

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben

— von der —

Allgemeinen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Wisconsin
und anderen Staaten.

Redigiert von der Fakultät des Ev.-Luth. Seminars
zu Thiensville, Wis.

Motto: „So ihr bleiben werdet an meiner Rede,
so seid ihr meine rechten Jünger, und
werdet die Wahrheit erkennen, und die
Wahrheit wird euch frei machen.“

Joh. 8, 31. 32

Preis per Jahrgang \$1.50.

Jahrgang 42.

1945.

Inhaltsverzeichnis zum 42. Jahrgang.

Abhandlungen	Seite
Study on 1 Corinthians 15. M	1
The Reformation: The Age of Faith. H. A. Koch	20
The Natural Knowledge of God in the Light of the Law and the Gospel. II. P. Peters.....	33
Closing Address. M.	65
A Pastoral Table of Duties. W. Bodamer	73
Die Verwertung und Bewertung der Uebersetzung des Alten Testaments in die griechische Sprache, der Septuaginta. W. Hoenecke	106
The Church and Christian Liberty. E. Reim	115
Opening Address. Carl Lawrenz	145
Pastoral Table of Duties (Cont.). W. Bodamer	151
Die Verwertung und Bewertung der Uebersetzung des Alten Testaments in die griechische Sprache, der Septuaginta. W. Hoenecke	175
Unionism. M.	209
Pastoral Table of Duties (Cont.). W. Bodamer	238
A Catholic on Luther. W. Dallmann	262
Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen	
“Denouncing the Christmas Story”	51
Dean Inge’s Attack on Lutheranism	53
The Doctrinal Affirmation	55
The Absoluteness of the Christian Religion	56
The Doctrinal Affirmation — A Closer Scrutiny	127
Introducing Weekday Religious Education into the Public Schools	130
Promoting the Cause of Christian Education	132
What Others Say of Our Parochial Schools	135
Ben-hadad I	136
1545 — The Council of Trent — 1945	194
Roman — All Too Roman	196
The Churches in Russia	197
The Lutheran Church in Europe and We	199
News From the Free Churches of Poland and Saxony	203
Religion On The Battlefield	204
The Affirmation on Election	270
Lutheran Unity in Canada	272
Rome’s Most Recent Move	272
“It Happened in St. Louis”	274
The Treysa Conference	277
The Netherlands Reformed Church	278
The Pledge of the Austrian Evangelical Pastors	279

	Seite
The Free Church in Germany	281
Boy Scout Movement in Germany	282
Martin Luther Bible	282
Brzesc Bible	283
German Publishing Houses	283
Uncarthed Burial Urns	283

Büchertisch

A. Vespredungen

Luther and the Scriptures	57
"The Five Books of Moses"	60
Scripture Cannot Be Broken	61
The Arabs. A Short History	64
Reaching Youth for Christ	138
In Thy Light	139
Cross and Affliction	140
Symbols. A Practical Handbook	140
Encyclopedia of Bible Life	141
The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible	142
Born Crucified	143
Great Songs of the Gospel	144
Our Creed	205
A Right Way for Our Little Ones (Ezra 8:21)	205
The Loci Communes of Philip Melanchthon	206
Christ and the Believer in the Song of Songs	207
The Bearing of Archaeology on the Old Testament	208
We Move Into Africa	284
Understanding the Child	285
"The Word Was Made Flesh!"	285
The Relevance of the Prophets	286
An Outline of Missions	287

B. Kurze Anzeigen

Kalender auf das Jahr 1945	64
Northwestern Lutheran Annual	
Gemeindeblatt-Kalender	
The Lutheran Annual	
Amerikanischer Kalender	
America, Turn to Christ!	144
General Course of Study for Lutheran Elementary Schools	
with Supplement	144
All-Lutheran Directory	208
A Statistical Bulletin	208
Lutherans Working Together	208
Christ, Set the World Aright!	288
Living With Luther	288

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben von der Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Synode von
Wisconsin und anderen Staaten.

Jahrgang 42

Januar 1945

Nummer 1

Study on I Corinthians 15

(Continued)

Verses 24-27a

(24) Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. (25) For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. (26) The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. (27) For he hath put all things under his feet.

“Then the end” — so Paul says tersely at the beginning of our section. Then he proceeds to show what a glorious end this is going to be. It will be the end of all misery — not a brief intermission, a breathing spell, but the *end*; not a little relief, a little easing of the pain, but the *end*; not merely a cessation, but a complete restoration: simply *the end*.

The end is marked by two great events: Christ will deliver the kingdom to the Father, and He will put down all rule, all authority and power. Neither the German nor the English translation here gives us a clear picture of these events concerning their order and their nature. The King James version uses the future perfect in both instances: *he shall have delivered*, and *he shall have put down*; while Luther uses the simple future: *überantworten wird, aufheben wird*. Menge translates: *wenn er Gott und dem Vater das Reich übergibt, sobald er jede andere Herrschaft und jede Gewalt und Macht vernichtet hat*. Goodspeed's rendering is: *when he will turn over the kingdom to God his Father, bringing to an end all other government, authority, and power*. The verb forms in Menge are closest to the original Greek. *Paradidōi* is a present subjunctive (a later formation), denoting an action as in progress; *katargēsē(i)* is an aorist subjunctive, denoting an action as complete and antedating the principal action then taking place. Luthers' translation is good German, but it

does not bring out the temporal and logical relation between the two actions. The translation of the second verb in the King James version (*shall have put down*) is correct, while the future perfect for the first verb (*shall have delivered*) is an error; the simple future would have been much better: shall (or will) deliver.

Thus *the end* means that on that great day the Son will deliver the kingdom over to God the Father.

What is *kingdom*? Kingdom is an abstract verbal noun denoting an activity. When we in our day speak of kingdom, we usually have in mind a people of the same nationality, occupying a common country, under a single government, representing a definite civilization and culture. In other words, we usually take the word as a concrete collective noun. — That is not the meaning of the Greek word in the New Testament, but, as stated above, it is an abstract verbal noun denoting an activity. We cannot now enter upon a detailed investigation to establish this meaning; reference to a single passage must suffice to illustrate the usage. We take it from the same First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, chap. 4, 20: "For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power." Try to substitute for "kingdom" the concrete collective meaning, and the abstract verbal meaning; and see in which construction Paul's words make any sense. — Jesus will, at the end, hand over the rule and dominion to the Father.

What it means for us when God rules as King, we ponder in connection with a few remarks by Luther in his Large Catechism. In the Second Petition we pray for the coming of God's kingdom. Luther asks the question: *Was heisst denn Gottes Reich?* and answers: *Nichts anders, denn wie wir droben im Glauben gehört haben, dass Gott seinen Sohn, Christum, unsern Herrn, in die Welt geschickt, dass er uns erlöste und frei machte von der Gewalt des Teufels und zu sich brächte und regierte als ein König der Gerechtigkeit, des Lebens und der Seligkeit wider Sünde, Tod und böses Gewissen. Dazu er auch seinen Heiligen Geist geben hat, der uns solches heimbrächte durch sein heiliges Wort und durch seine Kraft im Glauben erleuchtete und stärkte.* A little farther down he adds: *Denn "Gottes Reich zu uns kommen" geschieht auf zweierlei Weise, einmal hier zeitlich durch das Wort und den Glauben, zum andern ewig durch die Offenbarung.*

The latter is the form of which Paul is speaking in our text: Jesus shall deliver the kingdom up to God, even the Father.

In the above quotation from Luther there is a reference to the Creed. In connection with the Second Article we find this pertinent remark (by Luther): *Wenn man nun fragt: Was glaubst du im andern Artikel von Jesu Christo? antworte aufs kürzeste: Ich glaube, dass Jesus Christus, wahrhaftiger Gottessohn, sei mein Herr worden. Was ist nun das: ein Herr werden? Das ist's, dass er mich erlöst hat von Sünden, vom Teufel, vom Tode und allem Unglück. Denn zuvor hab ich keinen Herrn noch König gehabt, sondern bin unter des Teufels Gewalt gefangen, zum Tode verdammt, in der Sünde und Blindheit verstrickt gewesen. — Denn da wir geschaffen waren und allerlei Gutes von Gott dem Vater empfangen hatten, kam der Teufel und brachte uns in Ungehorsam, Sünde, Tod und alles Unglück, dass wir in seinem Zorn und Ungnade lagen, zu ewiger Verdammnis verurteilt, wie wir verwirkt und verdient hatten. Da war kein Rat, Hilfe noch Trost, bis dass sich dieser einige und ewige Gottessohn unsers Jammers und Elends aus grundloser Güte erbarmte und vom Himmel kam, uns zu helfen. Also sind nun jene Tyrannen und Stockmeister alle vertrieben, und ist an ihre Statt getreten Jesus Christus, ein Herr des Lebens, Gerechtigkeit, alles Gutes und Seligkeit, und hat uns arme verlorne Menschen aus der Hölle Rachen gerissen, gewonnen, frei gemacht und wiederbracht in des Vaters Huld und Gnade und als sein Eigentum unter seinen Schirm und Schutz genommen, dass er uns regiere durch seine Gerechtigkeit, Weisheit, Gewalt, Leben und Seligkeit.*

Where God is the King there He rules by showering His blessings on His children. This is the glorious implication in the remarks of St. Paul about the end. On earth, and gauged by human standards, Christians lead a very pitiable life. Storm after storm rises dark o'er the way. In all their endeavors they are hampered by sin: temptation without and corruption within. "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Rom. 7, 24). Of all men most miserable. To all these miserable people Paul holds out the hope of an end. And this end will be marked by that grand event that Christ will deliver the kingdom to the Father, so that the Father, according to the boundless goodness of His heart, can begin to bless, shower

His blessings without intermission and without any obstruction.

But how can it be said that Christ will deliver the kingdom to the Father? Is not the Father King in His own rights? Yes, He is. And yet Paul can rightly say that Christ will deliver the kingdom to the Father. When Jesus ascended into heaven, He announced to His disciples that all power had been given to Him in heaven and on earth. Even before that, He had said, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father" (Mt. 11, 27). In Phil. 2, 9, Paul applies the prophecy of Isaiah: "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear" (45, 23) to the exalted Jesus: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth: and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Isaiah says furthermore that "the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand" (53, 10).

This it is to what Paul refers in our text when he says that Jesus at the end shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father "when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power." The kingdom of the Father had been rejected by men. Seduced by the devil, they had declared themselves autonomous, men who would work out their own salvation. They had not attained their independence, rather, they had fallen into the hands of God's enemies, had become slaves of sin, of their own lusts, of the fear of death. Jesus was sent to crush the enemy's head, to bring his victims back to the blessings of God, or in other words, to restore the kingdom of God. In the essence of the matter, then, it makes no difference whether we say, we enter into the kingdom of God, or, the kingdom of God comes to us; whether we say, we are restored to the kingdom of God, or, the kingdom over us is restored to the Father.

When in the following verse Paul motivates (*gar*) the statement of v. 24 by speaking of the subjection of all enemies, we might thereby be led to understand "all rule and all authority and power" as referring to the hostile forces that obstruct the kingdom of God. Yet the terms which Paul uses seem to be too broad to be limited to the enemies. It is true, the enemies are to be

crushed utterly, as Paul will carry out in detail particularly with reference to death, who will be abolished as the last among the enemies. There are other rules, authorities and powers that will be put out of commission by Jesus before He delivers the kingdom to the Father. There are rules and powers instituted of God for the duration of the present world, to counteract the evil forces that were released against the human race in the fall of Adam.

We cannot now discuss them at length, nor is this necessary for a proper understanding of our text. A brief enumeration of some will suffice. There is chief among all earthly authority that of parents, particularly the father, over the affairs of the family, including the authority of the husband over his wife. This arrangement was instituted by God for our life under the conditions as He had created them for this earth. It was retained in essence, though modified in form, after the fall due to the influence of sin. The exercise of this parental authority is purified by the Gospel, but it will be entirely set aside in the world to come, where "they neither marry nor are given in marriage" (Mt. 22, 30). — Likewise, all forms of government will cease. On earth, God invested all legitimate government even with the authority to execute capital punishment, in order to maintain a degree of security for life and limb in this sin-infested world. — We must also include the preaching of the Gospel as a form of rule, authority and power that will be put down by Christ at His return on the last day, an authority which Christ gave to us, not for destruction, but for edification (2 Cor. 10, 8). On Judgment Day Christ will put an end also to this authority. There will be no Gospel preaching in the world to follow.

Yet, when Paul is speaking about Jesus as having, on the last day, put down all rule and all authority and power he is thinking not only of all legitimate rule instituted by God for regulation of the life here on earth and modified to suit the conditions of sin, we see that he has in mind chiefly all hostile rule and power, forces that usurp authority, that oppose themselves to the benign rule of God, and thus would hinder His kingdom, as he develops his thoughts in the following verses. The different forms of rule which God himself instituted for His own purpose will cause no trouble when God will abolish them because they are no longer needed. They will be like David, who, as Paul once remarked,

"served his own generation by the will of God" (Acts 13, 36), and then in obedience to the will of the same God "fell on sleep," charging Solomon, his son and successor: "I go the way of all the earth. Be thou strong therefore and show thyself a man, and keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes and his commandments and his judgments and his testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses, that thou mayest prosper in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself" (1 Kgs. 2, 2. 3).

Not so the rules which have been set up in opposition to God. They will not yield up their assumed authority and power willingly, they will have to be forced into submission. But not any sooner will Christ deliver up the kingdom to the Father than until this has been accomplished. First all rule and all authority and power, even that offering the most stubborn resistance, must have been put down. For that very purpose Christ was appointed king, and His commission will not expire till He has completely brought into submission all hostile rule and power to the last.

Paul states this truth in the following verse: "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet."

The connective *gar* clearly shows that the sentence is to serve as an explanation for the foregoing remark, both about delivering up the kingdom to the Father and about putting down all rule, particularly the latter. The putting down of all rule cannot be considered as complete until all resistance of the opposing forces has been thoroughly crushed and all enemies have been put under the Savior's feet.

This is a necessity. Paul uses the verb *dei*, which denotes a necessity from any cause whatsoever. It is not always the same kind of necessity, though a necessity it is. In our case it is a necessity flowing from God's plan of salvation and the task assigned to the Savior. The Savior's commission is here expressed in the term "reign," *basileuein*, to serve as king. We note the present tense of the infinitive, pointing to the duration of the action. A king's functions vary with the condition of his people. When a nation has been overpowered by its enemies, it becomes the task of the king to plan its liberation, to prepare for war and lead in battle, to sacrifice his own life, if need be, in the interest of the freedom of the people. After the decisive battle has been won,

the task of the king will change somewhat in form. The enemy may have been defeated, and yet may continue to cause trouble and to harass his former victims. It will be the king's task, not only to heal the battle scars, but to keep up the battle against the enemy till the last foot of his domain has been cleared and the last enemy captured and completely overpowered.

When the kingdom of the world was given into the hands of Jesus, the world was completely in the power of the enemy. Jesus took up the battle and gained a decisive victory in the wilderness, in Gethsemane, and on Calvary. In triumph He returned to heaven, whence He had been sent, but His work was by no means completed. Though utterly defeated, the enemy still contested every foot of ground. The individual souls, now redeemed, had to be wrested from his clutches. Badly battered and bruised, they must be nursed and nurtured. Meanwhile the battle against the enemy must go on. The King cannot rest on His laurels, He must function as a fighting king. He must *reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet*. Only then can He lay the commission back into the hands of Him that sent Him. Then can He *deliver the kingdom* — the rescued and restored kingdom — now no longer contested by any enemy — *to God, even the Father*.

In describing the utter rout of the enemies, Paul borrows his language from the Psalms, without, however, quoting directly. The eighth Psalm has this statement: "Thou hast put all things under his feet" (v. 6), and Psalm 110: "until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (v. 1). Psalm 110 is clearly messianic, and the propriety of applying its words directly to Jesus will readily be conceded by all truly Biblical theologians. Not so Psalm 8. It creates the impression, and is so understood by many, as referring to mankind in general. The use which Jesus makes of the psalm in stopping the mouths of His enemies (Mt. 21, 16), may not be decisive to establish it as messianic; but Heb. 2, 5-9, leaves little room for doubt. The glorious things spoken of in the psalm apply to man, because they first became true on Jesus. — So Paul borrows phrases from both psalms in describing the kingdom of our Savior.

Another point must be considered briefly, one which looks almost like a discrepancy. According to Paul, the person who puts all enemies under Christ's feet is Christ himself; while

according to both psalm passages it is God the Father. But in reality there is as little contradiction between these two ways of stating the fact, as there is when the resurrection of Jesus from the dead is ascribed in some passages to the activity of Jesus himself, in others to that of the Father. Lenski adds briefly, but to the point: "The Psalm does not mean that Christ shall sit idly at God's right hand, until God lays all these enemies prostrate under Christ's feet." We may well remember, at this point, a word from Is. 53: "The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand" (v. 10). It is the work of the Father, but He does not carry it out personally. He committed it into the hands of His Son, even to the very last phase. "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." Yes, He "hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man" (Jh. 5, 22, 27).

We have not considered the question expressly in what sense the conjunction *till* is to be understood. But in the whole examination of the subject matter the question has already been answered. The first impression is that it indicates time, a certain point in time. Yet, although Paul here speaks very much in terms of time — compare the word *end*, the temporal conjunction *when* (twice); and before that the idea of succession in *afterward* — yet in this *till* clause the time element is of secondary importance. The main thought is one of degree, one of completeness. Christ must reign, and must keep on reigning till His kingdom is without spot or blemish, disencumbered of all conflict and obstruction.

What a glorious prospect! Well may we say with St. John: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God" — a wonderful blessing! — "and it doth not yet appear what we shall be" (1 Jh. 3, 2). Or with Paul: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us" (Rom. 8, 18). "Your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory" (Col. 3, 3, 4).

After Paul has, by this clear factual presentation, warmed the hearts of his readers to the glorious blessing the future holds in store for them through the office of their God-appointed King, Jesus Christ, they are in a position to feel the weight of the following brief statement: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

Death is a reality. "All die," Paul had tersely said a few lines above. The Corinthians felt the impact of death every time they carried one of their loved ones to the funeral pyre or to the grave, which even the thought that in conversion a spiritual resurrection had taken place could not parry completely. Identifying conversion with resurrection and substituting that spiritual resurrection for a resurrection of the body proves to be a deceptive illusion, leaving the aching heart cold and cheerless. Death is an enemy who, if not destroyed, robs us of the glorious prospect Paul painted before our eyes, and limits our hope in Christ to this life. That would make us of all men most miserable. And if at the consummation of Christ's kingdom only such are to participate in its glory as shall survive at the time, then we are most unfortunate for having been born too soon. Our premature death robs us of an equal opportunity with the later generations. — Death must be abolished, or Christ's work will forever remain incomplete.

We now take a look at the word order and the verb form in this verse. The translation, though not literal, correctly expresses the thought of the original: "As last enemy (*i. e.*, as the last among the enemies) death is destroyed." Death is clearly indicated as the grammatical and logical subject of the sentence by the definite article prefixed to it, *ho thanatos*. Last enemy (*eschatos echthros*), being anarthrous, is predicative, showing in what capacity, or briefly, as what death will be abolished. He is the last in order. All other enemies will go down to defeat in order, till finally also death, who held out the longest, will have to succumb. By changing the customary word order Paul lays a special stress on both the subject and the predicative noun. When Paul says that death will go down in defeat, he wants his readers to realize that it is death, yes, death, all of death, and all that goes with death, that will be abolished. No traces of death dare remain. All the damage that death had worked must be undone. All the blessings of which death had robbed its victims must be fully restored. That is the meaning of death in the emphatic position of the sentence. — Equally emphatic is the predicative noun, last enemy, last among the enemies. Once death has been thoroughly vanquished, then, and not till then, but then absolutely, has the work of Jesus been finished. Then, after the utter defeat of death has been achieved, there is nothing more

for Jesus to do. Death is simply the last, the very last, among the enemies of God's kingdom. When death has been forced, by returning his victims to life, to acknowledge his defeat openly, then nothing can prevent Jesus from delivering up the restored kingdom to God, even the Father.

Since all this is to take place on the last day, a time still lying ahead of us in the future, we might expect the verb to be in the future tense, as most suitable to the occasion. Our English Bible does, indeed, substitute the future for the tense which Paul actually employed: "that shall be destroyed," while Luther retained the present: *der aufgehoben wird*. Paul used the present, *katargeitai*. In this manner the attention is drawn away from the time and focused on the action itself. The important thing is that death is being abolished. What would it mean if the Corinthian doubters were right that there is going to be no resurrection? Nothing less than that this enemy will continue to hold the field over against our Savior. To dispel their doubts, Paul stresses the action as such. They should not look forward to some hazy future, they should rather let this great fact sink in that death is being abolished, actually, and no ifs and buts about it.

The first part of the next verse, taken bodily from the eighth Psalm, concludes this part of Paul's appeal. He introduces it as conclusive proof for all he said about Christ, about the total defeat of His enemies, about the complete deliverance of the kingdom of God. It must be so, it cannot be otherwise: *for*, did not the psalmist of old already sing, "All things did he put under his feet?" We have looked at the messianic character of this psalm before, we need not repeat. But rather let our hearts be assured and comforted by this old hymn of triumph that the plans of God do not miscarry. He is not a God to take any half-measures, to leave any work only half-finished. When He appointed His Son to be the Savior of mankind, He committed to Him the whole work in every detail, with full authority to act as the situation might demand, without any reservation, knowing full-well that the Son would not return until He had completed the last stroke of the stupendous task.

The psalmist could sing without hesitation: "He hath put all things under his feet," rousing in us a cheerful hope in our own resurrection unto life everlasting, dispelling all doubt and gloom, and fortifying our hearts against the voice of seducers.

Verses 27b and 28

(27) For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. (28) And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

In these two verses Paul concludes the argument which he began in v. 20 with the emphatic declaration: "But now is Christ risen from the dead." Christ is the God-appointed Mediator to undo the damage that was done by Adam, and to restore in full the blessings which Adam had forfeited for the human race. As Paul in the entire discussion aims to fortify the faith of the Corinthians against the attacks from the doubters of the resurrection, so, we may assume, also these two verses serve the same purpose. In what way they do so will have to appear after careful investigation. First a grammatical difficulty must be cleared away.

"But when he saith," *hotan de eipē(i)*. A clause introduced by *hotan* and employing the Aorist subjunctive in the predicate usually refers to an action at some indefinite time in the future, as preceding some other future action. If we assume that this holds good also in the present case, we should have to translate: "But when he will have said."

There are commentators that accept this interpretation. Menge supports it with his translation: *Wenn er aber aussprechen wird.* — The situation which this translation presupposes is this, that Christ on the last day will make a final report to His Father, declaring that the work which He was commissioned to do has been finished and is ready for inspection and approval. In other words, the statement *panta hypotēktai*, "all things are put under," represents the formula with which Jesus will at the end deliver the kingdom to the Father.

