. 84.) - When Dr. de Valenti once proposed to the "church regiments," for the prevention of external divorce, that all theologians should first be required to study the Scriptures and the symbols, and after a time be subjected to a colloquium (Corr.Bl. 1831, p. 808 ff.), this was certainly good counsel in its time; for so long as faith won one victory after another, and called upon the ungodly in the ecclesiastical offices either to worship Christ or to reject the

When it came to clearing the field, everything was still in ferment and development; for so long the church was also like a sick person in convalescence. This changed, however, when the half-believers who took over the church regiments, just against such advice, defended the fellowship with false prophets and the toleration, if not the authorization, of the hell-poison of false doctrine by saying that one must not pull out the weeds (Ibid. p. 359. 392. Erl. Zisch. 5, 229). Christ was not to become unqualified king. One should not become so intolerant, loveless, fanatical, but touch the devil with ice-cream gloves, and love will win him over to the truth. The old pilots' wives found more and more good and beautiful things in Sodom, too, until they discovered a Christian kernel in every blasphemer and desired only the union of faith and unbelief. The children of unbelief grew bolder and bolder at this sight; for, mocks E. v. Hartmann, "when a formerly rich man has become bankrupt, he does not do well to stall himself and his family with untenable pretences of saved prosperity, but will still get farthest if he takes his miserable situation as it really is, in order to get himself up again as soon as possible by the more earnest united work." (Selbstzersetzg., p. 5 f.) Quite rightly does this impious man reproach the bankrupt state Christians: "From the time when Christianity had become the state church, and thus a secular power, the corruption of Christianity had begun." (S. 10.) Soon conditions had so clarified themselves that the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung had to write: "Whoever looks attentively at the phenomena of the times, and with an eye unclouded by desires and prejudices, must realize that, if things continue on the usual course, the hope of an even outward return to him of educated Europe, which has fallen away from Christ, is a fanciful and chimerical one, and is justly ridiculed as such by the organs of the spirit of the age, and that he who nourishes and expresses this hope only harms the cause of the Lord by linking his honor to its fulfillment; that he is a prophet out of his heart, crying peace, peace! when there is no peace. . . . The spirit of the age is more and more stripping itself of the Christian elements which for a time it had absorbed. It is becoming more and more conscious of itself." (1836, p. 2.) If shortly thereafter witnesses appeared like the fathers of our Synod, who, despairing of the conversion of the German state churches to God's Word, left their fatherland, what was punishable in it? They should have done this and that before they emigrated, as they themselves afterwards confessed; but that was only necessary for the sake of their own consciences; the state churches would no longer have become different, but would have quietly run on into the judgment of hardening. They departed from there in due time, before the first

Love was gone, and its actual testimony had a more shattering effect than so many protests. Unfortunately, within the circles of the state church, it was said by all whose consciences were soothed: "My people, your comforters deceive you and destroy the way you should go. Is. 3:12. Here and there individual voices have been raised, such as these: "Sooner or later the moment will surely come when the elements will have to separate, when it will be impossible to evade the loud admonition that one should accomplish oneself in one's own direction" (Erl. Ztsch. 12, p. 14); but when writings of Smend, Thiersch, etc., refer to such a separation in the state-church, it is only a matter of time. and others worked towards such a separation in 1845, it was immediately said that "the great separation to which everything is preparing" (p. 35) must be prevented as long as possible, for "then Germany will have ceased to be Germany; then there will be no German Church, no Germanic Christianity. Then the whole of Christendom will have lost its center of gravity; ... then it will be over with thorough theology, over with the all-round and profound development of dogmas; history will stand there without a conclusion. . . . We would regard the separation of Church and State as the greatest calamity that could befall our people and our Church, and therefore consider it our duty to do what we can to prevent the old order of things from being too quickly and tumultuously overthrown." (p. 316.) Hengstenberg, at least, said: "To us, too, the present condition of the Church, conceived as permanent, seems utterly intolerable, and we, too, expect with confidence from the future the separation of what is inwardly entirely dissimilar; but in this we differ, that it does not seem to us in any way now already the time to work toward such a separation." (Kzt. 1846, p. 44.) "We cannot, we will not," replied the Erlangeners, in answer to the question, "If you have master's rights in your own house, why do you not throw the rationalists over?" It seems too hard to us. We might also easily place too much value on breeding. "A radical cure now would be not only foolish, but cruel and unjust, after the State has so long cherished rationalism and semi-faith in the universities." "To thrust rationalism forcibly out of the Church, even if the Church should regain the power to do so, would not be advisable. ... It will gradually approach and pass into the right faith by opposition to the extreme which has arisen from it." (Ztsch. f. Prot. 3, 131 ff. 11, 242 f. 7, 99 ff.) These false prophets made the church all the more ridiculous among the ungodly. G. G.

(To be continued.)

Miscellany.

About Christianity in China we find the following interesting notes in the "Missionsblatt des Fräuen-Vereins für christliche Bildung des weiblichen Geschlechts im Morgenlande": Christianity came to China much earlier than is usually assumed. This is evident from a marble tablet found in 1625 by some Chinese workers. It was erected in 781 A.D., later buried, and not rediscovered for 800 years. To protect it from further decay, this memorial stone, whose inscription has been photographed and translated, was embedded in the surrounding wall of the city of Singanfu. According to this interesting historical tradition, Nestorian Christians from Asia Minor sent missionaries to China in the year 505, who gained followers there and whose work continued until the 14th century. From the old inscription it can be seen that high officials at that time were Christians who took care of the preservation of the old churches and their renewal, and that the emperor of that time was well-disposed towards the Christians; on the day of Christ's birth he gave them perfumes and let them dine at the imperial table. - Roman missionaries built the first church in Peking in 1299. Their prestige grew at first, but after 70 years it declined to such an extent that the mission went to ruin. The Jesuits renewed it after 200 years and knew how to make themselves so useful to the emperors, especially by drawing maps, casting canons etc., that the monarch, who reigned from 1662-1723, declared the Christian religion to be good. But already in 1723 his successor recognized in the pope's power a very dangerous encroachment on his sovereign rights, forbade Christianity in the strictest manner, and continued persecutions brought the number of Christians down to 130,000. It was not until the peace treaties of more recent times that the Roman mission took on a new impetus. In 1890 it counted 510,501 Catholics among 31 bishops, 555 European and 312 Chinese priests. Sick children were baptized by the thousands before death, often against the knowledge and will of their parents. - The first Protestant missionary in China was Robert Morrison of London, who began his work in 1807 under the most unthinkable difficulties. In 1823 he had completed the gigantic work of translating the Bible into Chinese. He baptized only a few souls. The hatred of foreigners was so great in China at that time that Morrison's language teacher always carried poison with him to escape any torture that might await him for teaching a foreigner the language. In 1831 the German missionary Gützlaff came to China and from then on devoted his life to the most difficult and vast of all missionary fields. The interior of the great world empire had been closed to the gospel and the missionaries until about

In the middle of our century it was completely closed. Only from then on could missionaries penetrate into the more remote parts of the heavily populated country. The vast empire has eighteen provinces, of which, with the exception of three, each is as large as the whole of England, and most are far larger still. England has in round sum 24½ millions of inhabitants; some Chinese provinces have nearly as many inhabitants as the whole of England, and none under 3-9 millions. By far the greater part of this immense population resides in the interior of the country. Since China did not allow foreigners to settle there until 1842, they were only allowed to do so in the seaside cities. As a result, until a few decades ago the evangelistic work was limited to these sea cities, and the gospel remained unknown to the hundreds of millions of souls living in the interior of the country. Hudson Taylor, physically weak, but strong in faith, has the special merit of having brought the gospel to the interior of China. Under great difficulties and self-denials he labored in China from 1854-1860. Then, through his health and other circumstances, he was forced to return to England. He went very unwillingly, but God had His special plans for him. He spoke much in England of the distress in China. Eleven provinces of China had not a single missionary at that time. Taylor and his fellow workers asked the Lord for two missionaries for each of these provinces. After a few weeks, the 22 workers were ready. They had volunteered. This was the beginning of the China Inland Mission, which has been working with such blessed success in China since 1865. 634 missionaries and 366 indentured workers are now connected with this society, which has 4500 church members in 134 organized churches. Since its foundation over 6000 persons have been baptized according to a public confession. 50 mission societies are now working in China with 1900 to 2000 evangelical European missionaries and unmarried missionary workers. Besides them, 2000 native helpers and ten educational and tract societies are working in the Middle Kingdom. In China the Christians live together with their heathen relatives, while in India they are expelled from the parental home with their baptism or even before, and are cast out by husband or wife. Only in exceptional cases do Christians in China have to endure persecution or maltreatment from their relatives. In most cases the Chinese, when he has become a Christian, remains in the house and in the same position as before. He eats at the same table with the others, except that he says his grace. He works with his own in the field or at home, or sits with them in the evening in the cool, but on Sundays he goes to church alone, while at home the work goes on. When in spring and late year the ancestor veneration takes place at the graves,

When on the first and fifteenth of the month, that is, on the new and full moon, the incense is burned in the hall of the house before the ancestral images, the Christian naturally does not take part in it. If a Christian takes his Christianity seriously, he acts as a light and salt among his family, and in time draws over, if not all, at least usually several members. If a man becomes a Christian, his wife may not follow him at once, because other women incite her; at first she is ashamed to go with him to the chapel, but it usually does not take long before she joins him. If the women become Christians, the men usually do not put anything in their way. If a whole family gradually converts to Christianity, the foundation of a congregation is there. Such families form a power against paganism and work directly and indirectly for the spread of the gospel by attracting other relatives to baptism and by their influence causing some pagan customs to disappear. If the last war in China revealed political and moral weaknesses, and at first in some places aroused renewed hostility against foreigners and Christians, on the other hand there are also the clearest signs that Christianity has already become a power in the "Middle Kingdom" and has taken root in it, so that the petition which a few years ago fanatics addressed to the Emperor of China to eradicate Christianity root and branch could no longer succeed. Yes, it was already evident during the war that new doors were now opening to the Gospel in China. Very gratifying news came from many regions. From Fuchau the American Methodists reported of a great revival. Hundreds of heathens were asking for the Word of Life. New calls came in every week to establish schools and preach sermons. In six months 14 new outstations were opened, each with a teacher. A silversmith delivered two large baskets of household idols to the missionary. In a town that had resisted the entrance of the Gospel for 40 years, a young man turned to Christianity, more than 40 persons of his relatives followed him, they asked for a preacher, now the whole town with its 8000 inhabitants is on the move. - An English missionary also writes from Futschau of a movement such as he had not experienced in 33 years. From the remotest villages came requests for Christian teachers. The rush to all the chapels was extraordinary. The people suddenly seemed to realize the whole folly of idolatry. - For the spread of the Gospel it is also of great importance and a sign of living faith that in the excitement and danger of war time the native Christians stood their ground. They remained faithful to their faith, even though they had to endure the brutalities of the soldiers who swarmed around them and the plundering of the robbers.

They stole their cattle and everything they could get, and at the same time had to endure hardship and poverty due to floods, which in some provinces destroyed the harvests. In some places, even in the midst of all this affliction and challenge, there was a growing desire for salvation. And European and native Christians looked the impending death in the face with joyful faith. Thus an old, half-deaf man, not yet baptized, was seized by a pack of good-for-nothing soldiers, stripped, bound, and while a knife was held to his throat, asked if he were a disciple of JEsu? "Yes, I am a Christian," he answered bravely. An officer saved him from death. When he returned to church the next Sunday, the Chinese preacher asked him where he, the unbaptized man, had found the strength to confess the Lord so faithfully at the risk of his life. The old man answered that he had just read in the Gospel that Peter had denied his Lord three times and then wept so bitterly. Then the test had come for him and he had to say to himself, "No, you cannot deny your Lord." Among the seeds scattered during the war was the wide distribution of the Scriptures in Chinese. The American Bible Society alone sold 383,000 Gospels and Bibles in China in 1895. The prisoners and wounded who fell into the hands of the Japanese and found the kindest care under the "Red Cross" were introduced to the Holy Scriptures by Bible messengers and Christian Japanese. It was also distributed among Chinese and Japanese on the battlefield. After the cessation of hostilities, not only did friendly private intercourse take place in some places between Japanese and Chinese Christians, but they also held worship services together. This happened, for example, in the Pescadores Islands, which were annexed to Japan by the peace treaty of Shimonosaki with Formosa. The Japanese had taken possession of the small worship locale of the Chinese Christians in the town of Makung, but returned it to them, and soon Christian Japanese and Chinese were sitting together in worship and also communicating through the old familiar Chinese characters. A native traveling preacher was arrested and imprisoned during the war as an alleged Japanese spy. There he preached to the thieves and murderers caught with him and sang Christian songs to them. This summoned some officials who, after his release, inquired from him about the Christian religion. He thought that the time of his imprisonment had been a glorious opportunity to preach the gospel. The opponents of the mission have repeatedly advised, especially during the persecutions of Christians that took place in China last year, that the missionary work there should be completely abandoned as useless and unsuccessful. And yet, in the first six months of 1895, 400 Gentiles were baptized by the China Inland Mission alone.

At present there are about 100,000 evangelical Christians in China; another 100,000 are in the struggle between the inclination to Christianity and the old faith of paganism. These are missionary successes which cannot be denied and which are at the same time a deposit for the gathering of thousands and thousands in the coming decades. The 1900-2000 European mission workers and their families, the 2000 national helpers, the 100,000 native Christians spread over all 18 provinces of China, together with the innumerable Bibles, some of which have been distributed in China for many years, form the Christian leaven that is mixed among the pagan mass of people in the vast Chinese empire. That the Bible has come to the imperial palace in Peking, and is also read by the emperor himself, can also be seen as a hopeful sign for the future. Scholars, men of letters, and those of high rank would not fight Christianity with such hatred if they did not fear its advancing and finally coming complete victory. But even among them there are already friends of the Christians. Some benevolent officials proved themselves protectors of the Christians in the troubled times. Thus a high mandarin in Nanking last year gave a banquet to the missionaries there, and another issued a proclamation in which he said that he had personally visited all the mission stations in his district and found that the missionaries did nothing but help the poor and sick in a completely unselfish way, without any other ulterior motive; woe, therefore, to anyone who slandered them or harmed them.

Literature.

Dr. Martin Luther's Complete Writings, edited by Dr. Joh. Georg Walch. Fifth volume. Interpretation of the Old Testament (continued). Interpretations of the Psalms (continuation), Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. Published anew by order of the Ministry of the German Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, et al. St. St. Louis, Mo. **Concordia Publishing House**. 1896. price of this volume: H3. 25.

This volume of our new, splendid edition of Luther's works contains Luther's explanations of individual Psalms, as well as his interpretation of Ecclesiastes Solomon and the short interpretation of the Song of Songs. In the preface, Prof. Hoppe gives a detailed account of the diligent and careful editorial work that has been done in this volume. The interpretations of the 2nd, 45th, 51st and 90th Psalms and the interpretations of Ecclesiastes Solomon and the Song of Songs have been newly translated. Whoever wishes to convince himself from this volume how tremendous and incomparable an interpreter of Scripture Luther is, should first read the interpretation of the 117th Psalm, which is found on pages 1136-1173. This interpretation is an introduction to the understanding of the entire Old Testament. Luther wrote it so that he could "give cause and instruction to all others who need it to understand the main part of our Christian doctrine in Scripture everywhere.

To seek and to act, namely, that without all merit, by the grace of God alone, given to us in Christ, we must become devout, alive, and blessed, and that otherwise no other way, nor footpath, nor manner, nor work, may help us to this end". (P. 1170.) May God in grace grant that in our Synod, among all human writings, the writings of Luther, the Reformer of the Church, shall take and retain the first place. F. P.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

General Council. Rev. H. Offermann of Camden, N. J., has published a pamphlet, "Our Position on the Luther League." His assessment of the Luther League is contained in the following sentences: "1. The Luther League is a federation of youth associations, primarily in the congregations of the General Council and the General Synod, which, without regard to confession, seeks to organize the younger members of the various Lutheran church bodies of this country and, through the power of the organization of the Lutheran Church, to gain a dominant position among the Protestant church communities of this country. (2) The deeper causes underlying this movement can be traced back in part to a general current of the times, which is especially favorable to associations, and in part to the influence of similar efforts in false-believing church communities. (3) Inasmuch as the Luther League unites Lutherans of the most diverse tendencies, without regard to their position in the confession, it bears the mark of a false union on its forehead and promotes the prevailing indifferentism. (4) In so far as the Luther League seeks to build the Lutheran Church by the mere power of organization, it underestimates the importance of the means of grace. (5) Insofar as the Luther League calls its members to co-teach and co-govern in the church, without distinction of class and sex and bypassing the office of preaching, it transgresses the God-ordained boundaries of profession. In so far as the Luther League wants to help the Lutheran Church to a brilliant position of power in the outside world, it overlooks the fact that the kingdom of God is not of this world, and is itself in danger of losing again the jewel entrusted by God to the Lutheran Church."

In President Cleveland's **thanksgiving prelude this year**, the words occur, "Let us, through the mediation of Him who taught us how to pray, implore forgiveness of our sins and further divine favor." At this a number of Jews have expressed indignation, because they would be asked to pray in the name of JEsu. We really do not know how to help the Jews. If the President is to issue a proclamation of thanksgiving - and that is what the Jews want - then, if the President is a Christian, the result is always an invitation to pray in the name of Jesus. A Christian knows no other prayer. Incidentally, all our governmental and judicial documents contain an outward acknowledgment of Christ in the formula "A. D.," "in the year of the Lord," 1896, etc. The reason for this is that in Jesus of Nazareth the promised Saviour of the world has really come, and that God, although the Jews and most of the Gentiles do not believe in Jesus, nevertheless, through His almighty world government, also provides for all kinds of outward testimony of the world-historical fact that the Saviour has appeared to the world. The Jews are just behind time.

Christ already pointed this out to the Jews when he reproached them: "You hypocrites, you can judge the form of heaven, can you not also judge the signs of this time?" (Matth. 16, 3.) If, by the way, the Jews see in the President's proclamation of thanksgiving an interference with religious liberty, they should remember that the exhortation to give thanks in the name of JEsu is not a commandment, but only a recommendation. One can already commend JEsu and prayer in his name to the Jews without infringing on religious liberty. Otherwise the Catholics too might complain of Cleveland's exhortation, because he does not remember the mediatorship of the saints in prayer, which after all is essential to the Catholics. So the Jews may rest easy. They are certainly not neglected here in America or in Germany. They prosper quite splendidly. And about the whole public press takes sides with them when something like the oppression of the Jews appears on the distant horizon. F. P.

As Rector of the Catholic University in Washington, the Pope has appointed "Father" Thomas J. Conaty of the Church of the Sacred Heart in Worcester, Mass. Conaty is Irish by birth, but educated in the United States at the Jesuit college at Worcester and the theological seminary at Troy. Conaty takes the place of Bishop Keane, from whom the pope took the rectorship, because a change in these positions was the custom in the Catholic Church. We refrain from any comment in regard to this change of persons. A pope is a pope as long as he remains under the pope. And the pope made the change because it seemed in the papal interest to do so. That is certain. F. P.

About the Jesuits and the American people, the "Apologist" offers a reflection that shows more patriotic elation than real expertise. The Apologist says: "Cardinal Satolli, the former papal delegate in the United States, who, as is well known, was recalled from his old field of work some weeks ago and whom our nation did not weep a tear for, has, on his arrival in Rome these days, submitted a report to the Holy Father on the religious questions in the United States. In the report he does not speak well of Bishop Keane, the former Rector of the Catholic University in Washington, or of Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul. He accuses the former of having expressed in various public speeches opinions which decidedly border on heresy, and says that the latter, in communion with the prelate of St. Paul, has left no stone unturned to break the way for a new Catholicism. Cardinal Satolli declares that the Catholic University in the Federal capital has become the centre of these dangerous ideas, and the freest theories have been established in the chairs there. The dismissal of Bishop Keane as Rector of the Institute had indeed put an end to this evil, but nevertheless he had left dangerous pupils there in the persons of the numerous university professors. In view of these facts, the Cardinal recommends to the Pope that these gentlemen be gradually relieved of their posts. Concerning Archbishop Ireland, Satolli uses even harsher language and formally accuses him of being the 'apostle of heresy'. This conduct of Satolli's is all the more surprising because during his stay here he paid only the highest praise to the two prelates mentioned. The Jesuit comes out fully in this. The struggle against Catholicism is therefore still a struggle against Jesuitism, and the sooner the American people realize this, the better. The time will come when the

brightest minds in the Catholic Church in this country will join with the Protestants in the fight against the Jesuits." (!) "The Protestant countries of Europe have expelled the Jesuits, and America has become the safe haven of these Romanists, who have sworn eternal enmity to everyone who is not completely Romanized. It will take a long time for the eyes of the American people to open, but they will open to them, and then it will be all over for Jesuitism in this country." Hardly!

F. P.

Alaska. The Church of the Brethren began the mission in Alaska in 1885. For several years there was not the slightest success. In recent years things have changed. There are about 500 Christians in three stations.

F. P.

II. Abroad.

The Uelzen Conference. The "Hermannsburg Free Church" reports: On October 6 and 7 the new Lutheran Conference met in Uelzen. The central meaning of justification in relation to the doctrine of church and ministry was discussed. Especially the 4th thesis of Pastor Hübner was discussed. Thesis by Pastor Hübner, which reads: "Although, in spite of the manifold falsifications of the divine word, justifying faith, and thus the church in the proper sense of the word, can still arise and remain by God's grace even where the same is still essentially present at all, yet all false teaching ultimately amounts to an obscuring of the doctrine of justification and thus to destruction of the church. and therefore it is the sacred duty of all Christians, for the sake of their salvation and that of the souls that may be entrusted to them, first of all to preserve in faith their membership in the invisible church, and for this purpose also, in obedience to the word of God, earnestly to avoid all ecclesiastical fellowship with false doctrine and false-believing churches, and to profess the pure doctrine as well as the orthodox visible church." The discussion, then, was on the question of separation. The following were represented: the national church, the Saxon, Breslau, Hanoverian and Hermannsburg Free Churches. Some Immanuelites were also present, but had no right to speak, because the Uelzen Conference only allows those to speak at its negotiations who profess the Bible without reservation, which, as is well known, the Immanuelites do not do. - Naturally, the debate on the separation question was a very lively one, and the writer of this only regrets that more laymen from our Free Church were not present: they would have been powerfully convinced anew of the scriptural conformity of their withdrawal. Unfortunately, Pastor Hübner was prevented by illness from presenting his thesis himself. He was represented in a masterly manner by Praeses Willkomm. In the spring, God willing, the next conference will take place, at which the doctrine of the ministry will be discussed. Hopefully, Pastor Gerhold will also come to this conference as a representative of the Vilmar doctrine of the ministry, so that Rome and Wittenberg will be properly represented. The attention of the readers is already drawn to this conference.

The Lutheran Free Church in Denmark. The Saxon "Free Church" reports: It will be remembered by dear readers that our Synod of this year had decided to exchange delegates with the Danish Free Church, in order to make the bond of brotherly fellowship, which has existed for 14 years, more intimate and stronger. The writer of this (President Willkomm), together with a member of his congregation, had been delegated for this year to attend the meeting of the Danish sister church. This took place on 11 October, the 19th Sunday of

after Trinity, took place in St. Martin's Church in Copenhagen, located on St. Martin's Way. Of course, this was not a synodal assembly in our sense. For the Danish Free Church at present actually forms only one congregation. This congregation is scattered over the whole country in such a way that a meeting of representatives of the whole congregation is only possible once a year. At this meeting the common affairs are discussed. During the period from Saturday evening to Sunday evening, three services and one consultative meeting took place. In the latter, which lasted from 2-15 o'clock in the afternoon, the following representatives from outside were present, in addition to the numerous members of the Copenhagen municipality: From Funen Niels Hansen, from Jutland Niels Jensen, from Langeland Peter Hansen, from Lolland Peter Hansen, from the out-of-town places on Zealand: Niels Hansen and Peter Jensen from Jgelsøe, H. Jensen from Helsingör, Jörgen Clausen from Asminderöd and Jörgen Nielsen from Vemmelöse. After an opening address by Pastor Waldemar Grunnet, who had to preside for the first time in place of his venerable father, who had fallen ill with a serious illness, Schreiber was allowed to convey the greetings of our Synod. Then the appointment of Pastor Hermann Solbrig, who was also present and who had come from the members living in the city of Copenhagen, was confirmed by those outside the synod in so far as they joyfully agreed that he should serve them in community with their previous pastor, and he was warmly welcomed. Then matters of money were discussed, and our delegate encouraged the Danish brethren in faith to willingly make the great sacrifices which the appointment of a second pastor imposes upon them. It was also decided that Pastor W. Grunnet should again publish a newspaper (the *Maanedsskrift*, which the venerable Pastor N. P. Grunnet had edited for years, had to cease publication at the beginning of this year due to the illness of the editor). The discussions, in which many took part, made a fresh impression and bore witness to the fact that the welfare of the Church and the salvation of souls is close to everyone's heart. The highlight of the day, however, was the service that followed. After the communion guests (about 40 in number) had received private absolution in the sacristy, Pastor W. Grunnet preached on the Gospel of Sunday (of the gout-ridden man). Then, assisted by the clerk, he introduced Mr. Pastor Solbrig into his office. Thereupon five new members of the congregation were received, according to local custom, with the laying on of hands before the altar, before which they renewed their baptismal vows after an address by the pastor. This was followed by the celebration of Holy Communion. The congregation, which almost completely filled the spacious church, remained devout until the conclusion of the service and was especially deeply moved during the introduction and the receptions. In the evening a social gathering took place in the rented hall of a small children's school, where the women of the congregation entertained the guests in the best way, and the young people sang lovely spiritual songs, which were interrupted by speeches of the clerk and Pastor Grunnet. In spite of the difference of languages and nationalities, there was complete, lovely harmony, it was really said: Here is not Danish, not German, but they are all one in Christ.

F. P.

The Saxon "Free Church" reports **about the meeting in Eisenach**: "The Ritschlians, that is, the present-day Rationalists as a whole, were assembled in Eisenach on October 5. Among them were no less than 16 pro-.