To your essayist this interpretation does not commend itself. For the first, it does not seem to fit well into Paul's line of argument. He urged that Christ's work of redemption must include the complete abolition of death. Death is an enemy. And since all enemies are to be utterly routed, death cannot be permitted to hold its victims indefinitely. Only when it also has been forced

to release them, can Christ's work be said to have been accomplished successfully. The promises of the Old Testament use some strong language. In two places at least, which Paul quotes informally, they state that all things are put under His feet. In other words, Paul has directed the attention of his readers to the promises of God as He made them in the past; then he tries to make his readers realize the unlimited and unconditioned implication of these promises: according to the tenor of these promises a resurrection from the dead is of necessity included. If any one accepts these promises, he cannot reject the hope in a resurrection. To doubt the resurrection would be a clear case of tampering with an unequivocal word of God. The promises demand and create hope.

Thus the argument of Paul has been entering very definitely on assurances given in the past. A jump into the future would be rather abrupt. We are under Paul's guidance lingering in the past. It seems more natural, accordingly, to understand his words *hotan eipē(i)* as referring to the promises which he had adduced from the Psalms and as adding some important observation concerning them.

A second abrupt transition, too abrupt to commend itself, would be caused by the change of subject, which this interpretation assumes. Up to this point the subject was God. Note that in the 110th Psalm it is the Lord who said unto our Lord, Sit thou etc.; and in the 8th Psalm, quoted in the first line of our present verse, again it is the Lord who put all things under Jesus' feet. If now all at once Jesus is made to be the subject of the verb "to say," there is nothing in the text to indicate the change, or to prepare the reader for it. Nor is there anything in the following words that would presuppose, and thus confirm, the change.

These considerations strongly suggest that we try to find some other reference in this sentence than one to a final report of the successful Savior to His Father at the end of the world.

While it is true that *hotan* with an Aorist subjunctive usually refers to some future event, there is nothing in the construction itself to limit it to such conditions. *Hotan*, like the English *when-ever*, simply indicates a likely eventuality — which may occur on any time level: in the future, in the present, in the past. So may the Aorist, which emphasizes the action as such, apply to any

time. Paul had quoted two passages from the Psalms. Now he may refer to these two, and to any others that would apply, and note the general fact that the truth which he is stating applies in every case: Whenever he said, *i. e.*, in the two cited passages and in others speaking of the same matter.

Another difficulty of a grammatical nature will resolve itself a little more easily. It is the change in the tense of the verb. The Psalm used the Aorist, *hypetaxen*, which Paul now replaces with a Perfect, *hypotetaktai*. The Aorist emphasizes the action as such, while the Perfect presents it as having been completed in the past, and as having resulted in a lasting condition; which then really becomes the important part of the statement.* Thus the prophecies emphasized the fact that God actually did put all things under Jesus' feet, while Paul in his brief summary accepts the resulting condition that now they are subject to Him.

The assurance which this gives to our faith for the hope of resurrection Paul couches in these words: "it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him."

Is Paul here giving the Corinthians a lesson in the use of language, or in logic? Is he afraid that the Corinthians, or, for that matter, any person in his right mind, might misunderstand him to say that the Father, in putting all things under Jesus' feet, must have put himself there also, else his statement would not be true to fact? It would be a very trivial remark that when someone gives someone else control over all things, he himself is not to be included among the things thus committed to the second person's control. By putting Jesus in charge of all things, the Father naturally did not create a Frankenstein monster, which would turn on Him and devour Him.

* Because we have no verb form in the English nor in the German to express the exact meaning of the Greek Perfect, it is somewhat difficult to realize the significant differences between the Psalm statement itself and the form in which it is repeated by Paul, *viz.*, in the Perfect. For that reason we here append a few illustrations. The Greek verb *ktaomai* means to *get*, but the Perfect, *kektēmai*, is equivalent to the colloquial phrase, *I've got (it)*, meaning to *have*. — In the German we frequently use auxiliary verbs to express the idea of the Greek Perfect. *Graphō, schreiben; gegraptai, es steht geschrieben; thaptō, begraben; tethaptai, er liegt begraben; heuriskō, finden; heurēka, ich habe die Lösung, ich hab's (gefunden).*

What, then, is the meaning of this startling remark? In a very impressive way it brings to the attention of the Corinthians that the Father in putting all things under Jesus' feet did not himself abdicate the throne. He retains the same position He held before. The very fact that He put everything under Jesus' feet rather serves to underscore this relation. If He were not firmly established in His position of supreme Ruler of the universe and all it contains, if He were not the omnipotent Master also of His raging enemies, how could He put all things under Jesus' feet? "It is *manifest*," Paul says, that the Father himself is excepted.

This consideration at once leads to another question. By placing all things under Jesus' feet the Father himself suffered not the least diminishing of His own kingdom, no lowering of His station: what, then, may have moved Him to make this special arrangement? There is only one answer. It is contained in Jh. 3, 16: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." God put all things under Jesus' feet for Him to restore them, to save them. By this act God commends His love to us. Stronger proof He could not give.

For this purpose Paul calls the attention of the Corinthians to this manifest thing, in order to remind them of the interest God has in the work of Jesus. God wants to see His creation saved and restored, because He loves it. But what if there is no resurrection? What, if there is no *end*? What, if things would be permitted to go on indefinitely as they are going now? What even, though Christ were at some time to return to this earth for a Millennium? Could God be satisfied with such half-measures? Would He consider any of them as a real redemption, a real restitution? — When God put all things under Jesus' feet in such a way that it remained manifest that He himself was clearly excepted, He showed that Jesus was to work, to battle, to suffer, to die, and to rise again, not in His own interest, but solely in the interest of His Father, who committed all things to His charge.

What a powerful stimulus this thought must be for the faith of the Corinthians! Who can doubt his resurrection unto life when he realizes that none less than the Father in heaven laid the plans for the salvation of the world through His own Son? Remember the exultation with which God in the beginning had said:

“Let us make man in our image.” Remember the deep emotions with which, after the fall, He complained: “Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil.” God, indeed, has set His heart on man. When He put all things under Jesus’ feet, He did so with the fond expectation that Jesus would repair the damage and restore God’s creation to its original glory. But what, if man, the crown of creation, were to be left in death? “God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.” He will have the dead raised. Not till then is the work of restitution complete.

Paul now continues, in unusual and therefore arresting terms, to describe the conditions as they will follow the completion of Jesus’ work of redemption. “And when all things shall be subdued to him” — what then? Then, naturally, the state will have been achieved as it was originally planned by God. What is it? Here we meet with an expression to which we are not accustomed: “then shall the Son also himself be subject.” It is the word *subject* that startles us. In the Greek it is the same verb that was used in the Psalm and applied by Paul to the work of Jesus. We assemble the forms of this verb as they occur in verses 27 and 28: *hypetaxen*, *hypotetaktai*, *hypotaxantos*, *hypotagē(i)* — then follows the verb in the statement now under consideration: *hypotagēsetai*, while another participle, resuming the preceding one, concludes the list: *hypotaxanti*. — In the Psalm passage the verb is modified by the phrase “under his feet.” Now the same verb is used with regard to the Son, He shall himself be subject. Does the same modifier apply?

From the Athanasian Creed we are accustomed to emphasize the perfect equality of the Son with the Father. “In this Trinity none is before or after other; none is greater or less than another; but the whole three Persons are coeternal together and coequal.” This doctrine of the equality of the three Persons in the Trinity seems to be endangered by the blunt statement of Paul that the Son will be subject to the Father.

Our present difficulty is not relieved by having recourse to the state of examination. The words of Jesus, Jh. 14, 28: “My Father is greater than I,” are customarily interpreted as referring to that state. While according to the nature of things perfect equality with the Father must be predicated of the Son, yet during the exinanition, when the Son had assumed the form and mode

of existence of a servant, it could, due to that fact, be truthfully said that the Father is greater than He. But this expediency does not apply to the present difficulty. Paul is not speaking of some event in the career of our Savior that happened during His exinanition, he is speaking of a phase of His exaltation, yes, the one marking its final consummation. Yet he says that when the highest heights of the exaltation have been reached, then the Son will be subject to the Father.

Nor will the question help us any, whether the verb form *hypotagēsetai* is to be analysed as a passive or a middle form: "He will be subject," or "He will subject himself." In view of the statement contained in v. 24, that Jesus will deliver up the kingdom to the Father, it may seem preferable to take the form as a middle. The Son, having completed His arduous task, in which He sought not His own glory, but the glory of Him that sent Him, now voluntarily turns over the kingdom to the Father and steps back into the position which He held before He received His great commission. — Yet, no matter according to which voice we translate *hypotagēsetai*, that will in no wise affect the fact expressed by the verb, *viz.*, that the Son will be subject to the Father.

Of one thing we may be sure: Paul is here not teaching subordinationism. For Paul the Son is simply God, not a God of a second order. But that is not the point in his present discussion, to define precisely the intratrinitarian relation of the Father and of the Son. He is speaking of the relation of God toward the chief of His creatures. He had referred to the time of the creation, when he spoke of Adam as the head of the human race. He specifically spoke of the work of redemption performed by the Son at the behest of the Father. The Son redeemed the world for the Father who created it. This work being completed, God will again be, as planned originally, "all in all." The unique position held by the Son while He performed the work of redemption, namely that of the Servant of the Lord in whose hand the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper, that of Mediator between God and man, will come to an end, and the original order of the three Persons will again be in effect.

While there is no semblance of subordinationism to be found in the Scriptures, yet there is a certain order of the three Persons

clearly indicated. We call the Father the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third Person, not because of any difference in rank, but of a given order. This order is indicated in the names of the Persons. No matter how independent a son may be, the father is always accorded a certain preeminence. God's Son is frequently called the Logos, the Word; this term again connoting a certain order. We think also of such passages in which the Son is spoken of as the "image" of the Father.

Here, where Paul is heading for the comprehensive statement that God will be "all in all," he uses the strong expression of subjection, to denote that the natural order of the three persons will be completely in force after the Son has achieved His special mission.

We must not lose sight of the fact that Paul is introducing all of this material for the sole purpose of strengthening the hearts of the Corinthians in the sure hope of the coming resurrection.

Up to this point Paul had stressed the economic division of function as it was arranged between Father and Son regarding the restoration of fallen mankind. The Father committed the work as such to His Son with the assurance of fully supporting Him in it. In this work the Son stands in the foreground. He is the Redeemer, the Savior, the Mediator. In the consciousness of the church the Son occupies a position of preeminence to such a degree that in enumerating the three Persons even the natural order is changed. In the closing blessings of his epistles Paul frequently mentions only the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ (*e. g.*, 1 Cor. 16, 23; Gal. 6, 18; Phil. 4, 23; 1 Th. 5, 28; 2 Th. 3, 18; Philem. 25), and in 2 Cor. 13, 13, where he names all three Persons, he places the Mediator first, through whom alone we have access to the blessings of the Triune God: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." Paul wants his Corinthian readers to remember that this present arrangement was made for economic purposes only, that when its aim has been achieved it will cease and give place to the original order of things. Although the kingdom of the Son is to be an everlasting kingdom (Is. 9, 6; Lc. 1, 33), yet when its purpose will have been attained, it will cease to be an independent kingdom, separate from the rule of the Father: it will be merged into the universal kingdom of God.

Naturally so, since the enemies have been completely routed and all obstructions removed.

Jesus once expressed it as an axiom that requires no further proof, to which everybody will agree as soon as he hears it pronounced: that God is not the God of the dead. We might appeal here to the same axiom in a modified form: Who wants to be king over all dead subjects? God established an eternal kingdom, and Jesus Christ reestablished it through His death, burial, and resurrection. Of what good will that kingdom be, yes, will that kingdom be at all, if the dead rise not? Who will be there to enter that kingdom, who will be there to inherit it, who will be there to sit in it and share it, if the dead rise not?

The dead shall arise, and then the plans of God will reach their final goal, the purpose both of His creative and particularly His redemptive work will have been achieved. Paul sums it up: "that God may be all in all," *panta en pasin*.

A question may be asked about the gender of *pasin*, is the word masculine or neuter? The King James version does not indicate how the translators understood. Luther evidently took it to be masculine: *alles in allen* — if he had assumed the neuter he should have written: *in allem*. Among the more recent translations that of Menge follows Luther on this point; so does Goodspeed, who translates: "so that God may be everything to everyone." To your present essayist it seems better to assume the neuter. The idea that God is in anyone is not found in the rest of the text up to this point. Here "all in all" is not a casual remark, but an expression for the fullest consummation of God's plans. If the expression is not to be lost on the reader, he must be prepared for the idea that God's indwelling in him is the height of his salvation. Yet, while the foregoing speaks of how man succumbed to death, how Christ defeated death and all enemies of man, how all things were put under His feet, and how He, after He gloriously finished the work of restoration assigned to Him, delivered the kingdom to the Father and Himself also became subject to Him, that put all things under His feet: never is the idea suggested that the Triune God, or the Father, or any Person of the Trinity, is indwelling in any person.

The thought itself is not foreign to the Bible. John 15 can show us that the expression "God in us," and the other "we in

God," may be considered as anonymous, and for all practical purposes as equivalent, interchangeable. There Jesus says to His disciples: "Abide in me, and I in you" (v. 4), and : "He that abideth in me, and I in him" (v. 5). The idea of God in us appears as a brief statement of the sum and substance of the matter in the doctrine of divine providence: "For in him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17, 28). Paul applies the same idea to his new spiritual life: "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2, 20). Jesus used the phrase with reference to the mystic union between God and the believers: "If any man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him" (Jh. 14, 23). In His high priest's prayer Jesus expands the use of the term to include the union of Christians into His spiritual body: "That they all may be one: as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us" (Jh. 17, 21). And again: "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one" (v. 23).

Yet, although the idea of the indwelling of God in His creatures is not foreign to the Scriptures, rather expressive of the deepest, most blessed truths, yet in the present case there is nothing in the text leading up to the idea, nothing to hint that Paul was even thinking of it at this moment. If any other explanation of the "all in all" is possible, it must at least receive due consideration.

The prepositional phrase *en pasin* is not uncommon, meaning: "in all things, in all ways, altogether." We list a few passages: "faithful in all things" (1 Tim. 3, 11); "understanding in all things", "watch in all things" (2 Tim. 2, 7; 4, 5); "please them well in all things" (Tit. 2, 9); "marriage is honorable in all", "in all things willing to live honestly" (Heb. 13, 4.18); "God in all things may be glorified" (1 Pet. 4, 11). To these we add a passage in which the singular and the plural are combined: "everywhere and in all things I am instructed" (*en panti kai en pasin*, Phil. 4, 12). Since *en pasin*, as these cases indicate, was used to express the idea of "in every respect," may it not be assumed that Paul used it thus also in the present case? The statement then would be that at the end, with Christ's work com-

pletely finished and formally "wound up," God will be absolutely all and supreme.

What unbounded bliss that will mean for the believer, when God is all in all! God is love, overflowing with blessings for His children. Then there will be nothing any more to separate them from His love. Without any obstacles to hinder them, without any hostile opposition to overcome, yes, without any institutions to intervene between the heavenly Father and His children, will He communicate himself, His love and His blessings to them. Can the arguments of the doubters still impress the Corinthians, that there is going to be no resurrection? If their faith clings to the "all in all" which will crown the work of the Savior, it will triumph over all such attacks.

This completes what we might call the doctrinal part of Paul's argument. He now turns to more personal arguments, showing from his own life and from that of the Corinthians how certain manifestations of their faith would be meaningless if there were no resurrection.

(To be continued)

The Reformation: The Age of Faith

The hammer blows of Luther on that memorable day, October 31, 1517, are still reverberating through the ages and will continue to do so till the end of days. The eyes of the faithful will always look back to that door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg, on which the monk and professor Luther nailed his 95 Theses. Through a disputation with friend and foe he sought clarification on the basis of Scriptures in the matter of indulgences. He inaugurated a new era, the era of the Reformation. Even though he did not see clearly in the matter at the time, he was led ever deeper into the truth of Scriptures. Gradually he brought to life and light again the old faith of the apostles that had been hidden and buried in the dust of scholastic theology, human traditions and worldliness among high and low. This faith centered in Christ and His perfect atonement for the sins of the world, leaving nothing undone or to be done by the individual sinner through good works or the super-abundant merits of the Church of Rome.

Through the grace of God Luther, that outstanding instrument in the hand of God, the greatest man after Paul and defender of the same faith, brought to light again the well-nigh forgotten truths: Scriptures alone, a salvation through faith and grace alone. These are the fundamental principles of the Reformation. With the proclamation of these basic truths the Reformer overthrew the blasphemous assumption of the Pope as though he were the sole authority in all matters pertaining to doctrine and life and involving our salvation. He overthrew the Roman dogma of salvation essentially through the good works of man and the merits of the Church. Only the merits of Christ count and only faith in Him saves. Personal faith in the perfect atonement of Christ for all sins, original as well as actual, is the grand theme of the Reformation. The Reformation inaugurated anew the age of faith and for that reason we can truly call the sixteenth century the age of faith. But why do we stress this?

The Roman Catholic Church has tried her very best to discredit the work of Luther and to belittle the importance of the Reformation. Beginning with the insidious propaganda of the Jesuits in the days of the Counter-Reformation up to the open as well as subtle efforts of present day Romanists, the Church of Rome has not ceased in her attempts to dislodge Luther and the Reformation from their high pedestal in the eyes and hearts of the educated and faithful.

To cite the work of one of the later Romanists we mention the widely read book of James Walsh, one-time professor of the Roman Catholic Fordham University in New York, written in the year 1907: *The Thirteenth, the Greatest of Centuries*. In the latest edition of the *Encyclopedia Americana* Walsh had been asked by the editorial staff to give a digest of the most important events of each century after Christ. In every resume he stresses the greater glory of the Church of Rome and her achievements, and speaks of the Reformation as a religious revolt in Germany. In his opinion there is no greater century in the history of mankind than the thirteenth.

From the very start we should like to stress that it is a grave mistake to speak of the Middle Ages as the Dark Ages from the standpoint of culture and civilization. Little is gained by such an exaggeration. However it is equally wrong to overemphasize

the importance of cultural life in the Middle Ages at the expense of the period of and after the Reformation. Only a biased Romanist can extol the thirteenth century and belittle the Reformation as a revolt. Even though we are ready to give the thirteenth century all possible credit from a cultural standpoint, we cannot grant that it was an age of faith, that the Reformation was a revolt against the Church of Christ, and that the cultural standard of the period of Reformation was lower than that of the thirteenth century. On the contrary, true enlightenment and progress are the glorious by-products of the Reformation and if any, then the sixteenth century is a century of faith, the restoration of the faith of the apostles.

In his praise of the thirteenth century Walsh with some degree of justification calls attention to the erection of the many magnificent Gothic cathedrals in all European countries. These cathedrals were the religious and social centers of activity. In connection with them the cathedral schools came into existence. Walsh also mentions the many universities of brilliant fame in Italy, France and England such as Bologna, Paris, Oxford and Cambridge. He focuses our attention on great teachers such as Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Roger Bacon, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus and Alexander of Hales. He refers to the literature of the century, to the ballads of Cid in Spain, to the Nibelungenlied, Meistersinger and Minnesingers in Germany, to the Troubadours in France, to the Trovatori in Italy, and to Dante, whom he is inclined to view as the greatest poet of all times. Only a child of Rome could claim that.

Walsh further emphasizes the rise of the guilds, the widespread influence of the Hanseatic league, the humane spirit shown in the erection of hospitals and the many works of charity, the origin and rise of the two dominating mendicant orders, the Franciscans and Dominicans, in sharp contrast to the world of commerce and wealth as represented in the guilds and the Hansa.

Walsh cannot refrain from calling attention to Boniface VIII and his proclamation of the first jubilee in this century, which was to be celebrated every 25 years and to grant remission of penal consequences of sins such as in purgatory. We should like to add that a trip or pilgrimage to Rome guaranteed a shortening of the time in purgatory for a 100 years. Truly this was an

expression of faith, not in the Bible, but in the "natural powers" and authority of the Pope. Walsh fails to mention the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, in which the Pope claims to have received two swords, the spiritual and the temporal, in order to be the absolute ruler of church and state, over the whole world, climaxing it with the following word: "Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus, dicimus, definimus and pronuntiamus *omnino esse de necessitate salutis*. At inopportune times the Romanists prefer to remain silent on certain issues and exaggerate and extol others at the expense of the truth, but the end, the greater glory of Rome, justifies the means.

Walsh calls Louis IX. of France, known also as Saint Louis, the best ruler of all times. He may be convinced of that, but not all historians are agreed on that, to be sure. He vividly pictures the fear of the western empires because of the threatening invasion of Genghis Khan, the founder of the vast Mongol Empire. He rightly calls attention to the development of representative government, and therewith mentions the signing of the Magna Charta in 1215. Who would deny that from a cultural standpoint the thirteenth century can boast of many achievements! But they are not a true expression of faith. In many cases it is the product and outgrowth of idolatry and superstition as well as the emancipation of man from divine authority. Scholasticism and the rising claims of papal authority are the dominant features of this century, but neither of the two have anything to do with the true faith. God and Scriptures were dethroned and reason and man enthroned. This is the characteristic feature of the thirteenth century, not faith.

In the opinion of Walsh there is but one century that shows a certain likeness with the thirteenth and can compare with it: the fifth century before Christ in the history of Greece. Note his comparison. In both centuries, he says, there was an abundance of leisure and wealth, enabling men to spend a great portion of their time in the cultivation of art and literature and the observance of religious rites and mysteries. This comparison clearly shows the purely secular viewpoint of Walsh. No spiritual factors enter the picture. It is the viewpoint of a humanist and a Romanist, who sees the essence of religion and faith in the observance of religious rites, ceremonies and mysteries and not

in faith. He sees the by-products and fruits and thinks they are the essence. The glory of Greece can be seen in the fifth century. It reveals what man can achieve through his own resources and with the natural gifts God has given him, but the critical student of Greece will have to look deeper, and then he will observe an ever increasing decadence in this century. Was not the state of Greek religion at a very low ebb already in this fifth century before Christ? Does not every unbiased student of church history know that the same holds true for the thirteenth century A. D.? Was it not the worldliness and immorality that crept into the churches, monasteries and nunneries, the purely secular interest of most of the burghers that finally led up to the great reform councils seeking a reformation of the head as well as of the members? Did they not prove futile? Were they able to stave off the threatening catastrophe? Were not matters brought to a head in the Reformation of Luther after men like Savonarola, Huss and Wycliffe had merely sought a reform within the Church of Rome and had failed? Let us not be misled by glib statements made by Romanists. Let us rather cling to the bare facts. These facts do not reveal the thirteenth century as a century of faith, but rather as a century of gross superstition still having the form, but lacking the essence of true religion. By superstition we mean every form of religion that is not based on the Word of God. Rome's religion is essentially based on the word of man, the Pope and human tradition, the truths of the Word of God are distorted to fit into the Papal world-view.