...professors of theology. The most important lecture was given by Professor Harnack: "Zur gegenwärtigen Lage des Protestantismus. In it, according to the "Reichsbote," he stated: "that, on the one hand, theological science has lost more and more the character of being bound and has adopted the method of general science, insofar as it has become purely secular, while, on the other hand, a catholicization of ecclesiastical life can be observed in the national churches" - facts which, unfortunately, must be admitted as such. To have proved as the "fundamental idea," indeed, as the "actual content of Protestantism, indeed, of the Gospel," "that religion is nothing but the constant mood of the heart in trust toward God, and, secondly, that this child's trust toward God is inseparable from the simplest and plainest morality," that, says Harnack further, is "the imperishable merit of Albrecht Ritschl." To have put such pure paganism in the place of Christianity is praised as one of Ritschl's "merits. Thus Harnack was not ashamed to declare openly that we must "endeavor to establish a new doctrine of faith. But in order to carry out the intended "reformation," one must persevere in the national churches without allowing oneself to become tired and unenthusiastic. - The ensuing debate gave expression to the "enthusiastic approval" which Harnack's lecture had aroused. - The "Reichsbote," which devoted an editorial of its own to this matter, attached to it, as usual, reflections that were partly Christian and partly state-church. It is Christian when he emphasizes that this "theology" is in the last analysis pagan and "not only the gravedigger of the Christian religion, but also of Christian morals. And: "If, therefore, these theologians, after denying the facts of God's revelation, still speak of trust in God, this is only a phrase, and the sentiment produced by it is self-deception and has no real value. Such moods have also the Turk, the heathen, as well as the atheist and the materialist at the sight of beautiful nature." In true state-church terms, however, the "Reichsbote" speaks of the Church as a "spiritual organism related to God, an institution of salvation," and this he now sees endangered by the new religion of the Ritschlians. "When one considers," he continues, "that our church must take its clergymen from the school of these theologians, who come with this theology to the pulpits and before the altar, then one might indeed become fearful for the Protestant church, if one did not know that the church has the promise that even the gates of hell will not overpower it." In these words there is again betrayed that astonishing unfamiliarity with the simplest Christian catechism truths, as we unfortunately meet with it nowadays almost at every turn. For one has not learned to distinguish between the invisible One, Holy, Christian Church, the congregation of the saints, to whom alone that glorious promise of Christ applies, and individual visible particular churches, especially the Royal Prussian State Church. But the deceit of this ignorance is terrible. For instead of shunning, according to the word of God, communion with the heretics in a "church" doomed to destruction, one remains, imagining that the royal state church has the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. "But after all," one thinks, "the Protestant Church, after this theology has so openly expressed its thoughts and aspirations, will have to seriously submit to the question whether it can and may still continue to employ theologians from the school of this theology as clergymen." Yes: "One need only ask this question, and the answer is already given to every logical and honest thinker. She can and may

This is why they must take up the fight against this theology with all their energy. These theologians want to persevere within the church, but the church must tell them that through their theology they have placed themselves completely outside the church and in the most active opposition to it. This requires truth and honesty, as well as the interest of the Church, which is being completely disintegrated and ruined by this theology. It will be the task of the Provincial Synod now in session, in view of this Eisenach meeting and of Harnack's speech, which is to be regarded as a kind of pronunciamento, to take a clear and firm stand on this subversive theology and to tell it flatly and unequivocally that there is no room for it in the Protestant Church. If this does not happen, the faithful members of the church themselves will protest, and the congregations will have to protect themselves from clergymen of this school, if the ecclesiastical authorities do not want to protect them from a theology which wants to cheat them of their most sacred things by a reinterpretation and mood religion which is fundamentally different from Christianity." - The "Reichsbote" would really do better to stop at last with such and similar empty threats of "protests" and self-help, which they never carry out, because they do not want the only effective protest and the only effective self-help, as the great God has commanded in His word, namely, a pure, ecclesiastical separation from heretical men and their protectors.

On the Slippery Slope! How boldly and openly the liberal theologians of Germany are now pursuing the overthrow of the Christian religion and the Christian church is shown by the remarks made at a meeting of "the friends of the Christian world" held in Eisenach on October 5 of this year. The "Vossische Zeitung" reports the following about it. The first lecture was given by Prof. Dr. Kaftan of Berlin on "The Relationship of the Protestant Faith to the Logos Doctrine. In his opinion the Logos doctrine itself and the church doctrine of the Trinity and of Christ founded on it are to be rejected. "For the philosophical Logos doctrine contradicts the Christian faith; it is founded on the fundamental view that the infinite God can have no immediate relation to the finite world; for this very reason a middle being, the Logos, is interposed between the two; the Christian faith, on the other hand, holds to an immediate relation of God to the world. Furthermore, the Logos doctrine amounts to pantheism, inasmuch as in everything finite there is the divine Logos, divine power, and divine life. If, then, the Trinitarian dogma based on the Logos doctrine is either a dead foreign body in the evangelical faith, or if, reawakened, it means a danger to it, the Logos doctrine must be abandoned for the sake of faith. And not only the philosophical presuppositions of the Logos doctrine, but also this doctrine itself in its ecclesiastical form is to be rejected in the name of the pure Gospel; for the Logos doctrine contains an overall religious conception which corresponds to Catholic but not to Protestant thought..... We must, if we wish to ascertain the significance of the person of Christ, confine ourselves for the present to history. Here, however, we are confronted with the concept of the Spirit-empowered personality. This must take the place of the old concept of the Logos. The personal God has taken form in the person of Jesus Christ, in his spiritually empowered life, so that he is the perfect mirror of God. Only in his person has the creation of man come to a conclusion, because only here has the intended goal been reached." Participants in the ensuing debate included: Prof. Preacher Scholz from Berlin, Prof. Wendt from Jena, Bornemann from Magdeburg, Harnack from Berlin,

Herrmann from Marburg, Ritschl from Bonn, Titius from Kiel, Dir. Evers, Sup. Stollen. There were no profound differences. - The second lecture was given by Prof. Dr. Harnack of Berlin on the subject, "On the Present Situation of Protestantism." He began by stating that the belief in a sacred function of theology had been completely lost, for two reasons: because the concept of science, and especially of historical science, had become a different one, and because the relationship between religion and science had changed. Canon law and world history first became secular, then the exegesis of the Old and New Testaments; in their operations they are detached from the specific interests of the church. Ritschl, with his energetic attempt to make theology again the basis of church life, is perhaps for the time being the last Protestant church father. If now in more recent times a lively movement for the ecclesiastical confession asserts itself, for the establishment of ecclesiastical order, for freedom of the church, then this essentially means the establishment of hierarchy, and that is Catholic. Fortunately, in spite of the catholicizing tendency, two main elements of Protestantism had not been lost: religion as a constant mood, which does not need refinement and constant stimulation, and morality, which consists in love and self-restraint. Ritschl's merit is to have brought these two crucial points back to light. What is our task now? 1. in a new formulation of our faith, 2. in a more elastic formation of religious education in order to better meet the various needs. "In particular, we must go back to the classical period of our people, and put to use all that was expressed there of religious, Christian content in untheological form, Goethe in his last twenty years, Herder, etc." 3. to persevere faithfully in the service of the national church in order to counterbalance the catholicising movement; "in the face of playing with religion and the pressure of hierarchy, we must emphasize the essence of religion." A four-hour debate followed, in which Prof. Herrmann of Marburg, v. Soden of Berlin, Dr. Joh. Müller of Darmstadt, Prof. Tröltzsch of Heidelberg, Bornemann of Magdeburg, Rev. Kötzsche of Sangerhausen, Prof. Pred. Scholz of Berlin, Gymn.-Dir. Evers from Barmen, Prof. Gregory from Leipzig, Pastor Göhre from Frankfurt a. O., Prof. Kattenbusch from Gießen, Rev. Förster from Frankfurt a. M., Pros. Ziller. The demand for a new formulation of the faith is lively discussed. The idea finds approval in many quarters. Gregory emphasizes that such a confession cannot be made, but must become part of history. But it already has its roots in today's development, and he wishes to accelerate this development by establishing guiding principles, for which a commission should be appointed. On the other hand, it is also argued against Harnack that there is no one who is authorized to establish a new dogma. Tröltzsch especially emphasizes that the present is not suitable for such a thing. The tremendous scientific revolution of the last centuries, with its repercussions on theology, is not yet over. The entire supranaturalism of the ecclesiastical system has been shaken to such an extent that even today the most enlightened dogmatist can offer nothing but fragments. In this long-lasting crisis, he said, one must be content to have a firm point of departure in the independence of religion and the Christian faith vis-à-vis all science. Kattenbusch whimsically replied that the dogmatist had not only become a whipping boy outside, but also among the dogmatists themselves. Of course the

dogmatists most vividly the difficulty of being a Christian as a modern man. But that we know nothing, we need not say after all. Only a certain form of supra-naturalism is broken, but qualitative supra-naturalism is inalienable to the essence of Christianity.

Leipzig Mission. The Leipzig "Missionsblatt" of November 15 reports: Based on a dispatch received from Tanga, we were informed a few days ago by the Foreign Office in Berlin that our two missionaries Ovir and Segebrock were attacked and murdered in the night of October 20 by robber Arusha and Meru people on Meru.

**The
Duel
Quest
ion in
Germ
any.**

The
"Evan
gelisc
he
Kirche
nzeitu
ng"
writes:
"On
the
questi
on of
duellin
g, the
Saxon
Provin
cial
Synod
, after
a
lecture
by
Profes
sor
Hering
, has
taken
a
stand
to the
effect
that it
has
unani
mousl
y
declar
ed that
duellin
g is
against
the
divine

and
human
comm
andme
nt. At
the
same
time, it
expres
sed
the
opinio
n that
a
more
effecti
ve
protect
ion of
honor
again
st harm
is
requir
ed by
way of
legisla
tion.
Just
as
pleasi
ng is
the
same
unani
mity of
the
Brand
enbur
g
Synod
in the
same
matter
and
the
word
of the
Synod
al
Freihe
rr von
Mante
uffel,
spoke
n
during
the
discus
sion,

that
everyt
hing
depen
ds on
unani
mity,
that
the
Reichs
tag
was
compl
etely
unani
mous
in this
questi
on,
and
that
the
Synod
should
not
stand
behind
the
politic
al
bodies
. Thus
it was
unani
mousl
y
decide
d: 1)
duelin
g is a
sin, 2)
the
church
has
the
task to
sharpe
n the
consci
ence
of its
memb
ers by
all
means
and to
penetr
ate
ever
wider

circles
with
the
consci
ousne
ss that
duelin
g
violate
s
God's
comm
andme
nt and
is
theref
ore
repreh
ensibl
e." If
only
consci
ence
would
stir a
little
more
vigoro
usly
even
in
regard
to the
Christi
an
doctrin
e of
faith!
F. P.

Roman from Spain. In No. 24 of the "Katholisches Volksblatt für Sachsen" the following announcement is found without contradiction, apparently with approval of the whole: The unburied body of St. Isidore, the patron saint of Madrid, which has been kept in the cathedral there for 700 years, was publicly exposed for veneration in the cathedral from May 15 to 23 of this year. The body of St. Isidore, the patron saint of Madrid, which has been kept in the cathedral for 700 years, was publicly exposed for veneration in the cathedral between May 15 and 23 of this year, after the long-awaited rain had immediately followed a petitionary procession in which this precious relic was carried out. Throughout the winter and spring there had been an extraordinary drought in Spain, so that the loss of the entire harvest was feared. As soon as the procession reached the middle of its route, the clouds that had been prayed for rose in the sky, and during the following night a heavy rain began to fall on the fields, which lasted for eight days, so that the harvest could be considered secure. The body of St. Isidor was carried in the procession in a precious silver coffin. The queen expressed the wish that she would like to see the saint, but only if the people were allowed to do so. Therefore, the most reverend bishop had the holy body displayed in a glass coffin on a bier covered with flowers in the cathedral under a magnificent canopy for public veneration.

From early morning until late evening, crowds flocked in from all sides. The saint - with arms crossed over his chest - is very well preserved, though somewhat brown and stained. Four knights of Calatrava and two clergymen knelt steadily to the side as guard of honour. - Hereupon still follow historical legendary tidings about the two holy Isidore, which Spain possesses, and especially about the miracles of the rain-making Isidor.

Doctrine and Defense.

Volume 42.

December 1896.

No. 12.

Lourd es.

A contribution to the characteristics of the present Pabst Church.

In the United States, too, we are in the position of having to fight Rome at every turn. In order to be able to do this properly, it is necessary to remember Rome's teaching and practice again and again. Only in this way will we be able, by God's grace, to become knowledgeable guides to the light of the Gospel for the individual souls who turn to us for instruction from the papacy or who cross our path in their dealings with us.

A characteristic piece of papist doctrine and practice is the cult of Mary with its appendix of Marian pilgrimages and Marian miracles. The Papal Church of our time is developing more and more in the direction of Marian service. The present Pontiff has on several occasions impressed upon his "faithful children" that the hope of the Church is in Mary, and has exhorted them to a faithful devotion to Mary.

Among the many places where, as a result of alleged apparitions of Mary, the veneration of Mary is practiced on a gruesomely large scale, Lourdes in the south of France is probably still the "most famous". Also from America larger and smaller pilgrimages have turned to Lourdes, and miraculous Lourdes water is also sent to America. In the following, we will therefore provide more detailed information about Lourdes. We take these from an article in the "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift" (published by Prof. Gustav Holzhäuser, in Munich). The article, written by Dean Gustav Braun in Uffenheim, is based on an exact study of the relevant, mostly papist, literature. We cite with some omissions.

In Lourdes, a remote little town of 4-5000 inhabitants, at the eastern foot of the Pyrenees, at the wildly rushing mountain stream

Gave, lived a poor miller named Soubirous. His eldest daughter was named Maria Bernard, called Bernadette, born in 1844. She spent her childhood in the even more remote village of Bartrös, with only 400 souls, with a certain Mrs. Lagües, who took the child from poor Soubirous. Her upbringing there is very important and significant in explaining what follows. She grew slowly and was always ill; she suffered from nervous asthma from an early age, and was generally sickly, weak, small, and retarded in mind and body all her life. She never attended school and at the age of twelve she could neither read nor write, but was otherwise good and gentle and unspoiled. She had great difficulty in learning the rosary. But when she knew it, she said it constantly; even when she was with her sheep, for herding was her only occupation, she could only be found with the rosary in her hand, praying it up and down; that was all she knew. Her foster-mother had a brother who was a priest, and who sometimes read wonderful stories of holy men and women, of apparitions of Paradise on earth, while the half-open sky made one perceive the splendour of the angels. There were pictures in the books, too. Bernadette preferred the books in which the Blessed Virgin appeared with her benevolent smile. If her imagination was excited, it cost her trouble to fall asleep, especially when witch stories were told. All the people there were very superstitious. Everywhere was said to be haunted; wolves, sorcery, ghosts and witches filled the imagination of the people and also of little Bernadette. At the age of fourteen, she was to be prepared for her first Communion. The Abbé Ader of Bartrés was particularly fond of her because of her piety and childlike innocence. He is said to have said that he could not look at her without thinking of the children of Salette (near Grenoble). Of these children Melanie and Maxlmin, the Abbé told in the spinning room, in the church, how twelve years ago (September 16, 1846) the Holy Virgin appeared to the shepherdess Melanie to entrust her with a great secret, and how from the tears of the Holy Virgin a spring was born which has since then cured diseases, while the secret rests on a sealed parchment in Rome. The holy Virgin is said to have spoken to the children in patois 1). Bernadette heard this story with eagerness, cherished it and moved it in her heart, and I believe we will recognize in the later the fruit of what was sown here. She was fourteen years old and had not yet received First Communion. She had rapturous eyes; this is particularly emphasized by all writers. In addition, she was an ordinary, small, physically undeveloped girl.

1) In the dialect of the peasants.

355 Lourdes. A contribution to the characteristics of the present-day Pabst Church.
very ignorant and simple-minded. At the age of fourteen she returned to her parents' house in Lourdes.

On Thursday, February 11, 1858, the mother sent her second daughter into the forest to gather wood; Bernadette, the elder sister, and another friend accompanied her. These three went up the bank of the Gave, and so came into the thicket of the forest, opposite a high rock called Massabielle. It was a wild place, where shepherds often sought shelter with their flocks in sudden downpours. At the foot of this rock, hidden under raspberry bushes and wild roses, was a very deep grotto. The two companions waded through the mill canal, because they saw dry wood beyond; Bernadette, who could not walk so fast, wanted to follow, and was just about to take off her shoes and stockings; then a great excitement took possession of her - in Lourdes it was just striking twelve o'clock. It roared so deafeningly in her ears that she thought she heard a storm; but behold, not a leaf stirred. Then the whizzing came over her eyes; she could no longer see the trees; she was blinded as by a white glow, as by a lurid light that seemed to press against the rock above the grotto. Then, by degrees, certain outlines became visible; she thought she recognized a figure that looked all white in the glare. Fearing that it might be the devil, she had immediately begun to pray the rosary. According to the Catholic writers, immediately at this first apparition the full figure of the Blessed Virgin is said to have appeared. "There was," they say, "nothing vague and misty in this heavenly apparition; it had not the indefinite outlines of a mirage; it was a living body," etc. The figure is also said to have smiled and greeted kindly, bowed its head and hands, and made the sign of the cross. The apparition had lasted twenty minutes. The children's account immediately caused a sensation, and the parents therefore forbade their daughter to go to the rock again. But the mother had to give in to the children's pleas, and so on Sunday, February 14, Bernadette and her friends went back to the same place in front of the grotto, taking a bottle of holy water with them to see if they might be dealing with the devil. Bernadette, as she knelt down and began the Rosary, saw again the brightness of the figure, which stood out more clearly, and smiled, without fear of the consecrated water. On Thursday, February 18, she went again accompanied by two women. This time the radiance had taken the form of a woman of wonderful figure and beauty. Her eyes were blue and very gentle, her mouth red and smiling, her face of youthful and motherly grace. At the edge of the veil, which covered the head and reached down to the ankles, one could scarcely see the splendid blond hair. The snow-white shining robe must have been made by

356 Lourdes. A contribution to the characteristics of the present Pabst Church. a fabric unknown on earth, which seemed to be woven from sunbeams. The lightly looped belt, of the color of heaven, let two long flying ends hang down. Her hands were folded in pious devotion before her breast, and from them hung down a rosary with milk-white beads and cord and cross of gold. And on the bare feet, behold, there bloomed two golden roses, the mystic symbol of the Immaculate Mother of God. Who, at this description, does not think of the pictures Bernadette had seen in books and churches? Yes, in this third apparition, the figure also began to speak, and, as Bernadette later said, it was always in patois. The Catholic writers say that this time Bernadette brought pen and paper with her so that the miraculous woman could write on it. The latter, however, said, "What I have to say to you I need not write; show me the pleasure of coming here every day for a fortnight." At the child's consent the figure added, "And I promise to make thee happy, not in this world, but in the next." The next apparitions quickly followed, the fourth on the 19th, the fifth on the 20th of February. It is said that five hundred persons were present at the first apparition, and thousands at the second, who, of course, neither saw nor heard anything of the apparition, but only observed the transfigured features of the visionary. On both occasions the figure, surrounded by rays, is said to have only smiled and saluted without speaking a word. The sixth apparition was on February 21. At this one the figure wept and said, "Pray for sinners." On Monday she remained absent. On Tuesday, February 23, she appeared again and confided to her a personal secret which was never to be known. Then she gave her the order, "Go and tell the priests that a chapel must be built here, and that one should go there in procession." Bernadette immediately went to the priest of Lourdes, Abbé Peyramale, and gave the order. But he received her coldly, interrogated her sternly, and dismissed her, saying, "I do not know who that lady is, and before entering into her wishes I must satisfy myself that she has claims to them. Ask her, then, to give me some proof of her power." As such he demanded that the lady make the scrawny rose bush at her feet green and bloom now in winter. When Bernadette made this request at the next apparition, on February 24, the figure only smiled and murmured three times, "Penance, penance, penance," which the child repeated, kissing the earth. The next apparition, the ninth, on February 25, is especially important because of the origin of the spring. Before this time, it is said, there was no sign of a spring or any other water in the grotto; only to the right of the entrance did water trickle down in rainy weather; but the background and the whole of the left side, it is said by the friends of Lourdes, were always dry. During the ninth apparition, the figure said: "Drink

Lourdes. A contribution to the characteristics of the present-day Pabst Church. 357 From the fountain, and wash thyself there." Bernadette, seeing no spring, wished to hasten down to the Gave; but the figure said, "Go not thither, I have not commanded thee to drink at the Gave; rather draw from this spring." With this she pointed to the spot on the left in the background of the grotto. As Bernadette began to dig there with her hand, the hollow suddenly became moist and filled with water. At first it was dirty water, and only with great effort did she drink from it and wet her face with it. The spectators did not know how to interpret this. Soon, however, the water ran away as a thin thread, and while Bernadette went home, the crowd crowded in, dipped cloths into the water, drew it, and the more one drew, the stronger the spring flowed, until after a few days the water gushed forth bright and clear, the thickness of a child's arm, giving 122,400 liters daily. The figure appeared again on February 27 and 28, March 1, 2, and 3, repeating the orders and smiling at the humble girl who prayed the rosary constantly and crawled on her knees to the spring. At the fifteenth apparition, on March 4, it is said that 20,000 people were present. The figure only repeated the demand for a chapel and solemn processions.

Until now, the figure had not yet given her name. This happened now at the 16th apparition on Thursday, March 25. Bernadette again pleaded urgently, "O my dear Lady, will you have the goodness to tell me who you are and what your name is!" And behold, just as they were praying the "Hail Mary" inside at Lourdes during Mass, the figure spoke, "I am the Immaculate Conception." And there she stood, "with hands folded in devotion and with a face shining with blissful delight, a radiant image of transfigured humility! She opened her folded hands and let the beautiful rosary slide down her right arm. Then she lowered her arms to the earth, as if to show those gracious hands to the whole world." Now the apparition had accomplished its work and that is why it came only twice more: on April 7 and on June 16. That apparition is marked by the "miracle" of Bernadette holding her hand over a burning candle for more than a quarter of an hour without feeling pain and without receiving a burn. At the last apparition, the figure merely said goodbye without a word, with a last greeting and smile. The grotto had already been cordoned off by the police, and Bernadette could only kneel in the distance on the opposite bank of the Gave.

So that was a total of 18 apparitions. Since then, the heavenly Virgin has not appeared there again.

A great commotion soon arose in Lourdes and the surrounding area. People argued for and against, but the pro side kept the upper hand, especially when soon miracles began to occur. The first happened immediately after the 9th Er-

358 Lourdes. A contribution to the characteristics of the present Pabst Church. appearance. In Lourdes there was a quarryman, Bouriette, who had almost completely lost the light in his right eye, despite medical treatment. As soon as he heard of the spring, he had water brought to him, which was still quite muddy, and washed his eye with it, and behold, suddenly he could see again! Only a slight mist remained, which also disappeared with continued praying and washing; he was completely cured! At the same time, other ever greater and more extraordinary miracles occurred. With songs of thanksgiving, people surrounded the grotto and lit it with candles; crowds of faithful came from all ropes. It was remembered that a shepherd had predicted that great things would happen at the Rock of Massabielle. Children went into raptures, a mad frenzy seemed to have seized the whole region. They sought Bernadette out, questioned her, besieged her with requests and petitions. There were sobs and a fanaticism took possession of the souls when Bernadette knelt before the grotto, a lighted candle in one hand and a rosary in the other. In ecstasy she was seen to become very pale, very beautiful and transfigured. Slowly her features came to life; they took on an expression of bliss; her eyes filled with radiance, her half-open mouth moved. Her whole person seemed full of majesty; she made majestic, very slow signs of the cross, which gave the impression of embracing the horizon. Many are said to have been brought to faith by this very sight. The neighboring valleys, towns, and villages spoke only of Bernadette; the crowd grew ever larger.

But opposition, or, as they say, persecution, was not absent. The parish priest of Lourdes, Abbé Peyramale, a rough but kind and energetic man, refused to believe in the story of the child whom he had not yet even seen in Christian teaching. Subsequently, of course, he was changed; but wisely and cautiously he awaited the bishop's decision. Not so the secular authority. The police commissioner had the child arrested and repeatedly interrogated. Bernadette stuck to one and the same statement during all the interrogations. When the crowd and the excitement grew worse and worse, the Prefect, by order of the Minister, had the entrances to the grotto militarily occupied, forbade visits to the place, and had a fence made of strong stakes built around it. It was all of no avail. When the prefect had the grotto, into which all sorts of things had already been thrown, cleared out, it was not until evening that the commissary was able to find a girl who rented him a cart for the purpose; behold, two hours later this girl fell and broke a rib in two. A man had lent him an axe for the purpose; behold, the next day a stone shattered his foot. All these things only fanned the flames. The faithful came more and more, kneeling in the distance, sneaking through the cracks, climbing over the obstacles, only to

Lourdes. A contribution to the characteristics of the present Pabst Church. 359
To steal water. One punished with money and increased the grumbling of the people. One tried with conceptions and teachings, they were talked into the wind. Thus the struggle lasted several months. But since nothing could be done, and in the end they had to fear an outrage, one after the other gave in. First the Bishop Lawrence of Tarbes. At first he had kept silent, as if nothing was happening in Lourdes. But after five months, on July 28, 1858, he appointed a commission to investigate. Furthermore, the Emperor (Napoleon) surrendered. He, too, had remained silent until then, as very high personalities, especially ladies, besieged him. At last he gave the order to pull down the fence and release the grotto. It was said that the Empress had mediated. There was now a cheer. It was said: God has triumphed! After the episcopal commission had begun its work in Lourdes on November 17, had interrogated Bernadette, had ascertained thirty miraculous healings, fifteen of which were undoubtedly of miraculous character, and after the bishop had waited another three years for more caution, he issued the pastoral letter on January 18, 1862. After the bishop had waited another three years for more caution, he issued a pastoral letter on January 18, 1862, in which he declared "that the apparition of the Immaculately Conceived Virgin and Mother of God in the grotto at Lourdes had all the characteristics of truth and that the faithful were entitled to believe in it. At the same time he authorized the devotion to "Our Lady of Lourdes" for the area of his diocese. At the same time, the bishop prudently purchased the grotto and the Massabielle rock formation, together with all the adjoining terrain, from the community of Lourdes as ecclesiastical property; a purchase that has paid off.

From then on, the magnificent buildings began. The bishop, in order to comply with the order of the Blessed Virgin to build a church, had turned to all the priests and faithful of his diocese, to all of France, and to all the devout Marian worshippers of the entire Christian world, with the request for contributions. The success of this request is shown by the buildings that could be built with this money. The entire surroundings of the grotto were changed. The millstream, the Gave itself, was given a different bed to make room for a beautiful, wide street, for avenues and large, open squares. Nothing was spared, especially in front of the grotto, to gain a free space for many thousands. Then the grotto itself was furnished with a statue of the holy virgin from carraric marble, above it a so-called crypt was built and over this a towering basilica from white marble, 2000 humans seizing, far shining; furthermore still another larger church, the so-called rosary church, which alone cost 3¼ million Francs, to the side of the grotto, 50 M. long and 15 M. broad with 15 chapels and 6000 pilgrims seizing, itself strangely and heavily crouching. There was built to the side of the basilica a magnificent episcopal palace, a house for the

Missionary Fathers, and otherwise a number of convents and monasteries and institutions; who can enumerate them all? A whole new town grew up around the grotto. Pilgrimages followed one another from near and far; Lourdes became more and more the world sanctuary of Catholic Christianity. As early as 1869, Pius IX, in a letter to the historiographer of Lourdes, Advocate Lasserre of Paris, had wished him happiness for having "proved and substantiated the most recent apparition of the mild Mother of God with such testimonies that now even the struggle of human malice against divine mercy must serve to make the truth and miraculousness of the events emerge all the more clearly. Now, however, at the insistence of Pius IX, he permitted and commissioned the Archbishop of Paris, as apostolic delegate, to perform the solemn consecration of the basilica, and the apostolic nuncio of Paris to crown the statue of the Blessed Virgin in the name of the pope. Both took place on July 2 and 3, 1876, of course with the greatest pomp, with papal indulgences and blessings, as with fireworks and rockets, where the words shone in flames: "Long live Our Lady of Lourdes!" 35 French and 7 foreign bishops and 3000 priests were present and the crowd of pilgrims is said to have numbered 100,000 or more. Finally, the Pope ordered an annual *officium* and *missa to be* celebrated on February 18. Thus Lourdes was now provided with everything, with graces and confirmation and authentication, and the world need only come and take what is prepared there. F. P.

(Conclusion follows.)

On Luther's position on Scripture.

In the eighth issue of the current volume of the Erlangen "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift" there is an article on "Luther's Position on Holy Scripture, its Value and Authority". The author is a Pastor K. Thimme. The content and tendency of his article is given by Pastor Thimme himself thus: "The following exposition is intended to set forth and explain Luther's twofold 1) position on Holy Scripture, which is expressed, on the one hand, in his unconditional submission 1) to its authority, and, on the other hand, in the broad-hearted freedom 1) which elevates him so high above the external belief in inspiration of many of his followers and adherents."