The same Roman tendency can be seen in many other characteristic articles of the new *Americana*. We need not wonder at this unduly, when we know that a Roman Catholic, John B. McDonnell, signs as a member of the educational staff of said encyclopedia. The undersigned has continuously felt this Roman influence in only too many articles on typical subjects, has written to the management and inquired whether the *Americana* was not being sponsored in the main by Rome, but has received no reply to this very day, even though the management maintains an information bureau for any desired added information. We are inclined to think: he who remains silent, seems to agree. Since the *Americana* is to be found in practically all of our libraries, and has also been purchased by many of our

Lutheran faith, we should like to utter this word of caution. Students of history and those desiring the truth will do well to bear this in mind, when they read any article connected in any way with the Church of Rome. It is just another instance of the open as well as subtle propaganda of Rome to be found everywhere in our days for the greater glory of Rome at the expense of the really great Reformation.

Much has been made of the fact that Richard Wagner also recognized the thirteenth century as an age of faith. To the uncritical, easily swayed mind it would seem as though he really portrayed a true picture of the religion of those days and had a correct understanding of Christianity in his well-known operas. Do we not find Tannhäuser on his way to the Pope of Rome to do penance? Do we not find a close resemblance to the Lord's Supper in Parsifal? Is there not a grand display of religious observances, rites and mysteries? Is not the whole cultural background that of the Church of the Middle Ages?

Wagner was a pessimist and mysticist. Did he not portray his own pessimism in the *Götterdämmerung*? Is not a religion of good works to be found in Tannhäuser, who tries to free himself from the fetters of Venus by a pilgrimage to Rome? Is it not gross superstition to ascribe to a chalice, which is supposed to be the one used by Christ at His institution of the Sacrament of the Altar, the power of healing? To do penance outwardly and to believe in the saving and healing powers of relics is not the essence of true religion. Wagner was furthermore misled by the mysticism of Rome, with which it lures susceptible souls into its folds. The glamour of the mass, the varied richness of the liturgy, the pageantry and pomp of the vested clergy, all these had their attractions for mystic souls in the days of the Middle Ages, of Wagner, and also in our present day and age. Religious ceremonies and pomp must not necessarily be interpreted as true religion, they can be the very opposite. The Jews at the time of Christ had their gorgeous ceremonies and sacrifices, but Jesus calls their religion lip-service, just as in the day of Isaiah. The Jews had the form of true religion, but lacked the essence: Christ and faith in Him. This is also true of Rome which demands the unbloody sacrifice of the mass for the actual sins of man, thus denying the completeness of Christ's redemption, and also adds to

faith good works as necessary for salvation, thus denying that salvation through faith in Christ alone is sufficient. Only too many souls are led astray today by the imposing splendor of Rome's form of worship, considering that to be the essence of true religion. Through such pomp and splendor, through such a display of power, through their vast numbers and outward solidarity they capture many undiscerning souls and lead only too many to their eternal destruction. Wagner was captivated by such a form of religion and thus erroneously thought of the thirteenth century as an age of faith. He portrayed the religious beliefs and ceremonies of those times, but not the true belief and faith in Christ as the only way of salvation. Nowhere does Wagner either in his autobiography or his operas clearly reveal that he pins his faith on nothing else but Christ alone. True faith seeks expression. We failed to find it in Wagner.

We do not want to claim that there were no true believers during the Dark Ages within the Papacy. The Lord also had and knew His own in those days as well as today. True faith in Christ and His atonement alone, however, were again brought to life and light through the work of the great Reformer. The age of the Reformation is the age of faith, and all attempts of the Romanists to whitewash the dark Middle Ages and their church are of no avail. The leopard does not change his spots. Facts are stubborn things.

How little Walsh is able to give an impartial picture of the sixteenth century in his resume is borne out by the fact that he calls Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits, the most fascinating character of the sixteenth century. How can an advocate of that abominable principle: "the end justifies the means", be fascinating? Does not Paul already condemn those who say: Let us do evil that good may come of it (Rom. 3:8)? Does that not reveal a strange code of ethics both on the part of Ignatius and of Walsh? How can such a critic do justice to Luther? It is impossible. He calls Luther the most disputed character of the century and holds him responsible and accountable for the multitude of sects, because he advocated the doctrine of the liberty of judgment (right of private judgment) and personal interpretation of Scriptures. Who is more personal in his interpretation of Scriptures than the Pope who claims that he is the only person on earth capable and

privileged to interpret Scriptures? When the Pope does it, all is well, but woe unto Luther and his followers, if they reject the Pope and his interpretation and follow Scriptures alone. The right of private judgment is one of those liberties Luther fought for. The Pope condemns it. Did not the Christians at Berea search the Scriptures to see whether the things were as Paul had preached to them? (Acts 17:11.)

Walsh furthermore thinks the movement of the Reformation is too close to us to be appreciated properly, but he adds significantly, that the first World War has helped us on to a better understanding. He thereby implies and interprets the defeat of Germany at that time as a defeat of Lutheranism, and we vividly recall that this opinion was noised abroad during the past war. Rome is always ready to assume honors for anything favorable to her greater glory, but is also very ready to place all the blame and responsibility on her greatest opponent, the Lutheran Church. In this war it is Dean Inge of London who takes a nasty fling at Lutheranism and Luther. A scapegoat must be found. We shall not be surprised if Romanists also will take another fling at Luther and Lutheranism. Signs of a shifting opinion in Rome are not lacking. If the future of Rome and her greater glory are involved, anything is permissible. Then Luther and the Lutheran Church will again be held responsible for everything.

The defeat of the Mohammedans by the Christians in the battle of Lepanto in 1571 is viewed by Walsh as the most important historical event of the sixteenth century. We do not deny that this was a decisive battle of the world's history and of that century, but to say it is the most important historical event is a gross exaggeration. In another article of the *Americana* on Lepanto this naval battle is viewed as the concluding and decisive battle of the Crusaders against the Turks. Again it is the greater glory of Rome that makes just this battle the decisive historical event of the sixteenth century. Even though the Reformation lies on a spiritual plane and is no mere historical event, and cannot be evaluated as such alone, it nevertheless changed the world and dated the beginning of the New World, and not the battle of Lepanto. All important and unbiased books and works on history bear out our contention. Only a man with befogged spectacles can misread 1571 for 1517. It makes all the difference in the world.

Walsh is not the only writer who speaks of the Reformation as a revolt. In the *College Outline Series* used as a means of review of history by thousands of students of history through the length and breadth of our nation today, the period beginning with the Reformation is designated by the author, H. W. Littlefield, as "The Protestant Revolt." The Church is identified with the Church of Rome and the separation from Rome on the part of the Protestants is deplored. We cannot definitely say whether the author is a Roman Catholic, but his Roman bias is brought to light by the following statement in his book: "The movement of separation from the Catholic Church was long known in Protestant countries as 'The Reformation'. It is more accurate to call it 'The Protestant Revolt' and to reserve (*sic!*) the term 'Reformation' or 'Counter-Reformation' for the movement within the Catholic Church that followed the Protestant Revolt and corrected many of the abuses that had been partly responsible for the Protestant Revolt." *Sapienti sat!*

Through such and many other statements of a similar nature, for which we could adduce many other examples, our studious youth of today is systematically being led away from the truth. It is a subtle propaganda against the work of Luther and the outstanding importance of the Reformation. Can we not sense the grave danger threatening our youth of today exposed to such base distortions of historical facts? Rome guides her youth through all phases of education from the Kindergarten to the University, and does not shrink from poisoning her own youth and others with such falsifications. What are we doing to protect our own youth? Are we Lutherans not in great danger of giving up the blessed heritage handed down to us by Luther himself? We should at least see to it that our own youth be not subjected to such falsifications but be warned against them. Only in our own Christian schools will we really be able to counteract such maligning. The Church of Christ will prevail even against the devil and the Antichrist, but we shall lose out if we fail to recognize our duty toward our own youth. It is not sufficient that our teachers and professors here and there occasionally call attention to these insinuations and falsifications of Rome. We must earnestly endeavor to expand our parochial as well as high schools and colleges and see to it that our youth be not poisoned

and weaned away from the truths of Scriptures and separation of church and state. With the help of God we must not only try to counteract the outgrowths of a materialistic philosophy, but also the deadly poison of falsified religions.

If you will go to the trouble of studying most of the historical textbooks of our public school system, you will find the term: 'Protestant Revolt' in the ascendancy. How long before the term Reformation will be forgotten by most people. Already now the answers and opinions one often gets to hear when discussing the Reformation are surprising, if not shocking. Should we Lutherans therefore not be on our guard, write and speak against such false interpretations of facts in connection with the Reformation and otherwise? Should we remain silent, when Rome is doing everything within her power to exalt her own church at the expense of all the other churches and especially of the Lutheran Church? Rome has much to hide that led up to the Reformation. Let us cling to the facts and be up in arms against this insinuating misnomer: Protestant Revolt.

Before we enter the discussion of the essence of faith, we should like to call attention to another author who has done much to popularize the study of philosophy as well as of ancient history and literature and has found many readers and admirers: Will Durant. Many students of today are already guided by his views. Durant received his early training at the hand of French Catholic nuns and later on through Jesuits. His views are colored by the early and collegiate training he received. This is borne out among other things by his announcement in his latest book: 'Caesar or Christ', that it will be followed by: 'The Age of Faith'. This book will cover the whole period of the Middle Ages. Durant goes even farther than Walsh and Wagner. He will most likely also later on view the Reformation as a revolt. Wherever we look, Roman propaganda stares us in the face. Let us shout it from the housetops that it was Luther who inaugurated anew the age of faith bringing the Church back to the faith of the apostles.

The whole period of the Middle Ages was a period of religious uncertainty. Rome had and has no answer to the question: How can I obtain a merciful God? How can I be assured of my salvation? Rome does not want the individual member to feel secure. The whole theory of penances and

indulgences proves this decisively. Through this feeling of insecurity Rome has and retains such a strong hold on its members. Faith meant and means to Rome nothing else but a blind acceptance of the doctrines of that church. "I believe what the Church believes" is still the essence of Roman faith. If faith indeed means nothing else than a mere knowledge of and assent to doctrines upheld by the Church irrespective of the fact whether they agree with Scriptures or not, then Rome may speak with semblance of truth about faith; but faith according to Scriptures is something altogether different from the Roman concept. According to the Bible it is not enough to know the saving truths and give assent to them, but to have that implicit trust in the Word of God, in the perfect atonement for all of our sins through Christ, and the absolute confidence in that fundamental truth that we are justified before God through grace and faith in Christ alone. Not our own good works, not the merit of the saints and the vast treasure of superabundant good works of the Church, can and will bring us to heaven, but unreserved faith in His complete redemption wrought for the whole of mankind on the Cross. The malefactor on the cross went to heaven, not because of any possible good works, of which he could not boast, but solely through faith in Christ as his Savior and King. Luther did not obtain true faith and the assurance of his salvation through monkery. Of his own conversion he has this to say: "With a burning desire to understand Paul I took up the Epistle to the Romans. But in the very first chapter there opposed me the word: 'The righteousness of God is revealed in the Gospel.' You see, I hated the word: the righteousness of God, for owing to the teaching of my former professors I held it to be that attribute of holy God according to which He punishes the sinner. Though I lived as a blameless monk, my restless conscience nevertheless told me I was a sinner before God . . . I rebelled against God. I hated a righteous God punishing sinners. My conscience was wounded. I gnashed inwardly and yet ever came back to that verse, for I would by all means get the sense of Saint Paul. At last, thinking over the matter, for days and nights, God showed me mercy and the connection of these words with the sentence following: The Just shall live by faith . . . I saw the meaning of the verse to be: through the Gospel is revealed the righteousness of God by which

the merciful God declares the believer righteous . . . Now I felt myself newborn and in Paradise. All the Holy Scripture looked different to me . . . This passage appeared to me as the gate of Paradise." (Dallmann: *Luther*.)

This truth that man is justified before God through faith, absolute trust and confidence in Christ alone, is the bulk and kernel of the teaching of Scripture, Paul and Luther. This was the truth that lifted up the souls of men again after the spiritual slavery of Roman penance in cloister and home. This was the truth that spread like wildfire through Europe and transformed the lives of thousands and filled them with new hope. To delve ever deeper into the truth, the Bible became the most cherished and diligently studied book. The monumental writings of Luther were also eagerly studied and their truths imbibed. New life sprang forth out of the ruins of the Middle Ages. A new faith, and yet the old faith of the apostles, became the characteristic of the new era of the Reformation. If any century, then the sixteenth century only can be called the Age of Faith.

When Luther nailed his 95 Theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg, he did not as yet possess that clarity of vision and judgment of his later life, but a start had been made. Luther was forced by the power of the Word to break with Rome. For a time he stood alone, but soon adherents sprang up here and there, among the nobility and peasantry, among artists and humanists, in the cloisters and parish churches, among high and low. Finally Rome could no longer stem the adverse tide. All of Europe was discussing the new gospel coming from the little university town of Wittenberg. Soon the world was ablaze from that fire which started when Luther nailed the 95 Theses on that never to be forgotten day of October 31, 1517.

Through the force of Scriptures and the living faith in him Luther was driven on from conclusion to conclusion until he finally came to that inescapable conclusion that the Pope is the Antichrist, revealed in the prophecy of 2 Thess. 2. If the doctrine of justification is the key to the correct understanding of Scriptures, which it truly is, and justification through faith in Christ is the only salvation, then the Pope who denies this basic truth must be the Antichrist, the man who seats himself in the Temple of God and claims he is God by pretending to know and to offer the only

way of salvation. The Church of Rome has fixed its doctrinal tenets in the Council of Trent. Regarding justification by faith alone the Church of Rome and the Pope have this to say (Session VI Canon IX): "If anyone saith that by faith alone the impious is justified, in such wise as to mean that nothing else is required to cooperate in order to obtain the grace of justification and that it is not in any way necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will, let him be anathema (cursed)." The Papists at Trent were agreed on one point: All errors of Luther resolve into that one point: justification through faith alone. That doctrine is damnable heresy. Must not he, who denies the Scriptural way of salvation and who propounds another through faith and good works, be the Antichrist? We shall quote an arch-Catholic to prove that Roman theologians see clearly in this matter and give astounding utterance to that inescapable conclusion: Kiefl, a dean of the Cathedral of Regensburg in Germany writes: "If the dogmatical fundamental idea of Luther was correct that God alone is efficacious in spiritual matters and every cooperation of man is a blasphemy, then a Church, with the demands such as the Catholic Church must raise, must be the work of the Devil, and the Pope as Vicar of Christ the Antichrist." The Papists at Trent saw the essential difference, the Papists of today do too, not so all Lutherans. If Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone is Scriptural, and our salvation depends upon the acceptance of that faith and way of salvation, then the conclusion of Luther was inescapable that the Pope is the very Antichrist. Luther was asked to formulate the confessional stand of the Protestants which they would be ready to defend even unto death over against the Church of Rome. He penned this declaration of faith in the Smalcald Articles, a Confession of our Lutheran Church. There he clearly teaches, not only historically affirms, that the Pope is the Antichrist and bases his argument primarily on the Pope's rejection of justification through faith alone. He who therefore cannot and does not see eye to eye with Luther in this doctrine of the Antichrist cannot be termed a truly Scriptural and confessional Lutheran, since he has not discerned the depths of Papal depravity and fallacy.

Since salvation through faith and grace alone is the heart and soul of Paul's and Luther's theology, and Rome curses those who

teach it, which then is the age of faith, the thirteenth or the sixteenth century? Rome rejects the doctrine of salvation through faith alone, curses the Scriptural doctrine. How then can the thirteenth century with its scholastic theology be the age of faith, or even more so the whole period of the Middle Ages? On the other hand it becomes evident to all who want to see and accept the truth that the sixteenth century with its inauguration of the Reformation is an age of faith, because it returned to the faith of the apostles.

Luther did not revolt against the doctrine and faith of the apostles, but he did revolt against the outrages of the Church of Rome which falsely claims to be the sole heir of the Church of Christ. He did not destroy the unity of the Church. He reformed it. He built the Church of the Reformation upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, of which Jesus is the chief corner stone. Let us cling to the faith of the apostles and thank the Lord for the spiritual and cultural blessings of the Reformation. May the fundamental principles remain our true heritage and not in the name only.

H. A. КОСН.

The Natural Knowledge of God in the Light of the Law and the Gospel

Essay Delivered at the 72nd Convention of the Michigan District of the Ev. Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States in Wayne, Michigan, June 12 to 16, 1944.

P. PETERS.

II

Although man does not make use of his natural knowledge of God to glorify his Creator and to be thankful, nevertheless man does put this his knowledge to a certain use. Our Confessions speak of this use of the natural knowledge of God: "Now, we think concerning the righteousness of reason thus, namely, that God requires it, and that, because of God's commandments, the honorable works which the Decalogue commands must necessarily be performed. For God wishes those who are carnal (gross sinners) to be restrained by civil discipline, and to maintain this He has given laws, letters, doctrine, magistrates, penalties. And this righteousness reason, by its own strength, can, to a certain

extent, work, although it is often overcome by natural weakness, and by the devil impelling it to manifest crimes" (Trigl. 127, 22). . . . "For thus the outward discipline is retained, because all men ought to know equally, both that God requires this civil righteousness (God will not tolerate indecent, wild, reckless conduct), and that, in a measure, we can afford it" (337, 75). Thus we are being told by our Confessions that God requires of man to put this natural knowledge of the Creator to a certain use and that man is able to do this very thing.

Without the natural knowledge of God man would be without a moral social order. The divine ordinances whereby the social order is being regulated throughout the world have their roots deeply imbedded in the Noachian World Order. The form, however, which these various orders assume varies and differs as to time and place. We can, for instance, speak of monarchical and democratic, of communistic and fascistic forms of government. As to the state of matrimony, which God has instituted before all others, the normal form of marriage is monogamy (Gen. 1, 27; Matt. 19, 4-6). However, polygamy is another form of marriage, which was tolerated by God in the Old Testament, although it "must be considered as a heathen corruption of the original institution" (Reu - Buehring, *Christian Ethics*, 265). Again in regard to the family itself we can speak of the forms of patriarchy, matriarchy and fratriarchy, either the father or the mother or the son ruling in domestic affairs. Both patriarchy and fratriarchy are represented in the Bible (Gen. 24, 50). We also behold how nations continue to exist as nations, races as races. With our Confessions we regard this order of things as a "divine ordinance in man and as a natural right" (Trigl. 367, 9). This *ius naturale*, this divine right is common to all nations and individuals, and immutable. Such ordinances are "divinely impressed upon nature" (367, 12) and "cannot be removed by human laws" (367, 10). On the contrary, governments have their laws with the express purpose of defending and upholding the national, social, and family rights of their subjects.

Now this order of things undergoes constant changes. It is never uniform. Man on the strength of his natural knowledge of God does not see clearly which is the most God-pleasing form. He has only a vague knowledge of the ordinances and estates

as they are defined by God's Word and does not know the final purpose of these orders. On the other hand he is not always willing to submit to God's order. Even the Jews, knowing the law, often put away their wives and God suffered it because of the hardness of their hearts (Matth. 19, 8). At times men even seek to overthrow all divine and human ordinances. Witness the godless attempt of the Anabaptists to abolish the family altogether or the attempt to eliminate all forms of government on the part of Anarchism. Yet in the midst of such drastic changes and upheavals man can never fully deny the ordinances as such. Were such an abrogation of God's ordinances possible, chaos would rule. Only by a "special work of God", as our Confessions point out, "can the fundamental order of things be changed" (Trigl. 367, 8). This will take place on Judgment Day.

But man is not only moved by a moral order which is fundamental and relevant to the corporate life of men and the ordering of human society, man is not only able to give form and shape to this social order, but man also has a dim aspiration to obey it. Therefore man can lay claim to a civil righteousness. Our Confessions are very outspoken in their evaluation of this civil righteousness stating that our "corrupt nature has no greater good," that "in this life and in a worldly nature, nothing is ever better than uprightness and virtue" (Trigl. 127, 4). The controlling force in the field of civil righteousness is none other but the moral law grounded in human nature. This moral law is also the guiding rule and ideal in the realm of international righteousness. The moral law is a *lex gentium*, a universal law, which is acknowledged by all men as a code of justice, as Isaiah (24, 5) clearly teaches. Since there is a universal law, there is also a universal moral conscience underlying all phases of human nature. There is a common knowledge of the Golden Rule which penetrates and pervades all positive laws and which brings us into a fellowship with one another in times of peace and times of war. We can not and we are not to hide ourselves from our own flesh (Is. 58, 7; Neh. 5, 5). There even is such a thing as a brotherhood of men, although no term has suffered more abuse in that a naturalistic religion has been built up around it. Yet we are all made of one blood (Acts 17, 26), we all have a common habitation, the earth (Ps. 115, 16), and we all have a common task (Gen.

1, 28. 29). We are indeed one family. It is well to be reminded in times of war "dass in Gottes Augen", as we read in *Kurze Andachten* by Dr. Dau, "jeder Krieg ein Bruderkrieg ist, ein Krieg zwischen Kindern einer und derselben Mutter" (p. 14). Consequently men are morally bound to seek this fellowship, also as it pertains to international relationships. As all nations ultimately know of the "authority of Heaven, which overreaches all nations," as they know of the Golden Rule whether in one form or the other, they are also aware of having common standards of righteousness and justice. Indeed, there are moral elements in all cultures which are universal and akin to each other. To them we can also ascribe "eine internationale Verbreitung", a term, which Dr. Dau in his *Andachten* applies to the revelation of God through His works. Were this not the case, the earth, with all the nations upon it, would soon be in a chaotic condition, instead of only being visited at intervals by an upheaval and disorder. As a Christian Church we are to teach the fundamental truth concerning the moral law and the divine ordinances of God. The Lutheran Church has done this very thing since its incipency, Luther setting the example for us in his writings. In its doctrines concerning the principles set down by Scriptures, the Lutheran Church, however, finds itself at variance with the Roman Catholic and the Reformed Church, including those Lutheran church bodies which are being influenced by Reformed theology.

The point at issue is whether the divine order, by which the world is being governed, is to be classified as a rational order belonging exclusively to the realm of reason and the natural knowledge of God, or whether this order with all its laws and ordinances is to be classified also as a spiritual order belonging to the realm of Christ's kingdom. If the latter is the case then superiors and governments do not only exert their authority by means of their reason, then a Christian principle, "a higher righteousness of love", must supersede the ideal of justice and of love summarized by the Golden Rule and by the Apostle Paul in Romans 2, 14 and 15. Then the Christian Church has a very definite call to bring about a better social and political order by preaching this higher righteousness of love in the State and for the State.