There are two main things that come to mind when reading this article. First, that Luther's theological position is still a deeply hidden secret to Pastor Thimme. From this we can give him no

1) highlighted by us.

particular reproach to Luther. He is a child of modern theology, and modern theology is separated from Luther's theology by a "deep chasm". Secondly, it is evident from this article that Pastor Thimme cites Luther incorrectly, in that he takes Luther's words out of context, omits the sentences that speak against the newer view of Scripture, draws false conclusions from correctly cited words of Luther, etc. We do not reproach Thimme in particular for this either. From this, too, we do not reproach Thimme in particular. This way of using Luther is almost the general custom among German theologians, as we have repeatedly demonstrated in "Lehre und Wehre". The false citation of Luther is by no means always intentional deception, but can often be explained by the fact that one does not read Luther himself, but makes use in good faith of the citations that one theological family passes on to the other. Therefore, when we read Pastor Thimme's article, we did not think it necessary to say a word against it. Most of the passages from Luther, which Pastor Thimme cites for the Reformer's alleged "broad-minded freedom" in his position on Scripture, have been treated by us by and by in "Lehre und Wehre" and elsewhere. The writer in the "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift" evidently does not read "Lehre und Wehre." Nor is he probably acquainted to any but a limited extent with the German literature of the last decade dealing with Luther's position on Scripture. Otherwise, it would have been impossible for him to refer anew, for example, to Luther's preface to Link's explanation of the books of Moses 1) and to find in it a proof that Luther considered errors in Scripture to be possible.

What nevertheless prompts us to return to Pastor Thimme's article here in a few words is the circumstance that the December number of the Chicago "Biblical World" brings an excerpt from Thimme's article, with the concluding remark: "The exceptional merit of this article lies in the fact that it provides the data on which a judgment can be made about the question of what Luther's position on Scripture was, since both advanced and conservative critics claim Luther for themselves. That much can be learned from Luther's sound position for our time as well will not escape the attentive reader. The author's work deserves careful study." The writer of this recommendation in the "Biblical World" and the author of the excerpt is "G. H. S." (Prof. G. H. Schodde of the Ohio Synod?)

So we will briefly demonstrate here, using a few examples, how irresponsibly careless Pastor Thimme cites Luther. Thimme seeks to prove that Luther urges Christ as the main content of Scripture or the analogy of faith to the extent that he does not accept errors.

1) E. A. 63, 376 ff.

in secondary matters. He writes, p. 673: "Scripture always remains for him (Luther) the work of the Holy Spirit, even though it has come into being through the human intellectual activity of its authors and is by no means free from human error in things that do not belong to the 'right articles of our faith. This is at the same time a sure standard for judging everything in Scripture. To this we must now, in conclusion, direct our attention." After Thimme has hereupon cited a number of passages in which Luther says that Christ is the actual content of Scripture, he continues (pp. 673 f.):

"This standard" (of the interpretation of Scripture according to the analogy of faith) "is still decisive to him (Luther) even when his opponents hold up to him a passage of Scripture which after all does not seem to be explicable according to it. A passage in his Commentary on Galatians is characteristic of this, in which he discusses the saying Dau. 4, 24: 'Make thyself free from iniquity by doing good to the poor. 1) Luther first tries the explanation that 'sich ledig machet' includes faith; but seems well to feel the insufficiency of it (-admitting that that solution is insufficient, though it is quite certain' 2)). Then he continues: "Nevertheless, this is the main argument... against all objections, that they seize the head, namely Christ. Furthermore, even if the sophists are sharper than I and so overwhelm and ensnare me with arguments for works against faith that I could not extricate myself at all (although this is impossible for them), I would rather believe the one Christ than be moved by all the passages which they could produce against the doctrine of faith for the establishment of the righteousness of works/ Now if such a case should arise, in Luther's opinion one should simply answer the opponent: 'You appeal to the servant, that is, the Scriptures, and not to the whole Scriptures, nor to their noblest part. I leave this servant to you; I appeal to the Lord, who is a king of Scripture, who has become my merit and my ransom for the attainment of righteousness and blessedness.' Similarly Luther also says: 'if the adversaries also appeal to the Scriptures against Christ, we appeal to Christ against the Scriptures.' Gen. 1, 539." (?) "Thus, in conclusion, we find established once more with paradoxical sharpness what confronted us already in the beginning in Luther's position on Scripture. Not for its own sake 3) does Scripture have value and prestige for him, but because it contains and brings Christ."

So far Pastor Thimme. Indeed, if one reads only these sentences from Luther, which our article-writer deems it good to quote, one might get the idea as if Luther were bringing Christ and the Holy Scriptures into a real opposition to one another. One might think that Luther considers it possible that Christ and the Scriptures contradict each other, that thus errors occur in the Scriptures, which one could not understand.

- 1) We give the words quoted in Latin immediately in German translation.
- 2) Luther, therefore, makes no mere attempt at explanation.
- 3) Highlighted by us.

F. P.

from Christ, as the most excellent part of Scripture. But these thoughts disappear as soon as one reads the whole passage. Luther himself expressly rejects such a view of his words. He says in the passage which stands between the words adduced by Thimme: "Therefore, if he (Christ) is the ransom for my redemption, if he has become sin and a curse, that he justified and blessed me, I give nothing to passages of Scripture (*nihil moror scripturae locos*), if you also put up countless (*sexcentos*) of them for the righteousness of works against the righteousness of faith, and cry out that Scripture contends against itself; I have the author and lord of the Scriptures, on whose side I would rather stand than believe thee, though it is impossible for the Scriptures to contend with themselves, except among the senseless and obstinate hypocrites. But with the pious and understanding it bears witness to its master." 1) These words of Luther have been omitted by Pastor Thimme as not pertaining to the matter, although, as already remarked, they stand between the sentences cited by him and on the same pages (pp. 388. 389). These words of Luther's overthrow the whole modern deduction that Luther considers contradictions in Scripture possible. One recklessly ascribes to Luther a position on Scripture against which Luther expressly rejects, and even calls it the position of the "senseless and obdurate hypocrites.

But why does Luther speak as he does in the sentences cited by Thimme? The context shows this quite clearly. Luther thinks to himself

1) E. A. I, 388 sq.: *Quare si ipse est pretium redemptionis meae, si ipse factus est peccatum et maledictum, ut me justificaret et benediceret, nihil moror scripturae locos, si etiam sexcentos producas pro justitia operum contra fidei justitiam, et clamites scripturam pugnare; ego auctorem et dominum scripturae habeo, a cujus parte volo potius stare, quam tibi credere, quamquam impossibile sit scripturam pugnare, nisi apud insensatos et induratos hypocritas. Apud pios autem et intelligentes dat testimonium pro domino suo.* This is how Justus Menius rendered it - Menius' translation was available to Luther himself -: "Therefore, because Christ himself is the treasure for which I was bought and redeemed, and for which I became sin and a curse, so that he justified and blessed me, I ask nothing of all the sayings of Scripture, if you would bring up any more against me, to establish the righteousness of works with it and to put down the righteousness of faith. For I have on my side the Master and Lord of the Scriptures, with whom I will hold, and know that he will not lie, nor deceive me, when he saith, He that believeth on me, the same shall live, etc. Item, I am the way, the truth, and the life, etc., and let thee cry out against the Scriptures, that they are contrary to one another, ascribing righteousness to faith in one place, and to works in another; though it is impossible that the Scriptures should be contrary to themselves, except it seem so to unwise, rude, and hardened hypocrites. But with the godly and the rightly understanding it bears witness to its master and keeps it with him." (Samuel Lucius' Separate Print. 1717. p. 313 f.)

a simple-minded Christian who is harassed by sophists with passages of Scripture that deal with the works of man, and cannot quite see how these passages agree with others that promise salvation for Christ's sake alone, without the works of man. In such a case Luther advises the Christian to hold steadfastly to those passages of Scripture which proclaim Christ as the only cause of salvation. Christ is the actual content of Scripture. All things must serve him, as in heaven and on earth, so also in Scripture. What the Scriptures so clearly say about Christ cannot be overthrown by anything else in Scripture. Therefore, if a Christian holds fast to what the Scriptures say about Christ, he cannot go astray, even if he is not able to refute the objections that are raised against the righteousness of faith from passages in the Scriptures that deal with the works of man.

For Luther, however, it is an established truth, expressed in hundreds of passages, that there is basically only one secret in Scripture. This is Christ, namely the teaching that we have forgiveness of sin through Christ and not through our works. He who has recognized this in faith has thereby recognized the whole of Scripture. He does not need to worry that there are still mysteries hidden behind, which he would have to uncover in order to be sure of his faith and to rejoice in it. Would to God that this truth - which is a truth of Scripture, according to I Cor. 2:2, 7-10, etc. - were quite alive in all Christians. Unfortunately, many Christians, although they have recognized Christ, the star and core and the only mystery of Scripture, are still timid and stupid when it comes to judging spiritual things, in the opinion that there are still all kinds of mysteries hidden in Scripture that could substantially modify their Christian faith. Therefore they are so easily frightened by learned and unlearned spirits who speak of all kinds of mysteries and difficulties in Scripture that a Christian must first allow to be elucidated before he can be certain of his salvation. In contrast to this, Luther inculcates every Christian on the basis of Scripture: If you have known Christ from the Scriptures, you have grasped the truth for the sake of which the Scriptures were given. You can leave all difficulties in Scripture alone, regardless of your faith.

Luther's remarks about the apparently contradictory statements of the evangelists are also to be understood from this line of thought. Here, too, Luther advises the simple-minded Christians to leave such difficulties to themselves and to order the scholars. This would not detract from their faith. But nowhere does Luther say that errors are found in the statements of the evangelists. We challenge all Luther scholars to produce such a passage. We have a

such so far not found. Thimme refers to a sermon of Luther about Joh. 2, 13-16. Luther says here: "The question here is, first of all, how the two evangelists, Matthew and John, rhyme together. For Matthew writes that it happened on the day of the palm tree, when the Lord rode into Jerusalem; here John says that it happened soon after Easter, after the baptism of Christ." About this difficulty Luther remarks: "But there are questions and remain questions, which I do not want to resolve; nor is there much in it without many people who are so sharp and perceptive, and raise all kinds of questions, and want to have exact speech and answer about them. But if we have the right understanding of the Scriptures, and the right articles of our faith, that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, died and suffered for us, there is no great lack, though we cannot answer all that is otherwise asked. The evangelists do not keep the same order; what one puts in front, another sometimes puts behind; as Marcus also writes of this story, that it happened on the next day after Palm Day. It is also possible that the Lord did this more than once, and that John describes the first time, Matthew the other. Now be it as it may, whether it happened before or after, one or two times, it does not affect our faith.

1) So far Luther. Where does it say anything here of an error of the evangelists, which Luther-according to Thimme-is here to acknowledge "openly"? Luther's whole exposition is only an earnest admonition to Christians not to make their faith in Christ and salvation in Him dependent on the solution of individual difficulties in Scripture.

This admonition should also be taken to heart by the newer theologians, instead of citing Luther in a mutilated way and wanting to make him their guarantor through false conclusions. F. P.

Modern theologians' attacks on God's Word.

(Continued.)

Degeneration of the Faith.

How can one keep a good conscience in such a community? One threw oneself on the Pietist excuse, borrowed from the monks and mystics, that one, instead of openly confronting the enemy, wanted to withdraw into one's heart and closet and from there send prayers to heaven and apologies to the world. A sick, pietistic Christianity, which even in prayer makes its own ego the main

1) St. Louis ed. VII, 1780, 1781.

The pietists, who made it their business, increasingly misjudged the true Christian vocation. A system of associations cleaned up the pietistic little churches in the church according to the new fashion. Often enough, however, the associations, like the Gustav Adolf Association, soon fell so deeply into the commonplace that everyone saw that there was no longer any question of salt. Dr. Gollenperger sang quite true of the Gustav Adolf Society: "Everyone enters the Society as a member without further ado, as soon as he has shown himself to be a human being by means of a certificate. Faith does not come into consideration. It is love that makes everything. Love is the shiboleth of the new world society. The Pescheräh, the Hottentot, the Persian with the double god, the Jew, pagan, Turk is a born member like the Christian. The man-eaters alone, they must be excluded; for human love is not where one still eats the other." Apologies should also give up as much as possible of Scriptural truth, so as not to provoke the enemy; should be more denial than testimony. "It always remains inalienable to apologetics that it is that theological science by means of which, in the organism of the collected sciences, the transition of philosophy into theology is accomplished." (Delitzsch: System der chr. Apologetik. 1869. p. 30.) It builds the artificial roads to the connection of church and world. It completes the bridges from faith to unbelief. Most apologetics have left the source of salvation, of the knowledge and power of the Spirit, and are themselves fighting against divine truth. They lack solid ground. They do not know the sword of the Spirit, the certain word of God of the apostles and prophets, and the certain grace of God in Christ Himself, as a new theologian confesses: "We no longer have any of those old pillars, nor do we have any new ones that are peculiar to us. What we have in common with the ancients stands with us on a different ground, so far as we possess any ground at all." (Tröltsch: Vernunft u. Offbg. 1891. p. 213.) Of Luthardt's famous apologetic lectures Die. Ströbel: "We say freely, these concessions cannot satisfy the adversary, and must mislead the Christian." (Ztsch. f. Theol. u. Kirche. 1865. p. 527.) Their learned language will do them no good, but rather harm. The popular Calvary Apologetics says it at once in the preface, that it comes from Laodicea, and is a product of the latter times. "This seems to us ... a need of our time," it says quite naively, "that such bridges of science and education be built for the unbeliever, by means of which he may pass from the region of unbelief into that of faith." (p. VI.) The enemies only scoff at the way that Jewish buffoon scoffed at the celebration of the Lord's Supper in an unchurched church, in which the sacrament was administered sometimes according to the Lutheran, sometimes according to the Reformed rite. "At the altars of the Protestants one now dines *a la carte*," quipped the blasphemer.