Now Luther and our Confessions (Trigl. 365, 6) have never placed divine and natural law, divine and natural ordinances under

the rule of Christ's kingdom, but exclusively under the jurisdiction of the *Ratio*, of reason. Although they speak of *divine* ordinances and *divine* laws, yet these laws and ordinances have no other purpose than to regulate the temporal and social order within a nation. God's order is nothing less and nothing more than a natural order, in which the natural knowledge of God is to be the guiding principle. All human ordinances again are God's ordinances, are divine, because God's Word, which He spoke when creating the world, and God's commandments, which he gave to man, establish them. Consequently we are called upon, whether Christians or non-Christians, to obey our superiors, our parents, our governments for conscience's sake. As Christians we are admonished by our Confessions that "legitimate civil ordinances are good creatures of God and divine ordinances, which a Christian can use with safety" (Trigl. 329, 53). Yea, by means of these very ordinances God Himself is commanding us to obey Him, to obey His Word, as Luther says, since His Word is synonymous with order (WA 18, 304, 13). And God speaks to us and deals with us through the servants of the Word, *i. e.*, through our parents and superiors. Every man knows this Word of God, no man can excuse himself of being ignorant of it. This Word is of course not the Gospel word, but the word of that universal Law, which is written in the heart of every man. Luther also calls it "das Wort der Schöpfung," which we should use more than the work itself. So highly Luther evaluated the ordained powers and their jurisdiction and yet regards them as being only within the realm of the natural law and the natural knowledge of God guided exclusively by their reason.

As Christians living in a godless world we are nevertheless to remain aware of the fact that we have our station as father, mother, son, daughter, master, mistress, man-servant and maid-servant within the framework of this moral structure of society. The laws, whereby such a normal order is established, are far-reaching in their scope. They are, of course, the laws of the government of the land. They do not only involve the paying of taxes and the political rights of the citizen. Laws of a country are directive for all organizations and institutions within the country. Consequently we can speak of the laws of commerce and trade, laws which rule production and manufacture, labor and employ-

ment, markets and stock-exchanges, schools and universities, individuals, families and racial groups, personal and international relationships, laws governing the conduct of man in times of peace and of war. We do not have to live under a fascistic or bolshevistic form of government to realize that restraint, discipline and government everywhere pursue us. There is government everywhere exercised over man and because of such government "men are interlocked, as the links of a chain and rise and fall together." Men as individuals and groups do not always have to be legislated into order, but have within themselves the only safe principles of order and growth, which impose themselves as laws not to be evaded in all their actions. This becomes apparent especially there where the laws of the land are inadequate. There men form law-enforcement associations to promote a better enforcement of existing laws, to bring about the enactment of new laws. By means of such laws and powers that be, ordained of God, God most excellently orders, regulates, and directs the affairs and actions of men according to His own wisdom, justice and goodness. Thus God's government and providence is revealed in these laws and their enforcement, despite the wide range which is allowed to human liberty. Government is the most potent order which God employs in directing the world for the accomplishment of His designs. The "Heroen" of all times, a Nimrod, a Ham-murabi, a Cyrus and an Alexander, to mention only those of the pre-Christian period, were instruments in the hands of God and instrumental in the overthrowing of an old and in the establishing of a new social order.

In Christian times the question has arisen whether the Christian Church has a definite duty and call to bring about a better social order. Those churches that do not distinguish clearly between the Law and the Gospel, finding in the New Testament only a new law, seek to set up as their goal a new social order and a visible kingdom of Christ here on earth. However, the Lutheran Church, which has always separated the Law from the Gospel, the Church from the State, does not, as a Church, seek to set up a better or a new social order, but has always divided between the duties of the State and the duties of the Church. Yet the Churches of today are being called upon by their respective governments to aid in the moral uplift of the nation, especially of

the army, and are being exhorted by many not to be unmindful of their social responsibilities after the war. Our Wisconsin Synod is perhaps the only Lutheran Church body in the United States which has not accepted the call of the government for chaplains. Our Missouri brethren have accepted this call. In an article by Dr. P. E. Kretzmann, "The Relation between Church and State," which has appeared in *The Lutheran Chaplain* of June, 1942, we read: "There is territory in which the functions of Church and State meet, namely in the field of moral conduct . . . Of course both the motives and the methods of the two agencies in this field are different. The Church, in working for the salvation of men's souls, must expose and rebuke sin . . . The State, on the other hand, is not concerned about the soul's salvation of its citizens, but about the civic righteousness. The State's definition of certain crimes, such as murder, robbery, and other sins, may not always agree in full with that of the Bible, and hence that of the Church, but this fact does not change the fact that both agencies are definitely interested in the field of moral conduct" (pp. 24 and 26).

In view of the aforesaid we'll do well to speak of the Law as it is used by the State and of the Law as it is used by the Church. Both have one and the same Law. There is no such thing as a "new law" of the New Testament, which some churches would like to foist upon the State. The new commandments (John 13, 34), which Jesus gave to His disciples to love one another, are not commandments in any Mosaic sense. They are precepts, Aufträge, and these precepts are the Gospel behests of Jesus (Comp. Lenski, *St. John's Gospel*, pp. 936 and 971). There is only one Law, as also our Confessions clearly state: "The Law is and remains both to the penitent and impenitent, both to regenerate and unregenerate men, one [and the same] Law, namely, the immutable will of God; and the difference, so far as concerns obedience, is alone in man" (Trigl. 807, 6).

Although there is only one Law, still the interpretation of this Law on the part of the Church is essentially different from that of the State. Ever since Christ has taken the Law into His hands, and has explained it spiritually, Matt. 5, 21ff; Rom 7, 14 (Trigl. 803, 7), the Church in its use of the Law begins there where the State has left off. The State indeed is only interested

in civil righteousness and uses the Law accordingly. The Church, however, is interested in the salvation of sinners and therefore also uses the Law accordingly, even as Jesus used it, namely in close connection with the preaching of the Gospel. The Church uses the Law in order to show men their complete lack of righteousness. "Thus the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all sinners [Rom. 1, 18], how great it is," we read in our Confessions; "by this means they are directed (sent back) to the Law and then first learn from it to know aright their sins — a knowledge which Moses never could have forced out of them" (Trigl. 803, 7). The spiritual interpretation, which Christ gave to the Law, creates such a new understanding of the Law as even Israel did not have, let alone governments, which are only guided by their reason. And as to the field of moral conduct, that of the State is created by means of the Law, that of the Church is created by means of the Gospel. The moral conduct of natural man is that of a self-righteous sinner, the moral conduct of the Christian is that of a repentant sinner. These two fields of moral conduct we must separate from one another and therefore cannot speak of a "common ground" of moral conduct of both State and Church.

There is no common ground, where State and Church meet as far as the functions of both are concerned. There is, however, a territory where Christians and non-Christians meet. This territory is the State. Here both are linked together as citizens of one country, here they have common rights and common duties. Christians and non-Christians meet on the common ground of national duties. They can do this because Christians do not take part in the efforts for the social improvement of the country as church members, least of all as representatives of any particular church, but as citizens, as Christian citizens of their community and country. Therefore it is wrong to say that "it is at this point where the church and the state, each with its own sphere of activity and its own distinctive duties and prerogatives, meet on common ground" (*Christian Ethics*, Reu and Buehring, 299). Not the Church and the State, but the Christians and the non-Christians meet on the common ground of national affairs, despite the differences which separate them otherwise for life and eternity.

Although Church and State do not meet on common ground,

still Church and State serve each other indirectly. A government ordained by God serves the Church indirectly, in that it preserves discipline and public peace, "without which," as our dogmaticians put it, "the ministry of the Church could not readily perform its duty, and the collection and extension of the Church could scarcely have a place, 1 Tim. 2:2" (*Doctrinal Theology*, Schmid, p. 620). The Church on the other hand serves the State indirectly in preserving a knowledge of the ordinances of God. The Church, in preaching the Law, also continues to remind men of the principles of every stable world-order. Where nations or rulers sin against such fundamental principles, whether in times of war or in times of peace, thereby preventing discipline and order, the Church cannot refrain from preaching as Isaiah did, who spoke of the laws having been transgressed, the ordinances changed, and the everlasting covenant broken. And since man by his own reason knows nothing of the final purpose of all world order, the Church has every reason to make known this ultimate purpose, and thereby also instills the principles of such a world order into the minds of its hearers. This does not imply that the Church is to engage in politics or to exercise tutelage over the State. Both, the State and the Church, do not even join hands in the building of a visible moral kingdom here on earth, but are, each one in its respective province, to serve that purpose that God wants to see realized by means of his "Erhaltungsordnungen", namely the preservation of the world-order for the preaching of the Gospel.

While there are those who say that Church and State meet on the common ground of moral endeavors, there are also those who claim that Church and State meet on the common ground of religious endeavors. Man, having a knowledge of God, is indeed never without a religion. The piety of individuals and the religions of nations testify to the truth of Paul's statement in Athens, that men are ever seeking God, if indeed they might touch him and find him. God made us for Himself, as Augustine confesses, and our hearts are restless until they rest in Him. This restlessness finds expression in a constant longing on the part of man for some highest good. This highest good has nothing in common with the Gospel truth. Man has a longing for a lasting peace and well-being. The fact that this longing for a lasting

peace grows in times, when "time itself is out of joint," only proves our point. Men have not only a sense of feeling for their need, they also have an apprehension of God as the highest good. Cicero's confession need not surprise us: "There is in our minds an insatiable desire to behold the truth . . . to know heavenly things." Consequently there is no one without a religion. Man is naturally a believer. All men are believers. Luther in his Large Catechism argues that "even in the mind of the heathen to have a god means to trust and believe" (Trigl. 505). It is only the fool who says in his heart: "There is no god," no god, in whom I can trust and believe. By saying this the Atheist denies his knowledge of God and all that it embodies. No, men are religious and put their trust in some god. They cannot deny their secret inclination to some form of religion. No matter how far men go astray in their search for God, it ever remains true that they know of God and that there is "an inner urge in man to reach outside of Himself to another" (Dell, *I Still Believe in God*, p. 41). We have telling testimonies to this effect in the religious literature of all nations. They demonstrate most forcibly that men are by nature quite religious, some even extremely so. As a result they "institute and observe some divine worship" (Trigl. 585, 17), "speak of God and offer to God a certain service by an outward work" (Trigl. 335, 70). Yet all man-made religion is idolatry. All man-made religion is a lie, whether it takes on the form of gross idolatry or of some philosophical system. All man-made religions change the truth of God into a lie and the adherents of these religions serve the creature more than the Creator (Rom. 1, 25). Up to the present day it becomes quite evident in all man-made religions that men, although they know God, glorify Him not as God, neither are thankful, but become vain in their imagination, and their foolish hearts are darkened.

The godless world in which we live is a religious world. We are inclined to overlook this fact, because we know that the world is without the knowledge of the Gospel, and therefore without the godliness and piety worked by the Holy Spirit. Then we wrongly conclude that the world is irreligious. Again, living among a people which has been under the influence of the Gospel for many generations, we also do not always distinguish clearly between a piety which is the fruit of faith and the piety which proceeds from

a natural knowledge of God. We simply speak of the whole nation as a "Christian nation," of its culture as a "Christian culture," and lose sight of the natural religion and morality within the life of a nation. Yet we have every opportunity in our country to observe the role which religion based merely on the natural knowledge of God plays in all classes of society. Although we have separation of Church and State in our country, still Congress does not open its session without prayer, a custom which was introduced by Benjamin Franklin. On Thanksgiving Day, a national holiday, the whole nation is urged to give thanks to God. D-day was the day on which all citizens of the United States were exhorted to pray. Our President, who drafted a prayer on D-day, went on the air in the hope that the nation would join him in the prayer he wrote. The Boy Scouts as a youth-movement are, despite their revised Manual, a religious movement. The scout must promise to do his duty to God and thereby pledges his allegiance to God. His "Good Turn" to somebody every day is but one of his moral precepts. The lodges with their religious principles and worship testify to the fact that natural man cannot be without religion. To deny, therefore, that the lodge is a religious organization is tantamount to denying that natural man has a religion. Yet religion is not only found in an organized group within a nation, the nation as such is not without it. All heathen nations have had and have their State religion or religions. Also, most so-called Christian nations have their State Churches. Our government, especially in these trying times, does much to foster religious sentiment. A government opposing and endeavoring to eradicate all religions within its boundaries, as the Soviet government sought to do, is an exception, and something quite new in the modern history of mankind. The educational systems of the various nations also prove our point. It is difficult to see how religion can be absent for any length of time from the educational institutions of a nation. Non-confessional schools of higher learning, even in our country, have their religious instruction and daily devotion. And our public schools are clamoring for religious instruction of their pupils. The U. S. Commissioner of Education in a statement of March 1941 says: "Insofar as religion is inextricably intertwined with the daily affairs of men it is not absent from any lifelike curriculum in these (public) schools.

Separation of Church and State in America may be a price we must pay for religious tolerance. It need not mean that education, even secular education, should be without its motivating religious core." It is self-evident that in a country which enjoys the separation of Church and State as a most precious heritage, the teaching and preaching of any confessional doctrine by a public school cannot be permitted. It is also self-evident that one religion of the many religions, which are receiving the protection of the government, cannot be selected as the religion of our public schools, as long as we retain the principle of separation of Church and State. Still we should recognize the dilemma of our public schools. Our laws demand a secularization of education but a secularization of education is not possible for any school whose teachers still have a natural knowledge of God.

As long as we merely differentiate between the secular and the spiritual, as our Lutheran dogmaticians do, when discussing this problem, there is no question in our minds as to the territory, to which our public schools are to confine their whole educational activity. But as soon as we ask for a definition of the secular work of our public schools, we will receive different answers. Dr. Hoenecke in his *Dogmatics* (IV, 209) puts us on our guard by pointing out: "Gewissenssachen und geistliche Sachen sind nicht identisch nach der Schrift, denn der Heide hat Gewissen und ist doch ganz und gar fremd von allem Geistlichen (Röm. 2, 15; Eph. 2, 12 vergl. mit V. 3. 5. 6)". The government also has a "Gewissen", a conscience, whereby it is guided. It has the Natural Law as a norm for all its actions and aims. It seeks to foster civil righteousness. It is conscious of God and of His divine law and will also want to make its subjects conscious of God as the lawgiver. It therefore need not surprise us that the Commissioner of Education defines the secularization of education "only in the sense that public schools cannot preach sectarian dogma," and then finally adds: "It need not mean that education, even secular education, should be without its motivating religious core." Of course, the Commissioner is confusing two questions, the one, whether our Constitution permits religious instruction in our public schools, the other, whether it is at all possible to keep religious instructions out of the educational system of any public school. The first question must be

answered with a definite No. Our constitution does not permit the teaching of religion in our public schools. The answer to our second question can only be: "There is no neutrality in teaching; there is no 'religionslose Erziehung'."

Luther and Melancthon did not have to face the difficulties which are confronting us. They could simply call upon their government to establish Christian Day Schools. There was only one religious confession in the Electorate of Saxony: The Lutheran. No opposition was encountered. The Elector had, as Lutheran dogmaticians and the ecclesiastical lawyers defined it, an officium circa sacra, a calling to fulfill in regard to the Church, on the strength of which he "directed the Church and the Christian religion in their external government" (Doctrinal Theology, Schmid, p. 620). Dr. Hoenecke adds in his Dogmatics: "Selbstverständlich hat dies alles nur seine Geltung, wo ein Land als Ganzes der reinen Lehre zugetan ist und ebenso auch die Obrigkeit als eine der drei Stände der Kirche in dieser steht" (IV, 215). That our people as a whole, or in their majority, should ever accept the pure doctrine, is, even with the greatest stretch of our imagination, out of the question. Nowhere do Scriptures give us a promise of such a general conversion of mankind. Not even the Lutherans of our country can unite because of vital differences in doctrine and practise. Therefore we, who are willing to forego the advantages of a union with larger church bodies for the sake of retaining the pure doctrine, can do nothing less than to establish Christian Day Schools. Let us not forget: "Education cannot be neutral." There is no "religionslose Erziehung", not in our public schools, in our Normal schools and colleges, not in our universities. Let us therefore have our own schools, our parochial, our Christian Day Schools, our academies and colleges. In them we want to teach our children the Gospel of Jesus Christ and want them to discern the uniqueness of the Gospel as compared with the man-made religions of our day reflecting only more or less the natural knowledge of man?

The Gospel is not one of many religions, but is the revelation of God to mankind, revealing that which God's creation and God's law cannot reveal. It is "the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ" (Eph. 3.9), "the mystery which has been hid from ages

and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints" (Col. 1, 26). This "hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory" (1 Cor. 2, 7) has been revealed unto us by His Spirit; "for the Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God" (2, 10). It is Christ Himself, His redemption worked for us on the cross, sealed by His Resurrection, and offered to every sinner without money and without price in the preaching of the Gospel: "Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (2, 30). Christ with His divine and human excellencies is the light and the glory of the Gospel. He is the image of God, and he that has seen Him, has seen the Father (John 14, 9). "The law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ". Concerning this grace the Apostle proclaims: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of men the things which God hath prepared for them that love him" (1 Cor. 2, 9). No Plato, no Cicero, no Seneca knew anything of this Gospel. We may at times marvel at their knowledge of the Law, but we will search their writings in vain for but a syllable of the Gospel truth.

It is of great importance to keep in mind that this knowledge of the hidden mystery in God does not yet let us see the whole glory of the majesty of God. On the contrary, all men, even after their conversion, must confess with the nations who came over unto Israel: "Verily, thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Savior" (Is. 45, 15). "Du bist ein verborgener Gott, Du Gott Israels, der Heiland." In the light of the Gospel all makers of idols, all makers of religions "shall be ashamed, and also confounded, all of them" (V. 16). It does not suffice to speak with the Athenians of the unknown God. In the light of the Gospel-revelation we learn to know God as one who is incomprehensible and unsearchable and His ways past finding out. God cannot be found — but in Christ and in the Gospel Word. Luther says: "After he had created all things, he was everywhere, and yet he was nowhere, for I cannot take hold of him without the Word. But he will be found there where he was engaged to be. The Jews found him at Jerusalem by the throne of grace (Exod. XXV). We find him in the Word and faith, in baptism and the sacraments; but in his majesty, he is

nowhere to be found. Many philosophers and men of great acumen have also engaged in the endeavor to find out the nature of God; they have written much about him, one in this way, another in that, yet all have gone blind over their task and failed of the proper insight. And, indeed, it is the greatest thing in heaven and on earth to know God aright, if that may be granted to one . . .” (*A Compend of Luther's Theology*, Ed. by Hugh Thompson Kerr, Jr., pp. 28f).

The knowledge, which even the Holy Ghost imparts unto us, is therefore a limited knowledge. By means of it we do not gain a perfect comprehension of God's majesty. But it suffices that this knowledge of the Gospel is a saving knowledge of God, which makes us lost and condemned creatures, “wise in Christ” (1 Cor. 4, 10), “wise unto salvation” (2 Tim. 3, 15), which lets us exercise the faith of God's promises, and the works of His commandments. Yet it is not a knowledge which justifies us to aim at the perfect comprehension of God's unfathomable will. That “is dangerous work,” as Luther calls it, “wherein we stumble, fall and break our necks” (*A Compend etc.*, p. 27). Indeed, in the presence of that God, who has revealed himself to us in Christ, we bow down in true repentance and confess with the Apostle: “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out” (Rom. 11, 33).

Although the knowledge of the Gospel is a limited knowledge, still it is far superior to the natural knowledge of God. Therefore we have every reason to study, and to grow conscious of the fundamental and far-reaching difference between the one and the other.

A great gulf separates the truth which is the object of the natural knowledge of God from the truth which is represented by the spiritual knowledge of the Gospel. Yet men endeavor to bridge this gulf. Even Christian men and women may make themselves guilty of the wrong conclusion, that since there is only one God all worship and all prayer are directed to Him. The prayers of shipwrecked sailors and pilots, spending many days in prayer on a raft, are used as an argument that prayer is the deciding factor, a means of grace for Christians and non-Christians alike. And can one argue the power of prayer? Is not

prayer a matter of personal experience? Does not God come to grips with the life of man in prayer? Why argue about the way to God? Why emphasize the need of a mediator? Does it not suffice that men and women are praying in this war as never before? Let it suffice that these men and women are believing in the power of prayer, since they have experienced that power. Does not this argument silence all doctrinal discussion? Yet such examples which show us what a pious turn the lives of men can take, force us more than ever to give thought to the gulf, which separates the natural knowledge of God from the spiritual knowledge of the Gospel.

The same must be said of all attempts by theologians within the pale of the Christian church to bridge the gulf between the natural knowledge of God and the spiritual knowledge of the Gospel. The Church Fathers made themselves guilty of this attempt, the Scholastics of the Middle Ages, Zwingli and Calvin, and finally modern liberal theologians. Especially students of the comparative study of religions have done much to erase the line of demarcation between the realm of Reason and of Revelation. Everything that can be called religion is regarded by theological science of today as one in essence, whatever the differences and contrasts, the truths, half-truths and non-truths in these different religions may be. We are not to distinguish between natural and revealed religion, but between revelation and revelation, between a general and a more specific revelation (Comp. Nathan Söderblom, *Natürliche Theologie und Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte*, p. 107). Also the distinction made by our Lutheran dogmaticians between Law and Gospel has been dropped by modern theology. Agreements and compromises have been entered into instead with philosophy, and with a very dangerous sort of philosophy. The old dualism of Lutheran dogmaticians which separated between natural and revealed truth has not been retained. The inner experience of man has been placed on a level with the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit. While the theology of our Lutheran dogmaticians guarantees a clear and concise presentation of Scripture truth, modern liberal theology guarantees a mere presentation of the natural assets of our inward life. Such a theology explains the attitude of modern theologians towards a study of religions. All religions, including the Christian religion, are being stamped

more or less with the trade-mark of a revealed religion, and again, all religions, including the Christian, are being defined as religious experiences on the part of great minds, which places them on one and the same level. Men as moral and religious minds therefore claim to be able to determine whether the spirit which reveals itself in the Gospel is really holy and divine. Nothing is made of the necessity of a rebirth, of repentance, of a spiritual discernment worked by the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, the bridge which is supposed to span the gulf between natural and revealed theology, is made up of all the "moral ideas", the "mystical intuition", and the "innate belief in God", which have nothing in common with the spiritual knowledge of the Christian.

The practical result attained by such a liberal theology consists in this that Catholics, Protestants, and Jews can come together for common worship. Lodges, founded on such a theology and religion of reason, welcome members of all different religions of the world, including those of the Christian Confession, into their midst. Radio sermons, even some Lutheran radio sermons, do not distinguish as they should between the kingdom of God and the moral progress of a nation. Consciously or unconsciously they are under the influence of "meliorism," a word that means "betterment," which teaches the *American Doctrine of Progress*. It implies growth in moral insight and ideals and is regarded by its adherents as being in harmony with "what Christians have called the coming of the kingdom of God" (comp. Titus, *What is a Mature Morality*, p. 164). The idea of a moral progress of individuals and nations is the premise, on which all these -isms are built. If, however, a movement, which is only to create a betterment in the life of a nation, is compared with the kingdom of God and Christ, how much more will religions of all kinds be placed on a level with the Christian religion. *The Pocket Guide to North Africa* prepared by the Special Service Division of the U. S. Army, which is to prevent our soldiers from making mistakes in their dealings with the people of North Africa, has this to say on "the Faith of Islam": "The Moslem worships the same God as the Christians and the Jews, and speaks with reverence of Abraham, Moses and Jesus. Mohammed preached against the same vices which are the targets of American evangelists . . .

Don't refer to the people as heathen, they are very religious" (*The Readers Digest*, March 1943, 73f).

In view of such tendencies and attitudes we must learn in the light of the Gospel to distinguish more and more clearly between the natural knowledge of God and the spiritual knowledge of the Gospel. This difference culminates in the one great truth that the spiritual knowledge of the Gospel is the one and only saving knowledge of God. For "this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent" (John 17, 3). The personal relation of the believer to the true God and to His Son, Jesus Christ, consists in both the knowledge of God and of eternal life. One is not without the other. Here in John 17 we have a proclamation of our Lord, which is not only directed against all pagan religions and all Jewish unbelief, but also against all attempts of men to gain eternal life by means of their natural knowledge of God. Although natural knowledge of God is God-given, still man with this knowledge of God is and remains a lost and condemned creature. Only those who believe in Jesus and through Him in the only true God have eternal life. Their faith, which supersedes all other sources of certainty in the knowledge of God, is the faith of the repentant sinner in the Word of reconciliation. By means of this Word of reconciliation the believers "are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph. 2, 22), and as such a habitation they are the temple of God, the Holy Spirit dwelling in them (1 Cor. 3, 16). This "habitation of God through the Spirit" differs essentially from the immanence of the omni-present God, of which the Apostle speaks to the Athenians (Acts. 17, 27-28), and to which heathen philosophers could testify. It embodies "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost" (2 Cor. 13, 14). These are the foundation of the temple of God, and they are also the light which illuminates this temple, so that in this light we can see the light.

We, who by faith are the recipients of the grace of God, and who are able to perceive the things of the Spirit, are not to overlook the use to which man puts his natural knowledge of God in establishing and reestablishing a social order within a nation and the whole world. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin

is a reproach to any people" (Prov. 14, 34). With Luther in the First Article of our Creed we have every reason to praise and to thank God, that He has given us reason and all our senses, whereby a civic righteousness among men is being retained. But as Christians we cannot confess the First Article without confessing the Second and the Third Article. We do not isolate the First Article from the Second and the Third, as has been done in the recent past. God is not only glorified by His children as Creator, but also as Savior and Comforter. Only in and through Jesus Christ do we glorify God as Creator. In other words, we confess the name of the Triune God, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. Had we nothing else to fall back on in times of fiery trials than our reason which is blind in spiritual things, our conscience which accuses us, and the Law of God which condemns us, then indeed we would be without hope. Our hope, however, is God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and, by faith in Christ, our Father who saves us from judgment and from eternal death, whose great and redeeming love casteth all fear out of our hearts, so that we can have boldness in the day of judgment and joyousness to confess: "O Lord, thou art my God, I will exalt thee, I will praise thy name; for thou hast done wonderful things; thy counsels of old are faithfulness and truth" (Is. 25, 1).

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

"Denouncing the Christmas Story." — The principle of separation of church and state is being jeopardized in our country by those who do not see the vital and essential differences separating one faith from the other, one religion from the other, and who accuse those who recognize and evaluate these differences of "sectarian narrowness." Their aim — and the World War has added many to their ranks — is to see men and women of all creeds and denominations join in one church and in one religious celebration, doing away with all "pagan secularism" and establishing a new "Christian world-order." Consequently Rabbi Harold Englander of Kingston, New York, who denounced school teaching of the Christmas story, was in turn denounced for "thoughtlessness" and "narrowness" by the *Milwaukee Journal*. Even the president of the Kingston rabbi's congregation immediately disavowed the protest and the rabbi was forced to submit his resignation to his congregation, the *Journal* in an editorial (December 8, 1944) informs us. Had this rabbi made himself guilty of

denouncing the Christmas story as a legend in a sermon or a religious treatise, it might not at all have called forth any comment or criticism by the press. The Christmas story has had its denouncers and enemies among both Jews and Gentiles since the day of Christ's birth in Bethlehem, and it will continue to have its opponents and critics. But the aforementioned incident does not at all revolve round about such a straightforward denouncement of the Christmas story, although the *Journal* heads its editorial: "Denouncing the Christmas Story." In a previous news item (December 6, 1944) it had reported the incident in these words: "Rabbi Denounces School Teaching of Christmas Story." This is exactly the "thoughtlessness" and "narrowness" of which Rabbi Englander had made himself guilty. In his "protest that the Christmas story was being taught in public schools" he wrote to the committee of the Kingston board of education, "that the principle of separation of church and state which is one of the bulwarks of our democracy should at all times be strictly adhered to, and that nothing of a religious character should enter our public school system." This was also "the opinion of the other two rabbis of Kingston." Still the *Journal* in its editorial does not once refer to this great principle of our constitution. Instead, it defends the singing of Christmas carols in our public schools, and dwells on the celebration of the Christmas festival by all persons, whether it has a religious significance to them or not, and by all faiths, whether Christian or non-Christian. Christmas is to this daily paper "a day for little children — not of any faith, not excluding any faith. It is part of our life."

But what of the principle of separation of church and state, this bulwark of our democracy? It is being endangered by the desire for the realization of a national religion and a world-wide brotherhood in a new world-order. Such a new order of things will still be designated a "Christian" world-order, but it will not have as one of its pillars the principle of separation of church and state. It will not permit anyone to protest religious instruction in our public schools because of its sectarian character. Sectarianism will be taboo in this new world order. The indoctrination, which a child has received from its parents, will also not be given any consideration. Let us not overlook the fact that the protest of Rabbi Englander goes back to the experience of a Jewish mother with her child of kindergarten age and its bed-time prayers, "one containing Christological references." Are our public schools authorized to counteract and even supplant the religious instruction of a mother, Christian or non-Christian, or of a religious teacher, to whom parents have entrusted the indoctrination of their child? Where this is done — and it is done in our public schools from kindergarten on and in our colleges and universities — there we cannot anymore speak of religious liberty. Religious liberty consists in nothing less than the privileges of parents and religious teachers to indoctrinate the children entrusted to their care with the tenets which they uphold and cherish. Liberty of conscience in religious

matters is the very core of religious liberty. Religious liberty again is the corner-stone of the separation of church and state.

P. PETERS.

Dean Inge's Attack on Lutheranism. — On November 6, 1944, *Time* Magazine printed an excerpt from an article published by the former Dean W. R. Inge in the *Church of England* newspaper, reprinted by *The Churchman* in this country. We take notice of this attack on Lutheranism, which *Time* Magazine characterizes as "pungent and provocative," not because of its loathsome charges against the person of Luther, whom Dean Inge calls the "coarse and foulmouthed leader of a revolution," whose "utterances on sexual morality escape censure by being absolutely unprintable," but because of its direct attack on the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*. Personal vituperations of the character of Luther have been made in the past and may be expected to recur periodically in the future. They have been adequately answered by competent historians after due investigation.

We take notice of Dean Inge's attack on the doctrine of justification because it should open our eyes to the spirit of the theology that is impregnating the very air we are breathing.

According to the Dean it is a mistake to make the *Atonement* the "central doctrine of Christianity." That place should be accorded to the *Incarnation*; otherwise the whole scheme of salvation will be thrown "out of gear."

To make the Incarnation the central doctrine of Christianity reveals a peculiar mixture of physical and mystical ideas about our redemption. By becoming physically united with a human nature, in His conception and birth, Christ, the Son of God, did actually reunite mankind to God. This is then repeated mystically in all Christians, who are being perfected unto a divine life and condition by a contemplation of the divine glory of Christ and an imitation of His example. In this mystic science they are consecrated and inaugurated to realize more and more a deiformity in their life and person. — These were ideas developed in the eastern churches of old; and these seem to be the ideas advocated by Dean Inge.

It is true that Scripture comforts us with the doctrine of a mystic union of the Triune God with the believers. Christ promises as much, and Paul uses terms like: Christ is formed in us (Gal. 4, 19), and: beholding the glory of the Lord we are changed into the same image (2 Cor. 3, 18). But all of this is never based on the Incarnation of Christ. When Paul briefly sums up his Gospel preaching he says that Christ was evidently set forth by him as *crucified* (Gal. 3, 1), and: he, Paul, determined not to know anything save Jesus Christ, and him *crucified* (1 Cor. 2, 2). Thus, after all, Redemption and Atonement, not the Incarnation, must be accorded the pivotal position in Christianity.

In perfect alignment with Dean Inge's concept of Christianity, as just indicated, is his censure of the Lutheran doctrine of justification, which

he calls a "forensic and legalistic theory" and a "travesty" of the Paulinian doctrine; while "Calvinism is a fine manly creed which leads nations to great prosperity."

What is his objection to the Lutheran doctrine of justification? It is this that Luther taught a "righteousness not *imparted* but *imputed* vicariously," as a result of which Lutherans "worship a God who is neither just nor merciful."*

Justification by an *imparted* righteousness is the old Catholic error of *gratia infusa*, while Paul without equivocation presents justification as a forensic, declaratory act of God. In lieu of many passages that might be cited we refer to Rom. 4, 3-8: "What saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it *was counted (elogisthē)* unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not *reckoned (logizetai)* of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith *is counted (logizetai)* for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God *imputeth (logizetai)* righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities *are forgiven (aphethēsan)* and whose sins *are covered (epēkalyphthēsan)*. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord *will not impute (logisētai)* sin." Note the synonyms, which we italicized in the foregoing, and the corresponding Greek terms. Not one of them hints at an *imparting* of righteousness.

All the vituperations heaped on the person of Luther will do comparatively little harm. They will inevitably recoil on him that makes them, as the reaction of the press clearly indicates in the present case (as far as it came to our notice). But the attack on the doctrine of justification should rouse us to renewed vigilance. If we neglect this article, then Lutheranism is worse than "nearly dead," and no "next swing of the pendulum" will be required to "put an end to Luther's influence in Germany" and elsewhere.

Naturally, our preaching of justification, in order to be Biblical, dare not stop with the mere announcement that God imputes to us a foreign righteousness, the one prepared for us by the vicarious life and death of our Savior; it must lead over into an exhortation for sanctification. This is the burden of all of St. Paul's epistles: "that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again" (2 Cor. 5, 15). Jesus expressed the truth by saying that he to whom much has been forgiven will also love much (Lc. 7, 40ff.). Any one who fails to show in his subsequent conduct an appreciation for the free forgiveness of his sins will thereby forfeit his justification (cf. Mt. 18, 23ff.).

It cannot but produce the most disastrous results if we separate sanctification from justification. True, the two must always be clearly

* The *Time* excerpt makes this sentence characterize Lutheranism, while in the article as published by the *Churchman* it would seem to refer to Calvinism.

distinguished. To define justification, as Dean Inge does in agreement with the Roman Church, as an "imparting" of righteousness is a gross mixing of Law and Gospel. On the other hand, to urge sanctification as something not only distinct but separate from justification, as something merely added to justification, will degrade God's imputing of Christ's righteousness to us to a mere book transaction, will rob this very heart of the Gospel proclamation of its life-giving power. If anyone would preach about justification and sanctification in this fashion: God has freely forgiven us all our sins without any merit or worthiness on our part, but now we must also endeavor to lead a holy life — he need not wonder if people become pharisaic in their sanctification, or, on the other hand, make the application, as some did even in Paul's days: "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?" (Rom. 6, 1).

Justification is an "imputing" of righteousness, once publicly announced by God to the world in the resurrection of Christ and still proclaimed continually in the Gospel. The Gospel, because it conveys God's justification to us, is filled with divine power, raising a man dead in sin to new spiritual life. May God graciously preserve to us this heritage of the Lutheran Reformation, then charges like those coming from Dean Inge need not perturb us greatly. M.

The Doctrinal Affirmation. — Ever since it was announced that representatives of the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church had agreed on a unified statement of doctrine, publication of this "single document" has been eagerly awaited by all who have been following the movement toward Lutheran union. This "Doctrinal Affirmation" was published early in October and has recently been sent to all pastors of our Wisconsin Synod.

According to the foreword the procedure followed in drawing up this Affirmation consisted "chiefly in inserting into the framework of the Brief Statement the additional truths and clarifications contained in the other documents," *viz.*, the Minneapolis Theses of 1930, the Declaration and Resolutions of the A. L. C. of 1938, and the Resolutions of the Missouri Synod of 1938. It will therefore be interesting to note to what extent the Brief Statement has been modified by these insertions, and what the implications of these modifications may be.

Here it is indeed gratifying to observe that many articles of the original Brief Statement have been left unchanged, and that applies not only to points on which there was little or no difference in the past (the articles of God, of Creation, of Man and of Sin, of Redemption, of Faith in Christ, of Good Works, of Church and State, of the Symbols of the Lutheran Church), but also on matters which were in controversy (the articles of the Public Ministry, of Sunday, of Open Questions). But of greater importance is the fact that in a matter where there was so much controversy — the Doctrine of Conversion — the presentation of the Brief Statement is accepted with but one minor addition, a specific rejection of the Cal-

vinistic error of irresistible grace, an antithesis to which no Synodical Conference Lutheran will take exception. We are also happy to record that the article on Justification has been retained verbatim, and that in the section on Election the Brief Statement's rejection of *intuitu fidei* stands, together with Acts 13, 48 as proof passage.

All of these gratifying achievements to which we wish to give ungrudging recognition do not relieve us of the necessity of subjecting the changes which do appear to closest scrutiny. Before one can arrive at a final verdict it must even be asked whether, in view of later developments, articles written in 1932 still cover all issues adequately. The simultaneous negotiations which the A. L. C. is carrying on with the United Lutheran Church on the question of Inspiration make it necessary to weigh this article in the Affirmation with special care. The future relations of the A. L. C. to its sister synods will also, in the event of its acceptance of the Affirmation, have greater bearing than ever upon our evaluation of its position. But in all this it should be far easier than before to retain an objective attitude in the studies which must now be undertaken. E. R.

The Absoluteness of the Christian Religion. — The absoluteness of the Christian revelation can not be established on the basis of its conformity to reason. Sin has set definite limits to the reliability of human reason (cf. 1 Cor. 1, 23–29; Heb. 11, 3; Formula of Concord 592 — Trgl. p. 886 — 17). We know that “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him” (1 Cor. 2, 14). Furthermore, the absoluteness of Christian revelation can not be established on the basis of the cultural, social, and moral values of the Christian religion. Important as these matters are, they do not establish absoluteness. The absoluteness of the Christian revelation is based solely upon the faith in the truth of God's revelation in Jesus Christ. Only if we believe that Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and that no man comes to the Father except through Christ, can we claim absoluteness for the Christian message. . . . In the discussion with the non-Christian world we must never boast in our intellectual superiority. For whenever we speak of the reasonableness of Christianity we make sinful man the standard of reference for faith. In every discussion with the non-Christian world we can only proclaim our faith in the absolute truth of God's revelation in Christ. Christ alone is superior to all religion. He alone judges pagan religion as well as much that is degenerate in our empirical Christianity. For all of us, non-Christians and Christians alike, are subject to God's holy will and judgment. If we realize that, we shall never boast of our intellectual or moral superiority, even in the field of religion. For we know that we all live by divine grace and forgiveness. “That according as it is written, He that boasteth let him boast in the Lord” (1 Cor. 1, 31).

The foregoing splendid presentation of some basic principles is contained in a book review which we read in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, and which we herewith pass on to our readers for earnest contemplation.

M.

Büchertisch

Luther and the Scriptures. By Dr. M. Reu, Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa. The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio. Price, \$1.00.

"In which sense and to what extent was the Bible the authority for Luther?" This question the late Dr. Reu endeavors to answer in this his last work. Inseparably conjoined with this question is the other as to Luther's opinion concerning inspiration. Did Luther teach verbal inspiration? Did he teach verbal inspiration as a "dictation" or as "a unique cooperation of the Holy Spirit and the human writers"? The author has limited himself to the task of answering just these questions, which are so very much in the foreground in our days, although the title of his treatise, "Luther and the Scriptures," covers a much larger area. This limitation of the theme nevertheless involves important phases and aspects, such as a discussion of Luther's preface to the Epistle of James, of Luther's famous answer in Worms: "Unless I am convinced by testimony from Scripture or evident reason," of the question, whether Luther really ever said that the prophets erred in some of their statements and prophecies, a question which is being answered in the affirmative by a number of Lutheran theologians of our day.

The great value of this treatise lies in this that it rests upon the sources. The author, first of all, lets Luther and Lutheran theologians answer the question concerning the authority and the inspiration of the Bible. From these sources we receive answers to the questions whether Luther considered those parts of Scripture that contain "secondary matters," "which do not concern our salvation," errorless, whether Luther ascribed absolute inerrancy to our present text, or only to the original drafts of the Biblical Books, and whether Luther emphasized human cooperation. Especially in seeking an answer to the question whether other Lutheran theologians were on the road to the mechanical theory of inspiration, do we appreciate the quotations from sources which ordinarily are not accessible to theologians in our country.

It is self-evident that the author finally draws his own conclusions from these quotations and their sources. From the very outset, in his short preface, he presents the reader with a very definite answer to the question concerning verbal inspiration and the theory of dictation in Luther's writings. "Luther maintained the first and rejected the second" he informs us (p. 3). He repeats this answer in a lengthier summary: "Both facts were certain to Luther: the divine origin of Scriptures and its resultant inerrancy, on the one hand, and, on the other, the active cooperation of the human personality of the authors in their composition" (p. 114).

In substantiation of these two facts Dr. Reu in the fourth chapter of his treatise: "Scriptures Remained Luther's Sole Authority Until The

End Of His Life" proves on the one hand from Luther's writings, that the Reformer and the Christian Church '*refer all of Scriptures to the Holy Ghost . . . that Holy Scripture has been spoken by the Holy Ghost*' (p. 63). We hear Luther say: 'I see standing before my eyes *clear and mighty Scriptures, plain words, that have taken my conscience captive* so that I could not depart from them even for an angel from heaven' (p. 61). And in his last sermon in Wittenberg, on January 17, 1546, we behold him speaking "more disparagingly of reason than ever before, to see how at the very end of his life he clung to the literalness of Scripture as the only authority in matters of faith" (p. 64).

Yet on the other hand it is Dr. Reu's aim to convince the opponents of verbal inspiration "that one can maintain verbal inspiration and at the same time reject the theory of dictation" (p. 3). Therefore he devotes a whole chapter to those statements of Luther, which go to show that "Luther knows of no mechanical or dictated inspiration," that "he rather emphasizes human cooperation" (pp. 109-116). The cooperation, to which Dr. Reu is referring, is for instance that of the prophets, consisting in their "studying," as Dr. Reu puts it, "Moses industriously, and the later prophets studying the earlier ones, thus furnishing themselves, to a certain degree, with ideas for what, at the appointed time, they wrote down under the guidance of the Spirit" (p. 111). Or it consists in this "that Moses did not simply frame his laws as the result of divine dictation, but that in their drafting he himself cooperated to a very marked degree" (p. 112). And if anyone is of the opinion that such a "cooperation" is contrary to the doctrine of verbal inspiration, he will do well to read Luther's words on the "many things that had been written before Moses," which "Moses brought into good order, took away, and added what and how God commanded him" (p. 163), and Dr. Reu's additional comment: "In spite of this concession concerning the authorship of Genesis it was, according to Luther, the Holy Ghost who arranged these stories and wrote them; they are His word" (p. 163).

Yet the reader will want to know whether the other Lutheran theologians followed Luther in teaching this "active cooperation" or whether they taught a "mechanical dictation theory." Again the author devotes a whole chapter to this question. He sums up his findings in these words: "With the exception of the Thuringian Confession of 1549 no Lutheran theologian up to 1550, as far as we know, taught an inspiration by dictation" (p. 128). The Thuringian Confession, referred to here, turns out to be the only writing in which the author finds "a purely mechanical conception of inspiration" (p. 127). After having discussed other Lutheran writings of the sixteenth century, he brings his whole treatise to a close with the statement: "As long as the divine authority of the Bible is maintained, and as long as it is conceded that it is the product of a unique cooperation of the Holy Spirit and the human writers and, therefore, as a whole and in all its details the Word of God without contradiction and error . . . so long one is in harmony with the best

Lutheran theologians from Luther up to the year 1570" (pp. 131/2). And as to the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century, Dr. Reu assures us in his "Notes," added to the text of his treatise and covering no less than 70 pages, that also these theologians "emphasized the fact that the holy writers, instead of being dead, unknowing, and unwilling tools in the hand of the Holy Spirit, were knowing and willing instruments" (p. 166).

But does this fact forbid us to speak of verbal inspiration as a "dictation." Did Luther ever use this term? Dr. Reu informs us that it was Moldaenke, who in 1936 called attention to the fact that Luther "in a single passage, as far as we now know, uses the term *calamus* in speaking of the Biblical writer and his activity," and in doing so "uses the terminology of the medieval theology, of his former theological teachers, . . . the nouns *calamus* and *secretarius* and the verb *dictare*" often being found in this connection (p. 114). And as to the use of these terms by the Church Fathers and some dogmaticians of our own church, Dr. Reu adds, "this is by no means to be considered wrong in every respect. It is wrong only, if one, by the use of these terms, degrades them to merely mechanical instruments and machines who wrote without participation of their soul life. It is correct and an expression of a Biblical truth if these terms are used merely to designate human instrumentality without any definition of the latter" (p. 167).

Yet when understanding the word "dictation," even as our dogmaticians want to be understood, does not this activity of the Holy Spirit exclude all "cooperation" on the part of the holy writers? Can we at all speak of the cooperation of the sacred writers, *i. e.*, can we call Moses the author of the Pentateuch and St. John the author of the Fourth Gospel? Dr. Engelder, who asks these questions in his valuable work on Verbal Inspiration, answer them in the affirmative. We read: "Did the holy writers cooperate? Yes, as instruments; no, if that means that they produced anything of their own. Two factors? Yes, one the instrument of the other; no, if it means independent factors. May Moses and St. John be called authors? Stoeckhardt does not hesitate to call them 'the holy authors'." Yet Dr. Engelder also points out — and we shall do well to heed his words — that the moderns use the same phraseology, still "do not speak the language of the Scripture and the Church" (*Concordia Theological Monthly*, 1942, p. 505).