(Corr.-Bl. 1834. p. 280.) Thus Strauss also wrote of the bridges built by the apologists: "The views and representations which of to-day would like to mediate between the strictly ecclesiastical and the freest critical standpoint are patched together from all sorts of scraps of the most diverse materials, which cannot possibly hold together in length." (Kzt. 1861. p. 42.) One does not even recognize the enemy's main strongholds; how should one storm them? To the best of today's apologists one must usually still say what Rev. Seeger said to a brother-officer: "You seem to me like a commandant who stands before a fortress and would like to take it, but yet has not the heart to shoot into it, but directs his pieces, bombs, and carbines all beyond it." (Corr.-Bl. 1827. p. 159.) Instead of smashing it down with decided divine testimonies, one first acknowledges unbelief, and makes it important by the way in which one fusses with it. M. Claudius wrote: "In general, it is not to be understood why one should spend so much time in demonstrations with freethinkers and doubters, and make so much fuss about their freethinking and doubting. Christ says very briefly, "He who keeps my word will know whether my teaching is from God. He who cannot make this attempt, or does not want to make it, ought really, if he were a reasonable and cheap man, or only wanted to be called one, not to say a word either against or for Christianity; and yet if he is so weak and vain that, like Voltaire and Hume, etc., he must bring his bit of gallantry to market, one could let him do it undisturbed and not look around for him." (I, 61 f.) But only Christians who are sure of their faith can do so; but the apologists are usually nothing less than that. "Now scarcely anyone denies that the period of rationalism has fertilized the church, which has emerged victorious from it, with a precipitate of advanced knowledge," that is, with such as Eve learned from the serpent. (Br. Delitzsch: *The Wide Ditch*. p. 6.) The Protestant Association, which has grown out of it, "works to cleanse the Augean Stable of the Church" of the last crumbs of the Word of God, as a freethinker exults. "It transforms the Christian tradition down to its remotest parts, . . . even drops nine tenths of the Bible as useless." The church sees no danger. "Indifference is the serious disease from which she suffers." (Hieronymi: *Strauß u. Bewegung. der Ggw.* 1873. p. 15. 17. 85.) Hartmann sneers that she is sitting on a chair with the legs sawn off, and is still clinging to it in order not to fall.

Thus, the time of grace was allowed to pass by unused. They did not want to return to the faith that God had once given to the saints. The first witnesses had spoken with firmness and faith, but one unfaithfulness gave birth to another. The dross still clung to them.

and each had its own system of doctrine. A Lengerke could sneer that they should not awaken Luther again, lest he burn their books just as he burned the rationalistic ones. But does God no longer permit the sincere to penetrate to the clarity of knowledge? Was Hengstenberg therefore allowed to claim in 1844 that one had to remain in the dirty Union hall because the Lutherans were not yet Lutheran either? In 1843 he himself had to admit that the determination of the faithful had been weakening more and more for ten years, and that a sweeping out of the leaven was no longer to be thought of; theology was being eaten through by the poison of unbelief, and the tree of rationalism was sprouting new branches in ecclesiastical circles. It cannot remain as it is, "or God will give up His church," said Claus Harms in his interpretation of the Revelation of John. He himself, however, ceased to increase in spirit, and not only wavered in such a way that he again conceded all power in the church to the authorities (Kzt. 1829, p. 705 ff.), but, like Schleiermacher, declared it to be weakness on the part of a preacher if he considered himself bound by his text. The Bible was only "a stimulating, fertilizing principle alongside the Spirit of God, which also exists outside the Bible, is active in the church, and is itself not entirely dependent on the Bible and the church, but also goes its own way, though never in a direction contrary to the Bible and the church". (Kzt . 1855, p. 829.) If a relaxation of the obligation to the Lutheran symbols had been early encouraged among the "faithful," the longer the less was thought of a complete conversion. "What then do the faithful do?" asked a Christian in an English paper of 1829 of the German Church. "What efforts are they making to stem the tide of ungodliness that wants to swamp everything? What has become of the salt in the midst of the general rot? Where then does the light shine in this more than Cimmerian darkness, in this darkness that one can grasp with one's hands? This is the great question; this is the point on which everything depends. If the Lord wants to reveal his arm in those countries, we must hope that it will be through the faithful, and how they behave we must look to see if we want to conclude the outcome of the battle. Now some of them are losing heart even here. . . . The people of the Lord seem to be afraid to speak out against the kingdom of darkness and to oppose its enemies. One of the main causes of this flight from the field is the idolatrous respect for the learning of the unbelievers that is so widespread in Germany. This false-liberal, pathetic, fearful, half-hearted sentiment must, where it prevails, paralyze the champions of truth, and put an end to all hope that things will get better." (Kzt. 1829, p. 270 f.) Thus even Hengstenberg, who at that time still had good hope, had already to confess in 1845: "Already the

The old Bible was no longer enough even for the new Lutherans themselves." (Kzt. p. 440.) The old Bible was no longer enough for the new Lutherans themselves. The Erlanger Zeitschrift always had to do with the further development of doctrine before it had grasped the old Lutheran doctrine, and presumed to assert that the apostolic commandment to separate oneself from unbelievers was only authoritative for the apostolic times. "How very different is now the position of Christianity in our Christian countries, in which heathenism is not to be overcome first, but has been overcome for centuries; in which the whole nations no longer stand outside the church, but constitute the chief masts of its members! With us Christianity is so firmly rooted that no abomination of moral corruption of individual members is any longer able to shake it." - "That is why we also believe that the Lutheran Church will never become quite at home outside Germany," because the German character is supposed to be its best support. "If we Germans also come into the ways of the North American muddler, who will complete the formation of the dogma; who will investigate the authenticity of the New Testament Scriptures, who will develop the true theory of the Christian Cultus and Constitution? O one would weep to see how this great, glorious profession of the German Church is so misjudged and so easily surrendered!" (12, 299 f. 313. 321.) Alas, poor German theology, which with cainsunruhe still seeks for the ground on which it can stand, and yet, as W. Menzel says, suffers from scientificity as from dropsy!

Turning Point.

The be. Dr. Walther once said that the first love and power of the newly blossoming life of faith lasted at most until the year 1840. Friends and enemies agree with this judgment. Prof. Fleck, in his writing of 1842, dedicated to Dr. Neander, "Die Vertheidigung des Christenthums," boasted that the "fourth epoch in the course of development of Christianity," announced by Neander, had now begun. "The new crisis, which Christian theology, after discarding now obsolete forms, is approaching with a rejuvenated life of the mind, with a true spiritual springtime" Thus the newly reviving rationalism rejoiced. The ecclesiastics, however, complained about the same time: "The learned theologians at the universities have left their position in the church; by far the majority of them still do not want to muck about with a service in the church; they want to cultivate a free, independent science and shine in its aura; this is to be the master of the church and its faith, the educating mother of the church servants. On the life and conditions of the church in the real

They only look from the bird's-eye view of the cathedrals." (Ztsch. f. Prol. u. K. 2, 279.) Rudelbach, who was very much opposed to the emigration of the Saxon Lutherans, nevertheless related to his time a word of Jung-Stilling: "To me our present time seems like a sultry evening in the dog days. The whole western sky is one night-black thundercloud. All is still in all nature; no refreshing breeze blows; the fish gasp for air and the cattle for cool. Men always look timidly at the thunderclouds and shudder when they see the reddish flashes of lightning sidling this way and that, and then their ear hears the terrible thunder rumbling from afar." (Christi. Biogr. I, 189.) He wrote in 1842: "That a sifting and separation has begun in the Church of Christ, more profound and tremendous than any before,.... is evident from all the signs of the times.... The decisive moment has come for the nations, when it must be decided whether their relationship to the Word of God will be, as before, a truly organic or merely accidental one, whether they will recognize in this Word the true power of life or not, whether they will again enter into the Church of Christ or not." (Ztsch. f. Theol. u. K. II, p. 65 ff.) Sadly, however, he pronounced it three years later in his farewell sermon at Glauchau in Saxony, things had changed since his inauguration. "The great rift in the congregations that gaped at that time has become a great apostasy. It could not have come otherwise, where the forces of the world and of lies were given such room to develop as in our congregations.... Behold, O Lord, a great distress and affliction has fallen upon this evangelical church here in the homeland of the Reformation, as Luther's prophetic eye saw coming three hundred years ago. The altars are tottering, for the faithful confession is tottering, the holy reverence for the word of God, the endurance for the sake of your name, O Lord Jesus Christ! The rulers are dizzy, and the governors of the church are faint, because they fear the surging of the sea of nations much more than they fear accountability to the living God." (The Stranger's Farewell. pp. 15. 26.) Franz Delitzsch, in a lecture delivered in 1889, complained: "I have been honored to live through a beautiful period of revival of Christian faith and life, which ran out into a splendid rejuvenation of ecclesiastical theology; and now I have been kept up with a few to see the edifice of half a century torn down, and what hitherto stood firm, and seemed established in the long run, undermined and overthrown." - "Between ancient and modern theology lies a deep gulf, which the latter would have to leap over to make it grateful to the latter, and which it cannot leap over without approaching sin, for which there is no forgiveness either in this world or in the world to come." - "Modern theology goes

of prejudices which make it impossible for her to relive what she has experienced from a Paul or Luther." - Here in the valley of the Mulde, as a young man, I myself have been a witness to battles of the soul and victories of the spirit, which have forever put me off the overestimation of science. My spiritual life is still rooted in the miraculous soil of that first love which I lived through with Lehmann, Zöpfel, Ferd. Walther, Büniger and Bürger; the reality of the miracle is still sealed to me by the miracles of grace which I saw with my own eyes in the churches of the Mulde Valley. And the faith which I confessed in my first sermons, which I was privileged to preach in Niederfrohna and Lunzenau, stands to me to this day unalterably firm and infinitely higher than all earthly knowledge." - "I have learned from be. Ferd. Walther, with whom I lived through the pangs and delights of the new spiritual beginning of life, later on in some directions; but in one thing we have always remained in agreement, that the state of the true Christian is a supernatural one, one rooted in the experienced rebirth. This *habitus practicus* *ὑεοσδοτος*, as he called it, is wanting in modern theology.... The distinction of nature and grace is faded and washed out in it; and this is the deep ditch which divides us." - "The deep ditch remains; it will remain to the end of days; no work of thought can fill it." (The Deep Ditch. pp. 5 f. 10. 18. 12. f. 17.)

Hengstenberg thought that the turning point for the Christian life had already come in 1830. "Although the enthusiasm soon cooled, the apostasy began, yet the year 1830 formed a great period. Up to that time the spirit of the age still had the visible aspiration to incorporate Christian elements. - The spirit of the age again became completely conscious of itself; like a garment that had become uncomfortable, it threw off the religious prejudices that it had absorbed into itself. The ease with which he did this showed how much the alien element had remained on the surface. The spells against Christianity, that it belonged to past centuries, that a return to it was impossible in the present state of education, and that to continue to assert it in its old form was to commit the sin against the Holy Spirit, were again heard in general. And the individuals who spoke such things were so conscious of being organs of the spirit of the age that they regarded this instance against Christianity as the most weighty, and often considered the other instance unnecessary." (Kzt. 1836. p. 17 f.) In certain circles, just about the year 1830, one was already ready with the new time of grace. Gradually one came so far in all the state churches that nowhere did one know anything divinely certain, but only babbled about views, standpoints, directions. "O, they have invented a devilishly cold word, with which they have made their un-

calm conscience," Harleß exclaimed in a sermon from the forties. "They no longer speak of faith and unbelief, of the love of Christ and the enmity of Christ, no longer of blessedness and damnation, but of standpoint. So this one has his point of view and that one his point of view, and each is right according to his point of view. And there they stand side by side on their standpoints, either cold, wooden, indifferent, unloving, or grim, vengeful, venomous. For what do they care for their neighbor's soul? Rather, each one argues for his point of view. This is the icy-cold bliss of that kingdom of lies which they wish to substitute for the warm kingdom of love of Christ." (Sonntagsweihe. II, 192.) With scorn D. F. Strauß reminded the rising theology that it no longer had anything certain and was therefore bankrupt: "For the old Christians and the simple Christian people even now the highest authority is that Christ taught something, that it is written in the Scriptures. But all this no longer makes the same impression, at least on the educated. - To wish oneself back to the days of the old faith is but a fanciful touch, with which the next moment one is no longer in earnest. - A theologian who has tasted the freedom of the newer science cannot in clear moments really wish to be put back into the hanger of the old faith of inspiration." (Corr.-Bl. 1838. p. 180 ff.) They now agree with him, although they once called it a calumny. One need no longer ask in what doctrine the present theology of Germany contends against God's Word; one need only ask in what doctrine it does not. What Hengstenberg said of the Protestant Association is now true of modern theology in general: "This is the mere caricature of the truth instinct, the restless Jew who seeks but not to find." (Kzt. 1854. p. 581.) The Pilate question, "What is truth?" is the supreme question in the theological faculties, and in the pulpits it is not best. Oberconsistorial-Rath Uhlhorn confesses, "In the national church there is complete arbitrariness of doctrine; we must bear it as long as God permits it." (Herm. Freik. 1895. p. 75.)