After a thorough study of this treatise by Dr. Reu we have become convinced that the author, whenever he draws conclusions from his sources, is speaking the language of the Scriptures and the Church. We therefore can also say of this treatise: "A book like this is necessary." It is necessary in our days of doubt and unbelief, and should be read above all by those who have a wrong conception of verbal inspiration as taught by Lutheran theologians, as well as by those who harbor doubts concerning the correctness, yea scripturalness of a doctrine, which has been the heritage of the Lutheran Church since its incipency.

P. PETERS.

"The Five Books Of Moses." By Oswald T. Allis. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, 1943. Price, \$3.00.

Dr. Allis, a conservative and well-known Old Testament scholar, presents this work as a "re-examination" of the higher critical view of the Pentateuch. Since the time (1753) that the French physician Astruc made an attempt to analyze the Book of Genesis, almost 200 years have passed, in which the critical theory of the Pentateuch has gained more and more ground, until its "findings" are now accepted by most experts and specialists, by many ministers and teachers, and by not a few laymen. We agree with the author that the re-examination of this "important and widely accepted theory should be welcomed by friend and foe alike."

Both friend and foe should know, however, that this "re-examination" is a frontal attack on the critical theory of the Pentateuch. The author nowhere leaves his readers in doubt as to the issue involved and as to the purpose of his re-examination. The whole design of his re-examination is to make very "important matters clear to the readers." These important matters pertain to the authorship and the religion of the Pentateuch. While the Pentateuch, and for that matter the whole Bible, wherever they speak of these two important matters, claim Moses as author and the "supernatural redemption" as "the major theme" of the Pentateuch, modern critics deny the authorship of the Pentateuch on the part of Moses and teach "the doctrine of naturalistic evolution" as the basic principle of the five books of Moses. Dr. Allis succeeds admirably in bringing this important issue to the forefront as "fundamental to the whole problem of Biblical criticism."

The contents of the book are divided into three parts: In Part I the author discusses "The Documentary Hypothesis" with its variations in divine names, diction, alleged doublets and documents. Part II is entitled: "The Development or Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis" with its three major subparts: 1. "The Religion of Israel in the Pre-Prophetic Period," 2. "Prophetic Religion and the Reform of Josiah," and 3. "Priestly Religion in the Post-Exilic Period." Part III represents "The Present State of the Problem." Under this heading questions pertaining to "The Pentateuch and Archaeology," "The Pentateuch and Naturalistic Evolution," "The Fundamental and Abiding Issue in the Problem of the Pentateuch" and "The Final Question, 'What think Ye of Christ?'" are raised and answered.

A re-examination always harbors a challenge of the correctness of a theory and a promise of new light to be shed on the whole question. In both cases we can expect new arguments against the theory under attack, and new arguments in favor of the position which is being defended. Such arguments are new in a twofold sense. We can speak of them as relatively and comparatively new, or as new in the absolute sense of the word, based on new discoveries and finds. Dr. Allis has devoted a whole life-time of study to the defense of Biblical tradition and therefore is not only able

to re-examine old arguments, but also to advance new arguments. Such arguments are, in the opinion of your reviewer, "The Methods of Bible Translators" (p. 72), which are set forth to illustrate the fallacy and futility of the method of higher critics in their evaluation of synonyms and the general use of words in a given text; the "Aramaisms" of the Ras Shamra alphabetic tablets of the fifteenth century, which when found in the *Bible* are regarded as a proof of late date by the higher critics (p. 214); the names of some of the Mosaic sacrifices and the title "chief of the priests," as found in the Ras Shamra tablets, giving the lie to the post-exilic date of the priestly code invented by higher criticism. Dr. Allis' whole chapter on "The Pentateuch and Archaeology" brings new evidence to bear on the credibility and early date of the Pentateuch (comp. pp. 205-227). Much of what the author has to say on "The Antiquity of Writing" etc. is only comparatively new, yet it impresses itself upon the mind of the reader as something quite new. Dr. Allis' work is also up to date in his examination of the "suprahistorical" domain sponsored by Barth and his school. We are greatly indebted to the author for an excellent definition and judgment of this new term and concept in modern theology. It reads: "This claim that the supernaturalism of the Bible is suprahistorical is an attempt to combine naturalism and supernaturalism" (p. 250). And again: "A Christianity whose supernaturalism is *un*-historical or *suprahistorical* is not the Christianity of the Bible nor of that Christian Church which derives the content of its faith from the Bible" (p. 253).

Thus the author constantly holds up to the view of his readers these two main issues, the authorship and the religion of the Pentateuch, and is well justified to say at the close of his work: "Despite the most confident denials of a rationalistically controlled literary and historical criticism, the majority of the Christians throughout the world continue and will continue to believe and maintain that the Pentateuch is not a late, anonymous, untrustworthy composite, but is correctly described as 'The Five Books of Moses', the man of God. And those who hold this time honored and thoroughly Biblical view may well rejoice that they are today in a far better position to give a reason for believing that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, than was the case a century or even a generation ago" (p. 254).

P. PETERS.

Scripture Cannot Be Broken.—Six Objections to Verbal Inspiration Examined in the Light of Scripture. 498 pages, 6×9. Blue cloth. Title in gold on front cover and backbone. Price, \$3.00. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri.

In 1941 and 1942 Dr. Theodore Engelder published a series of articles in the *Concordia Theological Monthly* under the title "Verbal Inspiration — a Stumbling Block to the Jews and Foolishness to the Greeks." These articles are here presented to the public in book form under an abbreviated title, although the original title is still retained for the Prolog. In addition

to the articles themselves, the book carries a Preface by Dr. W. Arndt, a table of Contents, and a valuable Index, completed by Professor Emeritus Wm. Schaller. We wonder why Dr. Engelder's name does not appear on the title page, while both the front cover and the backbone present it.

As both the original and the revised title together with the subtitle indicate, the book is chiefly apologetic in character. It demolishes the arguments of the opponents of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures. It does so successfully and thoroughly.

In the first chapter, which is by far the longest of the book (pp. 7 to 225), Dr. Engelder takes up the question "Does the Bible contain errors?" By irrefutable evidence he establishes the fact that in numerous cases the critics have been found as blundering in their historical dates and as very limited in their knowledge of natural science. Yet, he is careful to point out that our faith in the Bible does not rest on any outside corroborative evidence for its statements. Even though all such human testimony should apparently go directly counter to the Bible, the Bible would remain absolutely true. Yet we rejoice to see that it can be demonstrated how "those who uphold the thesis that Scripture is in conflict with history, other sciences, or even with itself are in conflict with sound reason" (p. 78).

In the second chapter, pp. 226 to 248, the author takes up the question "Has the Bible moral blemishes?" — blemishes at which the critics pretend to be horrified. Yet, so he is able to show, in their attacks on the ethics of the Bible "some of the moderns stoop to unethical manipulations of the facts" (p. 243).

Then follows a brief chapter on so-called "Trivialities" contained in the Bible (pp. 249 to 272).

Chapter IV, pp. 273 to 300, summarizes "The disastrous results of criticising and correcting Scripture."

Of the following three chapters we merely list the self-explanatory headings. "V. Is verbal inspiration mechanical inspiration?" — "VI. Does verbal inspiration imply an atomistic conception and use of Scripture?" — "VII. Does verbal inspiration establish a 'legalistic authority of the letter?'"

We cannot refrain from quoting more extensively from the last chapter, which calls attention to the fact that just now the enemies of Christ are focusing all their attacks on this one point of verbal and plenary inspiration. "The old evil Foe means deadly woe. He would break down Verbal Inspiration in order to break down the Christians' faith" (p. 428).

"The war is on. Are we prepared for the conflict? They are not prepared who fail to realize that the age-long battle of the Church for her life is today being fought on the question of inspiration. On this front the enemy is concentrating his forces. He is still attacking the deity of Christ and other fundamental doctrines, but at present he seems to be chiefly concerned about getting the Church to discard Verbal Inspiration. . . . This doctrine has always been attacked. . . . But at no time has such a concerted and determined effort been made to remove it as in our

generation. Here is where the Church must marshal her forces. — Do we realize that the enemy hates and abominates Verbal Inspiration and is sparing no efforts to get the Church to renounce and discard it? The moderns are convinced that Verbal Inspiration is a wicked and a harmful doctrine, and they are determined to drive the 'foul spook' out of the Church. They are very tolerant with regard to other doctrines. Their principle is that men must be permitted to teach what they please; but they will not tolerate the preaching of Verbal Inspiration. Here tolerance ceases to be a virtue. Against this doctrine they have declared war to the death. . . . They are exulting over the great conquests they have already made in their holy war . . . and go forth to silence the few who still teach Verbal Inspiration. . . . Again, we must know the exact point of the attack. That is the inspiration *of the words*. The moderns are very willing to let us teach that the Bible is inspired and is a good book, a holy book. But they will not have us teach that the words of Scripture were chosen by the Holy Spirit and express the thought as perfectly and infallibly as only God can express it. . . . The moderns are willing to let us retain any kind of vague inspiration, if it only be not *Verbal* Inspiration. The strategical point in the battle for the Bible lies here: Is the Scripture absolutely infallible? Are the words of Scripture the identical words of God?" (p. 428 to 430).

"But the victory will be ours if we employ against the tactics of the foe *the divine strategy: bring the almighty Word into action*. . . . How shall we prove the truth of Verbal Inspiration? Being a teaching of Scripture, it carries within itself divine power. It proves itself. All that we need to do is to proclaim: 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' and let this Word do its Work. It has the divine power to convince men of its truth and produce their joyful acceptance of it. . . . We are asked to surrender (or modify) the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration. Our unbelieving, proud flesh asks it. We are sorely tempted to do it. But in this fearful conflict, which tries the soul and rends the heart, we shall gain the strength to overcome our flesh from this very doctrine itself. It speaks with divine power to our troubled soul. Let that power work in you! . . . When a man accepts Verbal Inspiration, a miracle is being wrought. Let us not attempt to *argue* men into accepting it. Our words of human wisdom cannot perform miracles. It takes almighty power to subdue the ratiocinations of the flesh. And this almighty power lies in the teaching of Scripture on Inspiration. Let us apply the power! — We can add nothing to it by our reasoning powers. But this great and glorious thing God permits us to do: we can proclaim His truth" (p. 440 to 443).

In reading the book a few minor mistakes were noticed, which, however, do not disturb. To show their insignificance we list them. Page 94, footnote 64, "eyes" for "ears"; p. 167, line 17, the verb form is incomplete; on p. 239, line 25, the archaic "denounced" occurs. — One may also question whether the story of Dives and Lazarus must be considered as actual history (p. 121).

Dr. Engelder, gathering the attacks against Verbal Inspiration from a wide field and quoting from numerous sources, has done the church of our day an invaluable service by his withering rebuttal of the opponents' specious arguments. M.

The Arabs. A Short History by Philip K. Hitti. Princeton, 1944. Princeton University Press. Price \$2.00.

This fascinating book of 224 pages on the Arabs, for whose lands "medieval times with their Dark Ages, held no blackout," is a version of Mr. Hitti's monumental *History of the Arabs*. It serves well as an introduction for the general reader and also for the student of medieval church history and of the Mohammedan religion. The study of medieval church history and even of the period of the Reformation requires a knowledge of Moslem military and religious conquests. The ever widening and farreaching influence of these conquests on European culture and scholastic theology give the reader an indispensable insight into various phases of European history. A mere reference to Luther's and Melancthon's study of Mohammedanism remind us Lutherans especially, not to neglect the study of this people and their religion in an age which is marked by "the passing of human isolation."

We agree with the author that much of that which is taught by the Koran and Islam is based on Jewish-Christian tradition, in as far as this tradition was accessible to Mohammed. We however are at variance with the author that "the message of the Arabian Muhammad was a parallel of the message of the Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament" (p. 25), and that "a faithful Moslem could with but few scruples subscribe to most of the tenets of Christian belief" (p. 4). The Koran with its denial of Christ, the Son of God and the Savior of mankind, testifies to the fact that the Gospel is also to the Moslem a "stumbling-block" and "foolishness" (1 Cor. 1, 23), although it alone is able to lift the blackout, by which the Moslem World has been and is enveloped. This "Short History," describing also very vividly the *decline* of the Moslem Empire, pictures this blackout to us in its moral aspects. P. PETERS.

Northwestern Lutheran Annual for the Year 1945. Published by the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Price: 15 Cents.

Gemeindeblatt-Kalender auf das Jahr 1945 nach Christi Geburt. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Allgemeinen Ev. Luth. Synode von Wisconsin und anderen Staaten. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Price: 15 Cents.

The Lutheran Annual 1945. Editor: O. A. Dorn, Statistical Editor: Armin Schroeder. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Price: 25 Cents.

Amerikanischer Kalender für deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1945 nach der Geburt unseres Herrn Jesu Christi. Literarischer Redakteur: D. J. C. Müller, Statistischer Redakteur: P. Armin Schroeder. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Price: 25 Cents.

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben von der Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Synode von
Wisconsin und anderen Staaten.

Jahrgang 42

April 1945

Nummer 2

ADDRESS

Delivered in the Seminary Chapel for
the Closing Service, March 19, 1945

The average age of the graduating class is about 25 years. If we let our mind go back 25 years in the history of our Seminary we shall find that our school just then suffered a severe loss. Two members of the faculty were called out of this life in quick succession. In February the president of the institution died, Prof. John Schaller, and within two months Prof. Herman Meyer followed him in death. Only two members of the then faculty remained.

The succeeding years continued to be years of trial. There were internal dissensions within the faculty, but we shall not dwell on them now; we shall limit our attention to outward difficulties.

Due to a growing enrollment, living quarters, classroom space, library accommodations became very cramped. A building program had to be undertaken. The Synod decided to relocate its school, and built up the new establishment on the present site.

More important was the change in the personnel of the faculty. The two men who remained in 1920, though still among the living today, are no longer serving as teachers. New men were called, moreover the faculty was increased to five members. But of the new men so called one had to sever his connections with the Seminary and three were called to their heavenly home. As a result, not one member of the present faculty was in service when the Seminary suffered the severe loss twenty-five years ago.

Nevertheless, although the Seminary was relocated, and the personnel of the faculty completely changed, and in addition a transition in the language of the classroom took place from German to English, *the spirit of our school is the same today that*

it was twenty-five years ago, the same that it was from the founding of the Seminary more than eighty years ago, and the same that we hope it will remain to the end.

This sameness of spirit may conveniently be summed up in the three terms with which our fathers were wont to describe the fundamental agreement which unites all Christians. There is in the professed attitude of the school complete agreement in the personal foundation, in the dogmatic foundation, in the organic foundation of our faith and doctrine. We briefly look at these.

The personal foundation of our faith and doctrine is none other than Christ, the Son of God and Mary's Son, our Savior.

Who is this Jesus Christ? That He is a true man will hardly be denied by anyone. The account of His earthly career as given in the four gospels may be questioned by doubters concerning some of the details, but all accept it as generally correct, as recording the story of a real man. But that there dwelt in this man all the fulness of the godhead bodily, that has been doubted by many from the earliest times down, and is being ridiculed by ever increasing numbers today. Yet Jesus is the Son of God. In His person two natures are wonderfully united. They are not fused one into the other, nor are they, on the other hand, merely connected in external contact. They are united, so that the one fully participates in the characteristics of the other. When Jesus died, *e. g.*, Paul could rightly charge the Jews that they had crucified the Lord of glory; while on the other hand, the Son of Man can claim all power in heaven and on earth.

This Jesus Christ is pictured to us in two different states. He is pictured as He lived like a man among men, so that people were not able to recognize in Him more than a common man. Only on very definite occasions did rays of divine glory flash from His person. He deliberately emptied Himself and refrained from the use of His divine majesty, till He died the accursed death on the cross. After that He was exalted to unspeakable glory by the Father, so that now all traces of human limitations have disappeared completely and He leads a life in truly Godlike fashion.

These two states of Jesus Christ serve the sole purpose that He may be our Savior in the threefold capacity of prophet, priest, and king. Very few people deny that He was a great prophet,

in fact they often make so much noise about His prophetic office that the unwary listener may be deceived to assume that they accept Him wholeheartedly, while in reality they reject His vicarious self-sacrifice and use their loud acclaim of Him as the great prophet merely as a screen to hide their denial of His true mediatorship.

Concerning this personal foundation of faith and doctrine there has been no change in the attitude of the Seminary since the last twenty-five years, yes, since its very beginning. Christ, and Christ alone, the God-Man, the Savior, rules in the lecture halls and in the dormitory as Prophet, Priest, and King. Not only does the professional work of every teacher, no matter what may be his particular subject, center in Christ, but Christ is also the heart of our personal lives. Though there may be vast differences in the manner of approach, in the method of presentation, in the range of scope: the personal foundation of faith and doctrine accepted in our Seminary today is the same as it was twenty-five years ago.

We turn to the dogmatic foundation. It is briefly this: that a sinner is declared righteous before God without any merit or worthiness of his own by the pure grace of God because of the sacrifice of Christ. The sinner appropriates this justification through faith, and in the strength of it out of gratitude toward God will lead a life of consecration.

Justification is a declaratory act, it is an imputing of a foreign righteousness, not an imparting of a new quality. It changes the status of a sinner before God. This judgment of God over every sinner was pronounced by God when He raised Jesus from the dead. Jesus had taken the guilt of the whole world upon Himself, the sins of every individual were imputed to Him; in the resurrection on Easter morning God absolved Him from all His assumed guilt, *i. e.*, in fact He absolved every sinner from his actual guilt, because it had completely and to God's full satisfaction been wiped out by the vicarious death of Jesus.

This verdict of God is announced to all sinners in the Gospel. They are invited to accept it in simple faith. No conditions are attached, neither of furnishing a previous merit, be it ever so small, nor of showing a subsequent worthiness. It is simply offered; and in this Gospel offer resides the power of God to create

faith in the heart of the sinner, which trusts — sometimes very weakly and tremblingly — yet trusts in the foreign righteousness thus offered to him.

This same faith then impels him to lead a new life in agreement with the righteousness which he has received. The blessing conferred on a sinner in the verdict of justification, the happiness which this assurance brings into the heart tottering on the verge of despair, is so overwhelming that a new birth, a new creation takes place. The erstwhile sinner begins to battle against the sinful lusts which still assail him from within and from without, which had formerly produced the guilt that drove him to despair, but which now, by the Holy Spirit, he feels the urge and the strength to resist. Thus he voices his gratitude for the unspeakable favor he has received and is receiving daily in his justification. His sanctification is not something which he on his part adds to his justification: it flows and grows out of his justification as does the fruit out of a tree.

In this dogmatic foundation there has never been a change in our Seminary. This is the truth which has ever been inculcated as basic and normative for the work of future pastors, and it is the solid foundation on which every member of the faculty personally stakes his own spiritual life. Professionally and personally we are filled with a holy horror against everything that smacks of self-righteousness in any form.

There remains the organic foundation, which is the holy Scripture. The holy Scripture is the Word of God, given to us by inspiration. It is the means through which God deals with a sinful world in conveying to men His grace and imparting to them His Holy Ghost. It is God's special revelation to us. Every statement of the Scripture is God's Word which cannot be broken, to add to which would be presumptuous blasphemy, just as would be the opposite, the denial of anything contained in the Scripture. The Scripture must ever remain the source and norm of all our teaching and preaching. Our Seminary aims to impart to our students a reverential awe and at the same time a warm love for the Word of God, so that one little word of the Scriptures means more to them than heaven and earth.

This has been the spirit of our Seminary from the beginning. It may be important to know something *about* the Scriptures, but

it is incomparably more important to know the Scriptures themselves. It may be interesting to know how other men have understood, or misunderstood, the Scriptures, but it is imperative that everyone, teacher or student, search the Scriptures directly, delve into it, imbibe it.

While thus we maintain that the spirit of the Seminary has not changed, and dare not change, we admit that the *spiritual gifts* have changed.

We gratefully acknowledge that God has in the past blessed our Seminary in the members of its faculty with some outstanding gifts. A brief review will stimulate our gratitude.

Anyone, though only superficially acquainted with the history of our Wisconsin Synod, will know that during its first years there was some lack of clarity in doctrinal matters. We need not go into details now. Then God placed into our Seminary Dr. Adolph Hoenecke, whom He had endowed with a love of the truth and a keen mind which could clearly grasp the truth of the Gospel, could express it in a lucid way, and present it to the students in lectures that carried conviction. Under Dr. Hoenecke's leadership our Synod became, what it always wanted to be, consciously Lutheran in doctrine.

Later, about forty-five years ago, two men entered the faculty almost simultaneously, each of whom was destined to leave a lasting mark. Prof. J. Koehler pointed out to us the importance of history. Sin and grace are spiritual forces in the world. History does not consist in this that we merely catalog events in their chronological order, but that we recognize how ideas, true or false, influence, hinder, or help the progress of the church — a fact which should put us on our guard even against the slightest aberration from the truth both in theory and in practice; for the word of error, as Paul says, will eat, will have pasture, as doth a canker.

Prof. Aug. Pieper stressed the need of a direct study of the Scriptures. The purity of doctrine will become deceptive if it is not ever, by each individual student and teacher, drawn afresh from its fountain in the Word of God. The books of the Bible must not be treated atomistically as a collection of proof texts: they must be studied in their connection, the line of thought in the individual books and the progression of thought must be carefully

noted. Particularly did Prof. Pieper, as his commentary on the second half of Isaiah shows, point out the Gospel content of the Old Testament. Also history, in order to remain divinely sane, must always gauge its methods and results by the standards provided in the Word.

Through the service of these three men in particular did God imprint a certain character on the methods of our Seminary, which we gratefully acknowledge and which we should diligently cultivate. These men were gifts to our Seminary, not for their day and time only, but for us to employ to the advantage of our school for years to come. We cannot duplicate these gifts in our persons, but we can profit by them.

To none of the members of the present faculty has God given such outstanding abilities as to those three men. He does not demand of us that we be pioneers in any field or intellectual giants as they were. God may have created us pigmies by comparison. Yet one thing He does demand of us: that we faithfully continue the work along the lines indicated by these gifts of the past, and that we faithfully labor with whatever gifts He may have given to us.

Our church is *facing perilous times*. It is an historical observation which already Luther noted that the Gospel rarely remains in its purity among the same people for any greater length of time. A certain feeling of security coupled with a state of tiredness will come over the church. From the fact that the fathers successfully established purity of doctrine in their midst and that their successors have retained the correct terms and phrases which they coined, it is inferred that the same pure doctrine is still present. Yet doctrines seem to lose their vitality and their hold on the hearts. Men no longer appear to be living by them, but are satisfied with a logical correctness in their development and presentation. Hand in hand with such formal correctness there usually goes a certain tired feeling, a satiety and an aversion to ever mine anew the treasures of pure doctrine by a direct and painstaking search of the Scriptures. New problems absorb our attention; why should we labor for the purity of doctrine, which seems less important for the moment than the burning questions of the day, and which moreover we have securely stored away in books. Yes, we may tenaciously cling

to old terms while we open the floodgates to questionable innovations. — We have now had the Gospel for approximately one hundred years. Faithfulness demands of us that in the spirit which we have inherited from our fathers we ever be on the alert against the general dangers of satiety.

To mention some more specific dangers. We are being told that one cannot successfully preach the Gospel to people with hunger gnawing at their vitals. The church, they say, must improve economic and social conditions and help raise the standard of living among the people. This is the first duty; after that also the spiritual needs may be provided. — Without going into details two facts should be considered. Jesus said, My kingdom is not of this world. The effectiveness of His truth is independent of the forces — economic, social, political, moral — of this life. We lose the Gospel if we make its power dependent on external conditions. — The social gospelites may furthermore be asked the pointed question, what in general is the reception of the Gospel by people who live in affluence. For not only the “cares of the world”, but also the “deceitfulness of riches” tend to choke the Word.

Another danger that is very acute today is the tendency to compromise with the world. As an illustration we may choose the Boy Scout question. The movement aims to build up the boys' character, an aim to which no one will take exception. The only question is on what basis and by what means this is to be achieved. For a Christian the only character training to be considered at all is one which presupposes a new birth and is effected by the power of the Holy Spirit through the means of grace. Character building which directs boys to become self-made men conflicts fundamentally with Christian training. Yet the lure of Scoutism may easily captivate us so that we compromise the Gospel, join the movement, perhaps organize troops under Lutheran leadership, in other words, adopt and embody the principle of a self-achieved character into a program centered in the freely imputed righteousness of Christ.

We mention one more danger of our day without going into details: Unionism. There are various forms. It may be that deviations in non-fundamental doctrines are treated as matters of indifference; it may be that joint work with erring church bodies is

undertaken with a view, eventually, to come to a better understanding and mutual recognition; it may be that cooperation in externals is made a pretext for cooperation in matters of a distinctly spiritual nature.

Over against these and similar dangers faithfulness demands that we stand firm, not out of stubbornness, but from a lively conviction of the heart, not in cold blood, but from a heart filled with love for the truth and with love towards the errorists who deprive themselves of the blessings of the Truth. In order to achieve this end we must diligently cultivate the blessed inheritance entrusted to us by God through the special gifts which He gave to our Seminary in the past. We must continue to cherish the purity of doctrine and its clear conception. We must bear in mind that this gift is not, like some dead treasure, safely deposited for us in mathematically correct definitions, it is a living force injected into the vicissitudes of life, as a factor in the struggle between sin and grace. We must ever remain conscious of the fact that we are dealing with spiritual forces, that errors incessantly press onward, so that the slightest aberration from the truth may lead to the most far-reaching consequences. For that reason we must ever, and that in the most important point of all, remain in intimate contact with the fountain of life, the Scriptures, and draw all our theology directly from it. No system of dogmatics, no science, no commentary, or whatever may be mentioned, dare interpose between us and the Scriptures. The Scriptures must remain the only source and norm, not only of our personal faith but of all our theology.

Who is sufficient for this? We realize our own weakness, our natural inclination to follow the line of least resistance. We know the lure of renown and recognition by the scientific world. We know how imposing externals may appear: finances, organizations, titles; and on the other hand, how insignificant will appear, and generally will remain unnoticed, the quiet work of the Gospel. We are not equal to the task. We cannot by our own reason or strength achieve the faithfulness required of us. But God is faithful, who will uphold us.

During all the changes that came over our Seminary within the last quarter century our God remained ever the same, our Savior is the same, God's promises still stand sure. He upheld us in the past, He is our hope for the future.

M.

A Pastoral Table of Duties

As we find it in the Imperatives of the
Pastoral Letters

Paul's frequent use of the imperative in the Pastoral Letters is striking. — The two letters to Timothy and the letter to Titus are the Pastoral Letters. They are called Pastoral Letters because in them the Apostle Paul by inspiration of the Holy Ghost describes the requirements a man must meet and the qualifications he must have to be in, or aspire to, the work of a pastor, and how the pastor as the servant of God and of Christ, as the steward of God's mysteries, as Christ's ambassador and as the herald of the sweet Gospel must perform the duties of his office.

Originally these letters were written to Timothy and Titus, two of Paul's truest and most trustworthy students and coworkers. Paul had so much confidence in these two men that he entrusted the superintendence of the congregations and bishops (elders, pastors) in Asia Minor and in the Island of Crete to them and made them his personal representatives in these fields. Timothy had the field in Asia Minor and was stationed in Ephesus, a large commercial city in Asia Minor, near the Aegean Sea. Titus had the field in Crete.

Before his imprisonment Paul had worked in Ephesus and surrounding territory for quite a long time. And "a great door and effectual" was opened to him in that field (1 Cor. 16, 9.). And the work he did there in preaching the crucified and risen Christ was not in vain. A large congregation was gathered in Ephesus and congregations were founded throughout the province. After his release from prison he, together with Timothy, visited Ephesus. And when Paul left to visit other fields he bade Timothy to remain in the Ephesus field as his personal representative and as general superintendent of the field.

After Paul's release from prison he and Titus worked in Crete. Whether any work was done in Crete before Paul's imprisonment we do not know. Paul and Titus traveled through the entire island preaching the gospel of salvation by grace through faith in Christ Jesus. And their work was crowned with the

blessing of the Lord. Throughout the island congregations were founded. After a time Paul went to other fields, but he left Titus in Crete as his personal representative and as superintendent of that field. Titus 1, 5.

Not long after he left them, Paul wrote letters to both Timothy and Titus which might have served as their credentials and at the same time gave instructions to them concerning the performance of their duties. The second letter to Timothy was written later from Rome, when Paul was in prison the second time, not long before he died a martyr's death.

But the pastoral instructions Paul gave Timothy and Titus in the Pastoral Letters also applied to the elders (bishops, pastors) and church workers who were under their supervision. — And, as stated before, it is striking how often the Apostle uses the imperative to give these instructions. Paul used the grammatical imperative and the practical imperative like *dei*: must. Certainly his use of the imperative made clear how imperative it was that his instructions be applied and carried out.

"Whatever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." Rom. 15, 4. Those commands, those "must's," those imperatives apply to, and must be applied by us today. They are just as important and necessary for the teachers and preachers of the gospel of salvation in Christ Jesus today as they were for Timothy, Titus and their coworkers then, — in a sense even more so.

Therefore a study of these imperatives dare not stop with an understanding of their meaning and application to Timothy and Titus, but must be thoroughly applied to the present and we must discover what they mean for the pastors, teachers, professors of theology, and all churchworkers of today.

Perhaps we can derive the greatest benefit from this study if we note that these imperatives fit into four distinct groups.

I. The imperatives which pertain to the qualifications which a pastor must have and which he must show forth in his life as an example of the believers.

II. The imperatives as they pertain to the personal attitude of the pastor to his work, studies, etc.

III. The imperatives as they pertain to the pastor's performance of the work and duties of his office.

of a bishop, elder, pastor. Without these qualifications a man cannot become a bishop.

Titus 1, 5 Paul writes: "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are (R. V. were) wanting (left undone) and ordain (R. V. appoint) elders in every city, as I had appointed thee (R. V. gave thee charge)." In verses 6-9 Paul carries out what kind of men Titus should appoint. "If any man be blameless etc. . . ." So again he enumerates the qualifications a man must have before he can be appointed or ordained as elder, bishop or pastor. — Here is an important "must" for us: Bear this in mind!

Before we begin a discussion of the qualifications Paul enumerates we should add these two thoughts. 1. A man who seeks the office of a bishop must also have these qualifications while he is IN office. The lack of all or any one of these qualifications disqualifies him from being ordained into or remaining in the office of a bishop, elder or pastor. 2. These qualifications, the "must not's," God expects every Christian to shun.

According to 1 Tim. 3, 2-7 a bishop (elder, pastor) must be: 1. Blameless (R. V. without reproach); 2. The husband of one wife; 3. Vigilant (R. V. temperate); 4. Sober (R. V. sober-minded); 5. Of good behavior (R. V. orderly); 6. Given to (R. V. a lover of) hospitality; 7. Apt to teach; 8. Not given to wine (R. V. no brawler); 9. No striker; 10. Not given to filthy lucre (Omitted in the R. V.); 11. Patient (R. V. gentle); 12. Not a brawler (R. V. not contentious); 13. Not covetous (R. V. not a lover of money); 14. One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection; 15. Not a novice; 16. One who has a good report (R. V. testimony) of them which are without. To these 16 *dei einai* from 1 Tim. 3, 2-7, Titus 1, 6-9 adds the following: 17. Blameless; 18. Not selfwilled; 19. Not soon angry; 20. Not given to filthy lucre; 21. A lover of good men (R. V. good); 22. Just; 23. Holy; 24. Temperate; 25. Holding fast the (A. V. to the) faithful word.

A long list. Reading all these *dei einai* most certainly makes one thing clear: No pastor, teacher or theological professor can take his office lightly; not if he wants to be faithful in his office and faithful to his trust. On the contrary, a little self-examination in the light of this list of "must's," and "must not's"

IV. The imperatives as they pertain to the personal relations of a pastor to the people.

Before we proceed, however, we should establish the sense in which Paul uses these imperatives. Are they law? Why were they written as imperatives by Paul — as he was inspired by the Holy Ghost? The answer is obvious: They were written to promote the course and progress of the Gospel. They were written to serve the Gospel. We must never lose sight of this, for only as we bear it in mind will we be able to capture the meaning and get a full understanding and abundant benefit of these imperatives.

I. The imperatives as they pertain to the qualifications which a pastor must have and which he must show forth in his life as an example to the believers.

What qualifications must a pastor have?

1 Tim. 3, 2-7, 2. Tim. 2, 24, 25, and Titus 1, 6-9 give the answer clearly and exhaustively.

1 Tim. 3, 2-7 reads: "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre, but patient, not a brawler, not covetous, one that ruleth well in his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity, not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil."

Titus 1, 6-9 reads: "If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly. For a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre, but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate, holding fast the faithful word as he has been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers."

1 Tim. 3, 1 Paul writes: "This is a true saying (R. V. Faithful is the saying), if a man desire (R. V. seeketh) the office of a bishop he desireth a good work." In verses 2-7, then, he enumerates the qualifications a man must have who seeks the office

will make a man exclaim: "This is a serious work!" More than that, it will make him confess: "How unfit I am for this office!" Above all, reading this list of "must's" and "must not's" will prevent the growth of self-satisfaction and pride in the heart of any man who aspires to, or has attained, the office of a bishop. It will, on the contrary, keep him humble and on his knees.

Before we proceed we should clarify a question concerning *dei einai*: Is it to be understood in the absolute or the relative sense? Luther does not translate it with "muß," but with "soll." He understood it in the relative sense. Thayer has a rather lengthy article on *dai*. He gives the following meanings: "It is necessary; there is need of it; it behooves; it is right and proper." Schierlitz has: "Es ist nötig; man muß." Kretzmann: "Es ist aber nötig." Lenski: "*Dei* is used to indicate all kinds of necessity; — here the necessity inherent in the office named." — If we take *dei* in the absolute sense, "must," we will have to draw the conclusion that no man could be a bishop except he were perfect in all the "must's" and "must not's" enumerated in 1 Tim. 3, 2-7 and Titus 1, 6-9. If we take it in the relative sense as Luther did: Soll, should, then we know that it should spur us on to seek for constant growth toward perfection. Certainly understanding *dei* in a relative sense would never give a man the right to say: Well, it does not make much difference whether or not I measure up to these "must's" and "must not's", for they are to be taken in a relative sense only. Rather, every *dei* in the Bible will compel a man to strive as eagerly and as conscientiously as he can to measure up to these "must's" and "must not's." — Another thought. If the absolute sense applies, then none of us and no one anywhere can qualify for the office of pastor, teacher or theological professor, "for in many things we offend (R. V. stumble) all." Or, as Luther has it: "Denn wir fehlen alle mannigfaltiglich." James 3, 2, *Ptaiō* means stumble, err, make a mistake, sin. But if the relative sense applies, then *dei* is a perpetual admonition: Keep on striving for perfection.

With the thought clear, we can study the 25 (24) "must's" and "must not's" of these texts and apply their lessons.

1. A bishop must be blameless (R. V. without reproach). The Greek word is: *Anepileptos* or *-leptos*. Thayer gives it the following definitions: "Not apprehended; that can not be laid

hold of; hence, that can not be reprehended; not open to censure; irreproachable." Schierlitz: "*Tadellos.*" Luther: "Unsträflich." One who seeks or holds the office of a bishop must be a man who is free from any possible charge of moral turpitude; otherwise he can not become or be a bishop. No man can, of course, escape slander. Matth. 5, 11. Even Christ could not. Nor could the apostles. But the life of a pastor must be clean and open so that no one can bring a just charge against him.

2. A bishop must be the husband of one wife. *Mias gynaikos andra.* The accent is on *mias*. This injunction does not mean: 1. That he must have a wife. Paul himself had none. Nor, 2. That, as a widower, he dare not marry again.

The Roman Catholic Church forbids the priests to have a wife. The Greek Orthodox Church allows the lower clergy to marry, but forbids a second marriage.

With this "must" the Word of God absolutely forbids that a pastor be a polygamist, one having more than one wife at the same time. More than that, it insists that he hold himself strictly and faithfully to his one wife and have no affair with any woman beside her.

This injunction was very necessary at Paul's time. Polygamy was very generally practiced by the heathen. The moral laxity in Greece and its colonies — of which Ephesus was one — was almost unbelievable. We know something, for example, about the Diana-worship of that day, in whose honor temples had also been erected in Ephesus and Corinth. The temple in Ephesus was surrounded by a dense grove where many cabins were built for the use of the temple prostitutes. To be one of these prostitutes was a definite and vital part of rendering service to Diana. Think, too, of the many courtesans in these cities. And, as far as the heathen were concerned, there was nothing at all wrong with this kind of life. The Christians had grown up and had to live in that immoral atmosphere. And it was a constant temptation to them. That helps us understand how necessary this injunction was.

Conclusion: A man who is not strictly faithful to his one wife or does not lead a chaste and decent life is automatically disqualified for the office of bishop.

3. A bishop must be vigilant (R. V. temperate.). Here the

Revised Version is better, for *nēphalios* does not mean vigilant, but sober, temperate, abstaining from wine. Luther translates: Nüchtern. Schierlitz: Nüchtern; sich des Weines enthaltend. The verb we find in 2 Tim. 4, 5: "Be you temperate, sober in all things." *Nēphe en pasin*. Luther: "Du aber sei nüchtern allenthalben." The adjective in our text has the same meaning. It means moderation, frugality in eating and drinking.

And this physical moderation must be accompanied by moral moderation, as the next injunction shows.

4. A bishop must be sober (R. V. soberminded). The Greek word is *sōphrōn*: Of sound mind, sane, curbing one's desires and impulses. Selfcontrolled; temperate; having a circumspect judgment. Luther: Mäßig. Schierlitz: Gesunden Sinnes, bei nüchternem Verstande. The stress is on the mind. A bishop must have a sound mind. He must be a man who is not easily swayed by this or that new phenomenon in the church, by this or that catchphrase, by this or that widely heralded panacea for all the ills of the church, but one who looks at things calmly, weighs and judges them carefully according to the faithful word and sound doctrine. That the church needed just such men then is clear from reading Paul's letters, especially Galatians and 1 Timothy.

Certainly we need such men today, men who do not fall for all the follies, fancies and errors which are seeking so insidiously to gain foothold in the church. Men who can and will stand against everything that is unbiblical and inimical to the Gospel. Men who cannot be moved to join in with those who make such a cry about the scientific approach and the so-called conclusions of science; nor by the weird conclusions of Bible criticism which would make of the Bible a hodgepodge of lies, errors, contradictions, fables, fairy tales, etc.; nor by the many religious fads and fictions, fancies of unstable minds; nor by all the din made by enthusiasts and the founders of new sects. Indeed it takes sober-minded men to withstand all this noise and agitation and remain sober in their judgment. How easily a man might be swayed by all the arguments in favor of church unions and the noise made about the need of a united front; by all the fuss about the social gospel; by the cry that it is the church's duty to take more interest in politics, in social work, in the economic and moral welfare and rehabilitation of people after the war, etc., etc. Think too of the

plight of a man with an unstable mind when he is confronted with the high-church trend which makes such a spectacular appeal and is growing in our Lutheran Church, a trend which seeks to put externals (gowns, surplices, liturgy, singing) ahead of everything.

Therefore we need soberminded pastors who hold fast to the faithful word and the sound doctrine, to the plenary verbal inspiration of the Scriptures and the inerrancy of the Bible. Men who always bear in mind that the work of the church and therefore their work lies in one direction only: To preach the Gospel, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, of grace, of salvation by grace through faith in Christ Jesus and His perfect redemption. Men who hold fast to the word and who follow the example of Paul, who "determined not to know anything among (the Corinthians and wherever he worked) save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." 1 Cor. 2, 2. Conf. 1, 17. 18. 22-24.

Are we always soberminded? Do we always hold fast to the faithful word and sound doctrine? Do we always pass sound judgment?

5. A bishop must be of good (or modest) behavior (R. V. orderly). *Kosmios*: well arranged, seemly, modest; used to describe a man living with decorum; a well ordered life. Schierlitz: "Ordentlich; in geregelter Zustände, besonders in sittlicher Beziehung; daher sittsam, erhaben." Luther: "Sittig." Some understand this word in an outward sense only: To be a gentleman, look decent in dress, not slovenly; to behave decently. All this is most certainly included in the word *kosmios*. But it means more. It describes a quality of the character. It describes an orderly mind and soul which, of course, brings about orderly outward appearance and behavior.

6. A bishop must be given to (R. V. a lover of) hospitality. *Philoxenos* (*philos* and *xenos*); literally: Loving the stranger, hospitable; generous to guests. Schierlitz: "Gäste, Fremde liebend; gastfreundlich." Luther: "Gastfrei." The pastor's house and heart must be open to the *Xenos*, the stranger and more especially to them who are of the household of faith. When they come they must know that they are welcome. The pastor and his wife will make them feel so by all their activity in their behalf.

This injunction was very timely in Paul's day. There was much traveling in the Roman Empire. And the farther the

Gospel spread, the more Christians were among the travelers. Nor dare we forget that the Christians were consistently persecuted, robbed of their goods, driven out of their homes and forced to flee to other localities. The Christian travelers or refugees who came to a strange place, could not, for obvious reasons, seek the hospitality of the gentiles. They had no choice other than to look up the bishop if there was a Christian congregation in the place to which they had come. It was up to him to take them in or to see to it that they found Christian shelter. The sense of *philoxenos* is: To do this gladly and willingly as a work of love; "without grudging," 1 Pet. 4, 9, without murmuring; not with a sour face. Dr. M. Luther's wellknown hospitality is a shining example of the life described with this word.

Our circumstances are a little different today. But the word, "a lover of hospitality," is still in the Bible and is as valid today as it was then. We must be gastfrei, given to, lovers of, hospitality.

Consider this question also: Are we safe from persecutions as they existed in that day? Russia should teach us a lesson.

7. A bishop must be apt to teach. *Didaktikos*: Apt and skillful in teaching. Luther: "Lehrhaftig." This qualification is not a "must" for every Christian, but it is a "must" for a bishop, pastor, teacher, professor of theology. Without it he cannot be a bishop. For all of his work centers in teaching, whether he preaches to a congregation, or instructs a class, or teaches in a Christian school, or instructs in a theological seminary, or sits by the side of the sick. Nor does he teach the arts and sciences, but the "one thing needful." He teaches spiritual things: the Word of God, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the way of life. He must ever be mindful of the fact that he is a teacher in the name and in the stead of his Lord Jesus Christ, as Christ's ambassador. What if he is not apt to teach? That disqualifies him for the office of bishop.

But how many are in this office who lack just this qualification? And the immortal souls of men have to suffer; the souls whom Christ redeemed with his holy, precious blood and his innocent suffering and death.

Apt to teach. But before one can teach he has to learn, he has to be taught both the subject matter he has to teach and

preach and the art of teaching. —To accomplish this we have our schools, high schools, college, teachers' college and the theological seminary. Selfevidently the teachers and professors at these schools must possess this quality, apt to teach, to a marked degree. Therefore they who, in the name of the Church (synod), must choose and call men to be teachers and professors at these schools dare never lose sight of the fact that they must choose and call men who are the best available, best in this quality too, apt to teach, for they are the men who are to teach future pastors, teachers and professors, to make them apt to teach and to preach the "one thing needful," namely the Gospel of salvation.

I cannot refrain from quoting in this connection what Dr. K. Zorn writes on this "must" in his book *Vom Hirtenamt*, p. 54–56: "Er (der Pastor) muß *lehrhaft* sein. Das ist ein für das Bischofsamt nötiges Stück. Er muß fähig sein zu lehren. Er muß die Gabe der Rede der *Weisheit* und der Rede der *Erkenntnis* haben, und das durch den Heiligen Geist; er muß ein solcher vom Heiligen Geist gelehrter Christ sein, daß, wenn er nun andere lehrt, seine Rede die in der Schrift geoffenbarte göttliche Weisheit bringt *und* auch so beschaffen ist, daß die Hörer sie fassen und die von ihm gelehrte Weisheit wohl verstehen, erkennen können. 1 Kor. 12, 8. . . . Diese beiden Gaben vereinigt (Rede der *Weisheit* und Rede der *Erkenntnis*) konstituieren Lehrhaftigkeit. Die beiden Gaben des Geistes vereinigt müssen bei dem vorhanden sein, der ein Bischof werden will. Wenn ein christlicher Lehrer die in der Schrift offenbarte göttliche Weisheit lehrt, so muss er sie auch in der Weise und mit solcher Rede lehren, daß seine Hörer, alt und jung, gelehrt und ungelehrt, dieselbe leicht und wohl verstehen und, sofern sie Christen sind, gerne und mit Aufmerksamkeit anhören. Was hilft es, wenn den Hörern die göttliche Weisheit dargeboten wird in einer Rede, die entweder zu hoch oder zu abstrus (difficult to comprehend) oder sonst zu schwer verständlich ist oder doch für viele derselben. (1 Kor. 2, 1–5.) Then Zorn demands that the Church make provision that he who aspires to the office of bishop be well instructed in the Word of God and that he have the gift properly to teach others what he himself has learned. Then he continues: "Finden sich bei ihm diese beiden Stücke und Gaben (Rede der *Weisheit* und Rede der *Erkenntnis*), so ist er lehrhaft und kann ein Bischof werden,

sonst nicht. Auch jeder, der schon im Amt ist, soll nach diesen Gaben trachten und streben (1 Kor. 12, 31a) dadurch, daß er die Schrift unausgesetzt fleißig studiert — *JEDER* hat hierzu Zeit — und sich in einfacher und einfältiger Rede übt. Gänzlich zu verwerfen ist einerseits das schwärmerische oder faulfrache Reden aus dem Stegreif und andererseits das hochtrabende, gelehrte, schwulstige, rhetorische, geisttötende Wortgeklingel, welches so viele 'prominente Kanzelredner' verüben."