By the position of the Scriptures, as Bengel rightly points out in the preface to his *Gnomon*, one must examine and recognize whether the church is healthy or sick. He who is of God hears God's word. All Christ's sheep cling to it, search in it in holy fear, and indulge in it in holy delight; for, says Bengel, "there is not a little corner in the holy Scriptures which has not its force and meaning." Yea, according to the law and testimony! If they will not say this, they shall not have the morning light. Isa. 8, 20. Now this is the defect from which the time of grace of this century, as Hengstenberg has repeatedly shown, has suffered from the beginning: they played too much with the Scriptures.

and lived too little in it in holy fear. "Among the laity the sense of scriptural research stands in deplorable disproportion to the extension of religious revival; a disproportion which has hardly occurred in a similar way in the evangelical church, and which, with other half-measures, ... goes hand in hand with other half-measures and produces them from itself. How seldom does the Word of God form the center of societies! How seldom is there a desire to be introduced into its depths! ... Unfortunately, among the clergy, the number of those who, out of an inner urge and without any immediate practical intention, seek to penetrate the sacred Scriptures ever deeper and into their most hidden depths is still small; and yet the sacred Scriptures are truly accessible only to such a striving; they always remain more or less a closed book to men of utility. Nothing can impel us more to such penetrating research than the example of the sacred writers themselves. The evangelical principle of Scripture needs no other support than that which the sacred Scriptures themselves offer. It is touching and shameful to see how a David has searched the books of Moses to their most hidden depths; how he everywhere bases himself on them and follows them; how the later Psalm-singers rest on David; how the prophets all cling to Moses, and the later to the earlier; how the Lord Himself is native to the Old Testament, takes from it His weapons against Satan, trembles and laments and hopes from it on the cross, and still refers to it in His last words; how the Evangelists and the writers of the Epistles everywhere draw from the Old Testament in a way which shows that it was the constant object of their minds. Likewise the example of Luther must serve to shame us, who says in the Table Talks: "For some years now I have read the Bible twice a year, and if it were a great, mighty tree, and all the words were little branches and twigs, yet I have knocked at all the little branches and twigs, and wanted to know what was in them and what they were capable of, and have always knocked down a few more apples or little pears." (Ev. Kzt. 1845, p. 442 f.) Hence comes the lamentation that every theological tramp can now talk the German church out of its Bible and make it wholly or partly doubtful: it has not given the Holy Scriptures the full honor due to them as God's Word, but has squinted after "science" and other flourishes of the flesh. To modern theologians everything has become questionable; the "believing" theologians of modern times have abandoned the old doctrine of inspiration, and therefore no longer stand in certain faith on the eternal rock, because they did not want to let the firm prophetic and apostolic word be their only source of knowledge. "We say with diligence: the richest, not the only" source of knowledge the church has in the holy Scriptures, emphasized the

Erlanger Zeitschrift (11, 36) already early. It did not find its treasure entirely in Scripture; therefore it lost it entirely. When Luthardt has to say: "These are the two main questions of the present time, the two best known propositions of Christian doctrine: the question of Christ and the question of the Holy Scriptures. Is Christ the Son of God? Is the Scripture the Word of God?" (Apolog. Vortr. II, 135.)-he has thus already pronounced that the present age, which still sees something questionable in these fundamental Christian doctrines, has fallen from the faith. The "faithful" theology has even despised Luther's admonition to the city councillors: "Dear Germans, buy because the market is at the door! Gather because it shines and the weather is good! Use God's grace and word because it is there! For you should know that God's word and grace is a driving downpour that does not come again where it once was. He was with the Jews, but he is gone; they have nothing. Paul brought him to Greece; gone is gone also; now they have the Turk. Rome and Latin country has had him; him is him; now they have the pope. And ye Germans must not think that ye shall have him for ever; for ingratitude and contempt shall not let him remain." As soon as the theologians listened to Schleiermacher's spirit, they no longer sat in the Scriptures, but beside them. Just as Adam and Eve lost the Spirit of God as soon as they gave room to the spirit of the abyss, so the theologians had to lose their understanding of the language of the Holy Spirit as soon as they no longer knelt at the source of the Spirit, as Dr. Höfling himself countered a rationalist: "If the Holy Scriptures are really what they claim to be and what they have always been held to be in the Christian Church, namely, the Word of God, the work of the Holy Spirit, then it is self-evident that their true understanding can only dawn on those who give room to the efficacy of this Spirit in themselves, and that, on the other hand, it must remain closed to all who reject the Holy Spirit from themselves through unholy arrogance, through impenitence and defiant conceit of independence." (Beleuchtg. des Daumer'schen Sendschr. 1832, p. 54 f.) To the open enemies he could say: "The important question at issue is whether or not we are to regard it as the book of books, as the Word of God, as the infallible source of knowledge of the only true religion." But he also had to testify to them: if it were so "that four things in the Bible are erroneous, inconsistent, and unworthy, if we could really no longer hold the Holy Scriptures to be of divine origin in the sense of older times, place our unconditional trust in them with regard to the highest interests of our spirit, and acknowledge them as the highest judge in matters of faith, then we would indeed not see what they should be to us more than any other human book, and how positive religion in them should be a mere source of knowledge of the only true religion.

could still have a somewhat tenable support. Christianity stands and falls with the divine reputation of the Bible." (p. 42.) Thus no Christianity without the Bible, and no Bible with errors! But one can only become aware of its divine speech if one allows himself to be completely worked by the Spirit who speaks through it. We must accept with holy fear and eagerness all that God presents to us; we must push nothing away in our own conceit as useless, but watch how in Scripture one thing explains and confirms another, and how what God does in individual saints and what he does in his whole people is wonderfully interwoven. All human studies, even the study of language, serve the explanation of Scripture only in so far as the Spirit of God Himself takes them into His service, as the homil.-lit. Corresp.-Blatt. wrote of the learned rationalists: "They may here and there determine a Hebrew root-word more correctly than Luther and Melancthon; but woe to them that they do not know the root of Jesse, the root of eternal life! They may know the rule of **spiritus asper** and **lenis** better than they do, but they do not have and do not desire the Spirit that gives life, the Holy Spirit. At best, they may best what sandals Paul wore; but the mind and walk of the man is hidden from them. They really possess a deeper insight into the herbal broth with which the pasta-lamb was enjoyed; but of the blood of reconciliation nothing more is known to them. They may be able to use seven dialects to explain the word hosanna radically, but they no longer call it to the King of Honour, but only to themselves among themselves. They are able to give a more correct German name to a stone in the breastplate of the high priest, but the divine light and right, Christian enlightenment and honesty do not dwell in their breast. O, there is something pathetic, lamentable, and harmful about an interpreter of the holy Scriptures, about a master of the seven liberal arts and doctor of theology, who sees in the Scriptures merely the word of men, and in the King of Truth and Judge of the living and the dead merely a Jewish rabbi! - who, like a woodcutter, thinks only of cutting down the sacred grove, like a butcher, only of slaughtering the living, like a piper, only of producing his own art, like a sleight of hand, only of concealing his tricks, like a church robber, only of emptying the sanctuary, and who sets the wisdom of his nose higher than the word of the Holy Spirit! It is pitiful to see such a one planting himself broadly on his catheter and beginning to drop right and left out of the nest, but the young people snatch up his mischief with their notebooks as if they were vain pieces of gold and precious stones!" (1830, p. 824 f.)

G. G.

(Conclusion follows.)

(Submitted.)

Twenty-three theological aphorisms.

(Walther's essay, "The False Supports of the Modern Theory of Open Questions" [L. u. W. XIV.], taken.)

1. Where the Scriptures speak, the true church speaks.
2. The voice of Scripture is the voice of the church.
3. The truly ecclesiastical is always biblical, and the truly biblical is always ecclesiastical.
4. The Lutheran Church is a part of the old Bible Church.
5. All our faith is not found in symbols, but in the Bible alone.
6. Biblical and Lutheran are identical terms to us.
7. Not all true Bible teaching is Lutheran-symbolic, but therefore Lutheran-church.
8. As precious and valuable as the incomparably glorious confessions of his church are to every Lutheran, he will never allow them to become the Lutheran Bible.
9. Patres fuerunt lumina, non numina, indices, non iudices, ministri, non magistri." (Gerhard.)
(The fathers were lights, not gods, teachers, not judges, servants, not masters).
10. "Quicquid in Cypriani scriptis sacrarum literarum auctoritati congruit, cum laude ipsius recipio; quod non congruit, cum pace ipsius rejicio." (Augustine.)
(Everything in Cyprian's writings that agrees with the authority of sacred Scripture I accept with his praise, what does not agree with it I reject with his own permission).
11. "Bibliothecae Patrum sunt perlustrandae oculo caritatis."
(Kromayer.)
(Fathers' libraries are to be perused with love's eyes).
12. "You cannot speak: I will err Christianly. Christian error comes from ignorance." (Luther.)
13. The standard of all doctrine is not human writings, but God's Word alone.
14. Amicus Plato, amicus Socrates, amicus Lutherus, amicus Gerhardus, sed magis amica veritas, magis amica Scriptura Sacra.
(Dear to me is Plato, dear to me is Socrates, dear to me is Luther, dear to me is Gerhard, but rather the truth, rather the Holy Scriptures).
15. "The question is not of the **eventu**, whether all are damned who cherish error, but of the inward **qualitate**, and whether this error in and of itself lies under divine **doctrinal condemnation**." (E. V. Löschner.)

16. The darkness of Scripture is not objective, but subjective.
17. Scripture is the complete revelation of the way to blessedness.
18. "A distinction must be made between a total and partial obscurity of the Scriptures." (Pfeiffer.)
19. "Scripture is dark per suffering, namely, the cognizant subject, which is not rightly disposed or equipped." (Pfeiffer.)
20. "There are still many passages in Scripture to be elucidated." (Walther, Lehre und Wehre XIV, 301. Luther V, 456-461.)
21. "The Scriptures have in them no more than Christ and Christian faith." (Luther.) ,
22. Only a prejudice was undoubtedly the cloud that interposed itself between Johann Gerhard and the Scriptures, obscuring the doctrine of Sunday. (According to Walther.)
23. No doctrine of faith is revealed in Scripture in an ambiguous way. -
 With pen in hand, I read Walther's exceedingly splendid essay, "The False Props," etc. While looking through my notes, I noticed that I had collected quite a number of winged words, axioms, aphorisms. To have these handy, and perhaps to serve other brethren with them also, has induced me to give them to our "Doctrine and Weir." How good it is to have such aphorisms, Dr. Walther once said somewhere with the words: "Collect especially the countless axioms, winged words, **canons**, proverbs, etc., which often contain a whole world of divine thoughts.

Aug. Schüßler.

Miscellany.

"The Church Father of the 19th Century." Schleiermacher was again called the church father of the 19th century at this year's Brandenburg Provincial Synod. O. Flügel characterized this "church father" in a letter to the "Deutsche Ev. Kirchenzeitung" thus: "As a thinker Schleiermacher was an atheist or, if one prefers to hear it, a pantheist. Pantheism, however, as H. Heine rightly remarks, is a bashful atheism. What Schleiermacher calls God in his Dogmatics is not God in the sense of Christianity, but is only the unity of the world, just as the concept of grain is the unity of rye, wheat, barley, oats, etc. With regard to immortality, Schleiermacher is a materialist who denies the soul and its personal continuance.

As a moralist, Schleiermacher is a naturalist who admits no absolute difference between good and evil, to whom physics and ethics are identical. If anyone wishes to convince himself of the logically erroneous thinking by which Schleiermacher arrived at these results, let him not be misled by Schleiermacher's words, and do not adhere to the ordinary representations of his teaching, but study Thilo: *Die Wissenschaftlichkeit der modernen speculativen Theologie*. One will then find how right Taute (*Religionsphilosophie* II, 39) is: 'Schleiermacher has brought a dialectical fever of consumption into Christian theology and the church, from which both, if the Principle were to prevail, would slowly have to die.'" - So far Flügel. Schleiermacher is indeed a "father" of the 19th century. Only he is not a "father of the church," but a father of the more modern theology, inasmuch as the latter does not want to take Christian doctrine from Scripture, but to develop it from the "pious subject," etc. Schleiermacher wanted to derive everything from pious "feeling." This is the basic error also of modern "Lutheran" theology, as represented by v. Hofmann, Frank, and their successors. Schleiermacher is the pioneer for the development of Christianity out of the "I" of the theologian. Christianity no longer enters the world through the objectively certain Word of God, as it is found in Holy Scripture, but - as Bohl *) puts it - "human, pious consciousness is the door through which divine thoughts enter the world. Everything that claims to be divine in the Holy Scriptures must legitimize itself here". Whether this false principle of theology be called, with Schleiermacher, "pious feeling," or, with the more modern Lutherans, "Christian consciousness," "enlightened reason," "reborn I," or otherwise, nothing is lost. There is a principal apostasy from the Christian way of knowing and teaching spiritual things.

F. P.

Literature.

Theological Quarterly. Published by

the Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States. Vol. I.

No. 1. January, 1897. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House,

Price: \$2.50 per year; for subscribers to "Doctrine and Defense" \$2.00.

As most readers of the "Lehre und Wehre" have probably already seen from the "Lutheran", the theological journal in English, which the last Synod of Delegates decided to publish, is now available. It is published quarterly as an issue of 128 pages in large octavo, and thus offers space in each number for the thorough discussion of important questions in almost every field of theology. The first number before us brings right under the

*) Dogmatics. 1887. preface, XXX.

Section: "Doctrinal Theology" as the first article: "What is Theology?". The second section, "Exegetical Theology," is followed by an article entitled "The Genesis of New Testament Greek. In the section "Historical Theology" the article "Calvin and the Augsburg Confession" proves conclusively that Calvin did not sign the Variata in Strasbourg, but the original Augustana. The fourth section, "Practical Theology", offers 38 pages of reading material, which is divided into the three articles: 1. "Public Worship in the Lutheran Church," 2. "A Short Exposition of the Small Catechism of Dr, Martin Luther," 3. "Outlines of Pastoral Theology." The last-named article is a translation of the paragraphs of Walther's Pastoral Theology, and the last but one is a translation of the new Catechism adopted by our Synod of Delegates this year. The fifth section, "Theological Review," contains 38 pages of instructive reviews of various theological phenomena on the English book market. The last section: "The Pulpit" is represented by a sermon by G. A. R. on the Gospel of the sixth Sunday after Trinity. All the articles in the five first columns were written by Prof. Gräbner. - May this new journal, the contents of which are as interesting as they are solid and wholesome, now find a wide circulation, especially within the orthodox German-American Lutheran Church. Alongside "Lehre und Wehre" and other periodicals, it will still have room and opportunity in our midst to bring about many blessings. But its real purpose will be best served when it reaches the hands of many theologians and preachers of English synods in our country. Whoever now helps to bring this about, does a great service to divine truth, to the Church of the pure Word, and to the truth-poor English ecclesiastical communities of our country.

F. B.

Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

I. America.

Ohio - Synod. There is again a pronouncement on the Ohio shiboleth that conversion and blessedness do not depend solely on God's grace, but in some respects also on man's conduct. In the "Kirchenzeitung" of November 7, it is conceded that this expression would probably not be found in an earlier faithful Lutheran teacher. But that does not obscure anything. New times call for new expressions. It is recalled that Athanasius, that well-known father of orthodoxy, in order to sharply express the right doctrine of Christ's person in the face of the error of the Arians, adopted the expression "consubstantial," which had hitherto hardly been used at all. Thus, in our day, Prof. Stellhorn of Columbus, the father of Ohio orthodoxy, has used the expression, to designate the right doctrine of conversion, that conversion depends not only on God's grace, but also, in a certain respect, on the conduct of man. In this sentence are gathered the rays of Ohio orthodoxy towards the "Missourian error." With this sentence the Ohioan pater orthodoxiae has followed the "hidden, refined Calvinistic error" "into the innermost recesses"! - We are truly sorry that the Ohio Synod wants to continue to march behind Stellhorn's flag. We are ashamed that a Synod, which after all still bears the Lutheran name, wants to parallelize the quite miserable proposition, immediately recognized as erroneous by every Christian, that man's conversion and blessedness do not depend solely on God's grace, etc., with the "like in essence" and make it the Lutheran shiboleth of our time. So terribly bitterly does it avenge itself, when one

has allowed himself to be carried away by arguing against the clearly attested truth. With Prof. Stelhorn there is also, apart from his fundamental error, a complete intellectual confusion. He says, for instance, in this latest rally: "The Missouri 'Lutheran,' and the Missouri 'Doctrine and Defense,' have not been able to do anything but repeat the old falsehood that Ohio teaches that man can and must convert himself, at least in part, and make himself blessed." We ask: How can Missouri and any man in the world come to a different view of Ohio's doctrine, since, according to Ohio's teaching, conversion and salvation are supposed to depend not on God's grace alone, but in some respects on man's conduct? If "by grace alone" is negated in conversion and salvation, there is nothing left but that "man himself, at least in part, shall be converted and made blessed." *Tertium non datur.*

F. P.

General Council. The Scottish writer Dr. John Watson ("Jan Maclaren") also wants to found a confederation which completely refrains from a confession of faith and wants to unite solely around a "life-creed". "It (the life-creed) can be adopted by any one who wishes to follow Christ, whatever his doctrinal belief." On this Dr. Krotel remarks in the "Lutheran" of December 17: "We believe that a great deal depends on a man's creed. No man has a right to be indifferent as to doctrine. The greatest part of our Saviour's public ministry was devoted to teaching, and a great part of his teaching related to faith. The apostles considered it of the utmost importance to teach doctrines of faith in their sermons and epistles, and over and over again they reveal that they were bent on making men both healthy in faith and rich in love and good works. Christ and his apostles could have saved themselves a lot of time and work if they had wanted to limit their teaching to the minimum of morals, which some people are content with." (Above all things: then Christ would not have had to die for men.) "How wrong is all this talk of staging "a crusade to restore to the world the really living Christ!"

F. P.

On "Synodal Taxes" the "Church Gazette" of Philadelphia writes: "Can taxes be imposed on congregations? Nevermore. The congregations must first of all provide for themselves. They are to provide for pastor, teachers, church servants, for church, school, and parsonage, and whatever else God the Lord has assigned to them. That is their first duty. But then the congregations should not forget that they are also to help build God's kingdom outside their own congregation. There is the matter of the education of preachers, the care of orphans, widows and the aged, the native mission and the mission to the Gentiles. A single congregation cannot keep these institutions going, but the congregations as a whole can. Therefore, each congregation should willingly and gladly make its sacrifice. But to force the sacrifice does not lead to the goal. The Lord does not like such sacrifices. Unfortunately, we have heard voices in our synods saying that pastors and congregations are to be summoned and called to account if they do not deliver the full amount of the requirement made by a committee. The speakers spoke so plainly that no man could misunderstand them. Instead of giving the right instruction, instead of warming hearts to sacrifice joyfully, a tax is imposed without being asked. Against this.

most pastors and congregations resisted. They did not protest, they attacked it in a practical way: they did not bring the sum. Thus the matter was settled. Now, however, things are to become serious: they do not merely want to demand the full sum, but to call the pastors to account. The scholars of the law emphasized this right of the synod. We deny this right to any Christian body: first to impose a condition, and then to demand payment, without the congregation having been consulted about it. Certainly pastors and congregations should be encouraged to make sacrifices. Much more could and should be done. The professors, the institutional pastors, and the aged pastors might also be included in the list, and each might give a personal gift for the encouragement of others, whether little if poor or much if rich. But pastors and congregations should not be "taxed," but should voluntarily make their own impositions.

General Synod. Within the General Synod a new German paper, "Lutherischer Zion's Bote," has been started. The main editor is Pastor L. Neve. Hopefully, "Lutherischer Zion's Bote" will do more honor to the Lutheran name than "Lutherischer Kirchenfreund." F. P.

The rights of women in the Church. Prof. Loy of Columbus has written a treatise on this subject, the contents of which are summarized in the following sentences: "1. In the kingdom of grace, the church in the strict sense, as a communion of saints, the rights of women are the same as those of all other poor sinners who have been redeemed by the blood of Jesus and have become children of God by grace through faith in his name. - (2) When believers come together to form an outward organization, they do not all have equal rights in establishing and conducting their government, which, according to the divine order, belongs not to women and children, but to men. - (3) The injunction which God gives to women to be silent in the church refers to every public activity which involves men in teaching or being masters of it. -

(4) The practical difficulties which may arise under this divine order must be solved by reverent submission to its provisions, not by dishonorable attempts to abolish or circumvent them.

The Bible in the State Schools of Wisconsin. From a local political newspaper we take the following notice: From Wisconsin's state capital a correspondence reports: The distribution of taxes among the schools of the state will bring a bitter disappointment to about fifteen towns, since religious instruction was given in the schools of these towns and districts during the past year, and these schools have thereby forfeited their share of the state school tax. A state law prohibits religious instruction in the elementary schools, and that if this nevertheless takes place, those schools are not to receive any tax support from the state. These localities are located in Bayfield, Columbia, Dane, Grant, Greene and Monroe counties. This is the first time in Wisconsin history that an elementary school has been denied state support for the reason stated, and the towns affected are likely to wage a bitter fight against this decision of the state superintendent of schools. The latter bases his decision on a ruling by the state's high court in the well-known "Bible Case" and is determined to enforce the law harshly. In the Bible case, the state high court had ruled that reading the Bible in school was to be considered confessional instruction.

II. Abroad.

Factory work and servants. The "Sächsische Kirchen- und Schulblatt" (Saxon Church and School Gazette) writes: "In the face of the all-consuming industry in Saxony, which no longer allows for a capable servant class (two new large worsted spinning mills will soon begin operation in the Zwickau area, an older one has been considerably expanded), Pastor Schiller in Friedrichsgrün has tried to win his confirmands for service. A large number of next year's confirmands have also decided to go into service at Easter 1897, if possible in one of the towns of the Zwickau Ephorate. The Protestant Workers' Association in Friedrichsgrün has set up a placement office where employers (only employers) and employees (only confirmands there) can be contacted free of charge. Even if some of the girls remain in the service for only a short time and then return to the factory, such paths will always be a great blessing. We see great harm in the decline of our Saxon people into a people almost predominantly devoted to industry. The election of McKinley as President of the United States of North America, which at first hit us hard, can only be welcomed as a dam to this side in the end."

No Pabst without a Pabst. The "Sächsische katholische Kirchenblatt" writes: "For us Catholics the whole idea of the English National Church" (which was envisaged by the last Anglican Church Congress) "is nothing more than the latest and hopefully last desperate effort of English Protestantism to 'strike at the sting'. It will be a vain effort in the long run. Apart from Rome there is no unity, and without unity there is no internal firmness, and without internal firmness there is no universal Church, and no British national Church. In particular, the imitation of Catholic customs, which is the order of the day in England, is not enough for this. However well-intentioned this Catholicism may be, it remains vain as long as the main thing is missing, that self-denial which constitutes the essence of the Catholic confession, and which expresses itself in the humble recognition of the ecclesiastical authority" (that is, of the Pope). "Without this, all is but an 'eternal lamp' without sacrament." - So far the Catholic church paper. It is quite right from its point of view. Toward the Pabbacy there is only an either-or. Either the pope is right in his demand that all Christians must be subject to him, and then all Christians must kiss his mule, or he is not right, and then we say to him, "God punish you, Satan!" Compromise cannot be made with the pope. If the English State Church sought the other day from the Pabst for recognition of its ordinations, it is an untenable half-measure.

F. P.

What is possible in the English State Church was again brought to light at this year's Church Congress, which met in Shrewsbury. The Bishop of Lichfield, as President of the Congress, declared in his opening address that the Church in our day must strive to satisfy the consciences of educated people. What kind of education the Bishop had in mind is evident from the fact that he presented Darwin as a man to whom the Church owed much gratitude. Darwin had known how to interpret the way in which Almighty God had proceeded in his work. According to this, the Bishop of Lichfield is himself a Darwinist who knows neither a God nor a conscience.

F. P.

A Hindu and the Buddhism craze in England. The "Deutsche Ev. Kirchenzeitung" writes: In England various anti-Christian groups, availing themselves of the general liberty, have taken upon themselves the task of working against the evangelists, and have therefore held meetings and addresses in the public parks on Sunday afternoons. Such took place on October 4 as well. A young Hindu, vice-president of the Young Men's Christian Association in Madras, was walking in Hyde Park. He heard an Englishman with great fervour extol the virtues of Buddhism over Christianity. After finishing his speech, the Hindu asked to speak and was given permission to speak after assuring him that he was not a preacher. The young Hindu began by saying that the best way to compare two religions was to look at them from the threefold point of view of their doctrinal teachings, their philanthropic actions and their moral and spiritual influence. As far as doctrine is concerned, Christianity seems to him to be far superior to Buddhism. In the area of charity, no single religion has even come close to the works of the Christian religion; what the non-Christians in India are now doing is imitating Christian deeds, which they would never have done on their own initiative. Finally, as far as the formation of character was concerned, none of the religions prevailing in India had succeeded in forming such excellent personalities as could be seen among well-known Christians. For these reasons, the speaker concluded, I believe in the divinity of Christianity. The English representative of Buddhism was visibly surprised by this testimony, so contrary to his own, from a Hindu who had been able to examine and study the question thoroughly in his homeland. So far the report of the "Deutsche Ev. Kirchenzeitung". Unfortunately, it is not stated in what the young Hindu found the advantage of the Christian doctrine over the Buddhist one. Then one could have judged whether we have here the judgment of a converted Christian or of a Hindu who is only well-disposed towards Christianity for reasons of reason.

F. P.

The Basel Mission in West Africa. The "D. E. K." reports: The Basel Mission, in spite of its heavy losses, has never had so many deaths within a year as in 1895-1896, since its last annual celebration. One sister, two construction workers, six missionary and two ordained brothers died, together 11 members of the brotherhood on the Gold Coast, five of them after a very short stay in Africa. In addition there is the departure of Missionary Christaller, who after ten years of missionary service on the Gold Coast, since 1868 returned home, has been tirelessly active for the mission through his work in African languages. Through his excellent translation of the Bible into the Chi language he rendered an invaluable service to the mission. In spite of these heavy losses of the Basel missionary work on the Gold Coast, the committee in Basel decided with great courage of faith to patiently continue this work. The decisive factor in their deliberations was the consideration that, in the rotten state of West Africa, the mere existence of a business in which the liquor trade and the notorious European immorality are frowned upon, is a powerful testimony to Christianity. The much smaller circle of the Cameroon Mission has also lost four members. The overall condition of the Cameroon Mission, however, is in a gratifying state of development and expansion. The number of mission stations is now seven; two new ones are to be added. An expedition to the southern regions of the colony is reported:

"Our main impression of the trip was that the doors are open to our missionary work and the people are almost universally tired of the old goings-on, and the frauds of the fetish people are universally recognized and ridiculed."

From Japan. The traveller who has reached the port city of Yokohama can immediately convince himself of the innovations introduced in Japan in just over two decades. For the railway will take him to the Japanese capital, Tokyo, in an hour. Railways and telegraph lines criss-cross the whole country, in which an excellent postal service is also established. Chimneys of factories, in which the machines of the latest invention are at work, tower up. Not only in the imperial palaces, but also in many shops, workshops and private houses, the electric light shines in the larger cities. The horse-drawn trams, drawn by one or two runners, run beside the Japanese companions through the streets of the capital, which are thronged with a colourful and gay crowd, men, women, and young girls (walking in company), on either side of which stand the graceful wooden houses, which, with their verandas and far overhanging roofs, remind one of the Swiss houses. In addition to the national costume, one often sees European clothing, which, for example, the civil servant puts on as soon as he leaves his house. The interior is still furnished as it has been for centuries. The inhabitants sit on floors covered with fine straw mats, sleep on neck cushions to preserve their elaborate coiffures, and eat their rice with chopsticks. But by the kerosene lamp the youth, crouching on the floor, study English and German books. American and European educated physicians practice in all larger cities. German guns and cannons and military training helped the Japanese to their brilliant victories over the Chinese. Trade and industry have been elevated by Western institutions, and the introduction of Western science has brought Japan to a high

level of education. Unfortunately, however, materialistic and atheistic ideas have also penetrated from Europe into the island kingdom of East Asia, and through their modern knowledge some young Japanese elevate themselves above the old and thereby violate the hitherto exemplary relationship of piety between the children and their parents. The war year with its excitement and victories and the increased sense of honor and nationalism of the Japanese has, despite the mass distribution of the Bible in Japan, resulted in a decline in the number of Christians and in part in increased hostility against Christianity. From 39,240 communicants in 1895 the number has decreased to 38,710 and 30 outstations have had to be temporarily abandoned. Nevertheless, the mission statistics about Japan give pleasing figures. It must only be remembered that the first Protestant missionary did not enter Japan until 1859, 37 years ago. And now the number of European missionaries is 231, that of unmarried missionary workers 225. The number of organized Japanese Christian congregations amounts to 425, of which already 80 bear all the costs of their spiritual care.

(Mis
sions
bl.
für
chris
tl.
Bildu
ng
etc.)