Those are golden words, well worth reading again and again.

8. A bishop must not be given to wine. *Paroinos*: One who sits long at his wine; given to wine; drunken; one who spends much of his time with the bottle. Schierlitz: "In der Trunkenheit frech, liederlich." Luther: "Nicht ein Weinsäufer." R. V.: No brawler, that is a quarrelsome person, a blusterer. This translation does not improve on the A. V. — Only wine is mentioned in this text because wine was and still is practically the only intoxicating beverage used in the Orient. But it is self-evident that this injunction applies to all intoxicating beverages. A pastor must not be given to drinking, to sitting around in the saloon. And certainly pastors' beer parties do not fit into this injunction, nor a life which gives evidence that a pastor cannot get along without his wine, beer, or other intoxicating drinks. Let us not give offense or set a bad example.

It is self-evident that this injunction does not forbid that the pastor use wine, etc. In this very epistle, 5, 23, Paul exhorts Timothy to drink (use) a little wine. But mark well, "a little." Not to excess, but moderately. A bishop simply must not be a winebibber, a drunkard. For a drunkard can not control himself and all too frequently becomes a brawler, a blusterer, a quarrelsome person.

And from brawler to the next "must not" is but a short step.

9. A bishop must not be a striker. *Plēktēs*: A bruiser; ready with a blow; a pugnacious, contentious and quarrelsome person. In German: Ein Raufbold. Luther: "Nicht pochen." Schierlitz: "Der Schlagende; der Schläger; auch Schimpfende, Scheltende." The verb, plēssō, means to strike, to smite. German: Niederschlagen. So a plēktēs is a person who is always ready with his fists. Unquestionably a striker, ein Raufbold, has

no place in the ministry or in the pulpit. He can not be an example to the believers.

It is too bad, but time and again we hear of pastors who, it seems, never heard of this divine injunction: A bishop *must not be a striker* no matter how much he is provoked. Read Matth. 5, 39.

10. A bishop must not be greedy of filthy lucre. *Mē aischrokerēs*. The R. V. omits these words because they evidently are an interpolation. They are not to be found in any of the old codices. They no doubt were placed here by a late copyist because they are in Titus. Therefore we will deal with this injunction when we get to it in Titus.

11. A bishop must be patient (R. V. gentle). *Epieikēs*: Equitable, fair, mild, gentle. Schierlitz: "Geziemend; passend, billig; menschenfreundlich." Luther: "Gelinde." A pastor in all his contacts with people, especially those of his congregation whose Seelsorger he is, must be mild and gentle in order that he might gain and keep their confidence. It is out of place even to think that he must meekly submit to any and all abuse. This injunction does not give everybody and anybody the right to use the pastor like a football. But it does hold the pastor to gentleness and patience in his dealings with quarrelsome, obstinate and erring people. It goes without saying that gentleness and patience are not the equivalents of servility and wishy-washy weakness in contending for the truth. Gentle in any firm stand he must take. That covers the thought. For example, there is certain honor due the office of a bishop. This must be established by gentle means, not by haughty, *von oben herab*, speeches and conduct nor by acting as though a pastor is by divine right the Lord and Master of his people.

12. A bishop must not be a brawler (R. V. not contentious). A brawler is a man who likes a noisy quarrel; in short, a man who likes to wrangle. The Greek word is *amachos*: Abstaining from fighting. Nicht streitsüchtig. Luther: "Nicht haderhaftig." An *amachos* is one who never fights; who is not of the fighting kind. That's the kind of man a pastor must be. He must be able to control himself, keep from losing his temper and avoid every temptation to become involved in a brawl. Conf. Matth. 5, 39.

13. A bishop must not be covetous (R. V. no lover of money). Luther: "Nicht geizig." *Aphilargyros*: Not loving money; not avaricious. Holy Scripture frequently warns against this sin. 1 Tim. 6, 10: "The love of money is the root of all evil." Col. 3, 5: "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth . . . and covetousness which is idolatry." Eph. 5, 3: "Covetousness let not even be named among you." And v. 5: "No covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God." These admonitions are for all Christians. But the pastor is especially admonished in 1 Tim. 4, 12: "Be thou an example of the believers." How much more, then, should he strive to avoid the sin of covetousness! Read: 1 Tim. 6, 10. 11 and mark the injunction in v. 11.

Despite these admonitions and warnings, however, it is a startling fact that this sin is frequently evident in pastors. There are all too many who are covetous, lovers of money, geldgierig, geizig. They contend, of course, that they are merely saving, not covetous. But let us not deceive ourselves. Saving, yes. But to what end? To give and give to our Lord toward the building of His kingdom; for the spreading of the Gospel; for the poor, the orphans, the sick, etc. That puts us on the spot. There God finds His answer to the question: Are we saving, or are we covetous? Are we serving our Lord and Savior, or is money our idol before whom we kneel? We can not deceive God. He searches the heart.

In my student days a Lutheran (?) pastor with a bad reputation in this respect was in charge of a congregation in the city where I studied. Throughout the city he had the reputation that he was the lover of money. And he had earned that reputation. How often I heard people say: If your dog dies and you offer pastor N. N. \$5.00, he will most certainly bury it and make a nice sermon in its honor. — The glorying of such is not good.

14. A pastor must be one who ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. *Proistamenos*: To be over others, to superintend, preside over. Luther: "Der seinem eigenem Hause wohl vorstehe." This is a very serious injunction, particularly in the light of v.5: "For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?"

May I again quote Dr. K. Zorn? In the aforementioned book, p. 56-57, he writes: "Er (der Bischof) *muss seinem eigenen Hause wohl vorstehen können*, so daß er seine Kinder, falls er solche hat, in Gehorsam hält, daß sie mit aller Ehrbarkeit ihren Wandel führen. Andernfalls soll er nicht Bischof werden. Denn wenn er nicht einmal seinem eigenen Hause vorzustehen weiß, wie wird er dann das Haus Gottes (v. 15), nämlich die Gemeinde Gottes, versorgen und ihr recht vorstehen können? — Wie wahr das ist, das zeigt sich nur zu oft beim Pastor, Lehrer oder Professor, der "unter dem Pantoffel seiner Frau steht" und seinen Kindern gegenüber ein schwacher Eli ist, der ist auch unfähig, die ihm in seinem Amt von Gott Befohlenen recht zu regieren. Wohl mag er es treu meinen, wohl mag er es auch versuchen, die Autorität, die er in seinem eigenen Hause nicht hat, in der Gemeinde, oder Schule oder Anstalt doppelt geltend zu machen, aber es wird ein Mißerfolg sein; er wird vielmehr zum Gespött werden. Zu beklagen ist, daß man in unseren Verhältnissen nicht im voraus wissen kann, ob jemand, der ein Bischofsamt begehrt, die besagte Qualifikation hat, da bei uns junge, unverehelichte Männer ins Amt treten. . . . Aus der hier gegebenen Weisung ist nicht anzunehmen, daß ein Bischof nicht im Amt bleiben kann, wenn er etwa ein oder mehrere ungeratene Kinder hat. Man denke an Samuel, 1 Sam. 8, 5-8. Samuel war kein Eli und doch hatte er Söhne, die nicht in seinen Wegen wandelten. Nur darf ein Bischof in solchem Falle dann kein Eli sein. Lies 1 Sam. 8, 27-30. Sondern ein Bischof soll sich dann reinigen von der Ungeratenheit seiner Kinder, wie eine Gemeinde sich reinigen soll von der Ungeratenheit eines ihrer Glieder. 1 Kor. 5, 6-12."

15. A bishop must not be a novice. Novice: One that has newly come to the faith. *Neophytos*: Newly planted; a new convert; neophyte. Luther: "Nicht ein Neuling," das ist, nicht ein Neubekehrter. One who has just recently become a Christian is not yet well founded in the faith and in sound doctrine. His faith has not yet stood the test. Timothy himself could not, under those circumstances, have had time to pass proper judgment on him, his character, his gifts and his aptness to teach. God, with this injunction, gives Timothy another reason why a novice should not be put into the ministry: It would endanger

his soul's salvation. Entering the ministry right after his conversion could go to his head and, being lifted up with pride, he could fall into the condemnation of the devil. Not that the devil can condemn — as some take it —; only God can condemn, but that the same condemnation which is the devil's due would be pronounced on him who is lifted up (puffed up) with pride. Conf. also 1 Tim. 5, 22.

16. A bishop must have a good report of them who are without (R. V. must have good testimony from). Luther: "Er muß aber auch ein gutes Zeugnis haben von denen, die draußen sind." *Dei de kai martyrian kalēn echein apo tōn exōthen.* The *dei* is repeated here. He that "seeketh the office of a bishop" (3, 1) must have good testimony from them who are not Christians. Without good testimony from them who are without he can not be given this office.

It is silly, of course, to conclude that such good testimony is no longer necessary after a man has attained this office. He who is a bishop must meet the requirements and qualifications enumerated by Paul v. 2-7 exactly as must he who seeks that office.

Good testimony from those without was very necessary at that time. There were no people then who had grown up in a Christian environment. Every one who was won for Christ by the preaching of the Gospel came from heathen stock. Consequently neither Paul nor Timothy could know anything about the former lives of their people. Therefore any report about a man had to come from those who had been well acquainted with him before. And Timothy had to have his good report before he could ordain anyone to be a bishop even though the testimony had to come from heathen. This testimony naturally had to do with a man's good name and reputation; seinem guten Ruf. Unless a man had this testimony he could not be accepted into the ministry.

Why was this good testimony from without so necessary? "Lest he (who did not have this testimony) fall in reproach and the snare of the devil." How so? If the unbelievers knew vile, evil or immoral things about a bishop they would certainly make these facts public, and he would "fall in reproach," disrepute, dishonor, in Schmach und Schande. And this reproach would

extend far beyond himself. The whole congregation would have to suffer because they had elected such a man to be their bishop. In this setting it would be easy for the devil to set a snare for him and it would be almost a foregone conclusion that he would fall back into Satan's power. So this injunction is also vitally concerned about the salvation of the bishop. Besides, this falling in reproach would retard and hinder the spreading of the Gospel because it would reflect on Christianity in general.

Wohlenberg in his commentary on 1 Tim. has a footnote to this injunction which registers some interesting historical data: "Mosheim meint, daß die Gemeinde an ihrem Versammlungsort öffentlich, durch Anschlag bekannt gemacht habe: Wer denen, die zu Ältesten genommen werden sollten, etwas Lasterhaftes und Sträfliches vorzuwerfen habe, der möge sich bei den Gemeindevorstehern melden und seine Bedenken vorbringen." — Lamprius in der *Vita Alexandri Severi*, c. 45, berichtet von diesem Kaiser, er habe die Namen der Provinzialamtskandidaten veröffentlicht und das Volk ermahnt, etwaige Anklagen vorzubringen, aber auch durch Tatsachen zu beweisen und dabei auf das Beispiel der Christen und der Juden hingewiesen in *praedicandis sacerdotibus qui ordinandi sunt*. — Man vergleiche die Ordinationsformulare für Diakone, Priester und Bischöfe in der anglikanischen Kirche nach dem Common Prayer Book.

"A bishop must have a good testimony from them who are without." That divine injunction still stands and is as imperative in the lives of pastors, teachers and professors today as it was in a bishop's life at Paul's time. A pastor must have a good name. This injunction, then, speaks a very definite language to every minister, teacher and pastor: Be very careful to live an irreproachable life, so that no one can bring a just accusation against you of evil, immorality, and an unchristian life.

That concludes the "must's" and "must not's" as they are applied to a bishop in 1 Tim. 3, 2-7.

In Titus 1 Paul gives Titus instructions governing the choice of elders, *presbyteroi*, and bishops. These instructions are again "must's." Most of them are identical with those enumerated in 1 Tim. 3. But several new ones are added.

As we stated before, Paul had left Titus on the island of Crete as his personal representative and as superintendent of that

field. In his letter to Titus, which was written "from Nicopolis of Macedonia," he instructs Titus concerning this work. Chapter 1, 5 he writes: "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are (were) wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." We are interested here in the kind of men he had to choose to ordain (R. V. appoint) as elders in every city. "If any man be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot and unruly." And we are interested in the qualifications he sets down as necessary in a bishop. "For a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God."

Here two things demand our attention. First: Elder, v. 5, Bishop, v. 7. Apparently the titles cover the office. In verse 5 Paul instructs Titus to ordain *elders*. In verse 6 he tells him what kind of men he would have to choose to be elders. Then in verse 7 he goes on to tell Titus why only such men could be *bishops*. Elder and bishop are two titles for the same office. A bishop is an elder and an elder is a bishop. In Acts 20 the same fact is borne out; in verse 17 Paul "sent to Ephesus and called (to him) the *elders* of the Church, and verse 28 he calls these elders, *presbyterous*, bishops, *episkopous*.

Secondly: As the stewards of God. Luther: "Als ein Haushalter Gottes." *Hōs theou oikonomon*. 1 Cor. 4, 1 Paul writes (of himself and his co-workers): "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ and *stewards* of God's mysteries." 1 Pet. 4, 10, Peter admonishes the Christians: "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good *stewards* of the manifold grace of God." The elders and bishops are the stewards of *God*. And as the stewards of *God* they perform the work of their office. A steward? That, the dictionary states, is: "An officer or employee in a large family, or on a large estate, to manage the domestic concerns, supervise servants, collect rents or income, keep accounts etc." A steward is somebody's employee; he works for somebody; manages somebody's estate, house or business. He is not the master or owner. A bishop is *God's* steward. He is called into the service of God by God. He is the steward of "the house of God, which is the church of the living God." God and the good shepherd Jesus Christ entrust the flock of the believers to his care. He should

look after them by faithfully and conscientiously taking care of their spiritual needs. God has called him to feed heavenly manna to His children, to lead on the way to life eternal, warn them of the dangers, obstacles and pitfalls along the way, protect them against the enemies of their souls, comfort and strengthen them in tribulation and persecution. And he does this by teaching and preaching the Word, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. And what does God demand of his stewards? 1 Cor. 4, 2: "It is required in stewards that a man be found *faithful*." "Daß er *treu* erfunden werde." — Also, a steward must give account of his stewardship. Luke 16, 2.

The very word, steward, proves as false and unscriptural the claims and pretensions of the Roman hierarchy, namely that the priests, bishops, archbishops and pope are lords and masters of the church and have power and sovereign authority over the Christians. A bishop, elder, or pastor is a servant, not a lord and master.

Knowing that God and the Lord Jesus Christ called us into his service as pastors, teachers, professors and has entrusted the souls of his flock to our care to help them attain a blessed end, will keep us conscious of the importance and responsibility of our call. Yes, what an important work is ours as stewards of God, of His mysteries, as ministers of Christ! And what responsibility rests on us! A double responsibility; first, to God whose stewards we are; then to the souls entrusted to our care. And the more we sense the importance and responsibility of our stewardship, the more we shall pray for and strive to attain the qualities and characteristics of which Paul writes: "A bishop must be"; and the harder we shall beg the Lord to strengthen us in the fight against those things of which Paul writes: "A bishop must not be." The more, too, we shall be on guard against the wiles of the old serpent (Eph. 6, 11) and the more fervently we will pray: Lord, keep me blameless.

It is hardly necessary to state that the words "as the stewards of God" belong to *all* the qualities, characteristics and attributes which are "must's" for one who seeks the office of a bishop.

Now we are ready to proceed to consider the injunctions for a bishop in Titus 1, 7-9.

17. A bishop as the steward of God must be *blameless*. This

was the first injunction in 1 Tim. 3, 2. Why then repeat it here? The injunction sounds the same in English, but not in the original Greek. In our English Bibles we find the same word in both places. In the Greek there are two different words: Luther also uses two different words. In 1 Tim. 3, 2: "Unsträflich." Here: "Untadelig." In 1 Tim. 3, 2 the Holy Ghost uses *anepileptos*; here *anenklētos*. The first means: No, open to censure, irreproachable. The second: One that *can not* be called to account, *unreprovable*. The second is stronger than the first. The life of a bishop should be so that nothing can be found against him. He must be unaccused, for he is the steward of God.

18. A bishop must be *self-willed*. *Mē authadēs*. Not self-pleasing, self-willed, arrogant. Luther: "Nicht eigensinnig." The word *self-pleasing* is closest to the Greek *authadēs*. So a bishop must not be self-satisfied, think too much of himself, stubbornly insist on his opinions and ways, be obstinate, think that he knows everything best. Yes, he must be stubborn in holding fast to the faithful word and to the true doctrine, for he is the steward of God. But in all that is left to Christian liberty he should never be self-willed or stubborn in trying to force his opinions on others.

19. A bishop must not be *soon angry*. *Orgilos*: Prone to anger, irascible. Schierlitz: "Zum Zorn geneigt, jähzornig." Luther: "Nicht zornig." A pastor must not lose his temper, but be patient and gentle. God does not want him to say or do the wrong thing in a fit of anger. James 1, 19: "Let everyone be slow to wrath; for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." I know very well how often pastors are provoked to wrath and how hard it is to control our seething anger. I know how hard it is to hold our tongue in check and keep our fists in our pockets. Remember: Stewards of God, not soon angry; that will help.

20. A bishop must not be *greedy of filthy lucre*. *Mē aischrokerdēs*: Eager for base gain. Schierlitz: "Schändlichem Gewinn ergeben, darnach begierig sein." *Aischros* means base, dishonorable, schändlich, schimpflich, unsittlich. *Kerdos* means gain, advantage. Luther: "Nicht unehrliche Hantierung treiben."

We would hardly think that a steward of God would have anything to do with something which is *aischros*, dishonorable.

But lust for money can do a lot of things. The desire to own something beyond his means has seduced many a pastor into dishonorable and shameful dealings. He speculates in stocks and bonds and real estate, and usually loses the little he has in the line of money. The real reason for this *aischrokerdēs* is not to be found in low salaries, but in unbelief over against the promises of God and in covetousness.

21. A bishop must be a *lover of what is good*. *Philagathos*: Loving goodness. Luther: "Gütig." The translation of the A. V., "A lover of good men," is wrong. *Philagathos* does not mean: Love *who* is good, but love *what* is good. Paul here brings the antithesis to *aischrokerdēs*. "A bishop as the steward of God must not love base gain, but "what is intrinsically good and beneficial and so good and helpful to others." Lenski.

22-23. A bishop must be *just, holy*. "*Dikaios*: righteous; observing divine and human laws; one who is as he ought to be; rechtbeschaffen. *Dikaios* here is not the righteousness of faith, but of life. A bishop must be just in his dealings, in his judgments, in his life. Friend or foe, Christian or unchristian, — he must render just dues to all and pass just judgment on all. Holy. *Hosios*: Pure, holy, pious. The bishop, sanctified in the true faith, will show sanctity in a pure, holy, and pious life. Lenski comments on these words: "The first (just) means conduct meeting the approval of the divine judge (forensic); the second (holy) conduct that observes the true and established ordinance of the Lord."

24. A bishop must be *temperate*. *Engkratēs*: Controlling one's self, temperate, continent. Schierlitz: "Seiner selbst mächtig." Luther: "Keusch." The real meaning of the Greek word is: Strong, robust, having power over, holding fast. Metaphorically we get the first definition given above. Zorn says: "Er muß enthaltsam sein, seinen Lüsten und Leidenschaften Zügel anlegen können." Kretzmann: "Er enthält sich alles dessen, was ihm in seiner Stellung als Christ und in seinem Amte als Ältester der Gemeinde Schaden bringen könnte; er hütet sich nicht nur vor Unkeuschheit in jeder Form, sondern vor allen fleischlichen Lüsten, welche wider die Seele streiten."

Yes, a bishop must have control over himself, must be able to check evil lusts and the desires of his flesh. Think of Joseph!

25. And now the last, but most important of all the injunctions: A bishop, as the steward of God, must be one who is *holding fast the faithful Word*, as he has been taught (R. V. Must be holding fast to the faithful word, which is according to the teaching). *Antechomenos tou kata tēn didachēn pistou logou*. Verbally: Holding fast in the faithful word according to the teaching. Luther: "Und halte ob dem Wort, das gewiß ist und lehren kann." I said before that this injunction is the most important of all for a pastor, for, though he were perfect in all the other injunctions Paul enumerates, he would not be worthy of the name if he did not hold fast to the faithful word, but were a pastor who "is tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine," Eph. 4, 14; "a reed shaken with the wind," Matth. 11, 7. A faithful pastor is made by his faithfulness to the faithful word. He must cling to it for the sake of his own soul and the souls of them entrusted to his care. He will not, he can not, let go of one word, because this word is faithful, utterly reliable and true. It is the word of God, THE TRUTH. Here is the sound doctrine, the divine doctrine, on which we can rely, — rely absolutely.

The reason why a pastor must hold fast to the faithful word is given in these words: "That he may be able to exhort in the sound doctrine (R. V.) and to convict (R. V.) the gainsayers." *Parakalein* and *elenchein*. Exhort and convince (convict). These two words sum up a pastor's entire work. *Parakalein*: To call to one's side, speak to, admonish, exhort, beg, beseech; to console, encourage, comfort; to refresh, cheer; to instruct, teach. How beautifully that word describes the pastor's work! He shall call sinners to their Savior; speak of "the wonderful works of God" Acts 2, 11 (redemption), admonish and exhort the erring; beg and beseech in Christ's stead: "Be ye reconciled to God," 2 Cor. 5, 21; console, comfort and strengthen the weak, the sick, the persecuted; refresh and cheer those who are in grief, affliction and mourning; instruct catechumens.

Oh, the unending mercy of the Lord! He calls poor sinners into the service as stewards to accomplish all this wonderful work for him. How can we ever grow weary of doing cheerfully, faithfully and conscientiously everything that lies in this word, *parakalein*.

Elenchein: To convict, convince, refute, correct, reprehend severely. A solemn duty this, to convict and reprehend the gain-sayers. Luther: Zu strafen die Widersprecher, those who contradict the divine Word.

All this we shall be able to do only as we do hold fast to the faithful word and the sound doctrine, the doctrine God has revealed to us in his faithful word, the Scriptures.

This last injunction brings to mind what was said in No. 4 which dealt with being "soberminded."

Hold fast to the faithful word means: Hold fast to the whole word, to each and every word of the Bible, to every syllable, every verse, chapter and book of the Bible. We can not let one word go, for the Bible is a whole. It is God's Book. It is the Scripture given by inspiration of God.

We can hardly imagine the devastation and confusion and havoc created by modern, liberal theology and its higher criticism. Inspiration has been thrown on the scrap heap. There is no book in the Bible, be it large or small, in the Old or New Testament, which this child of hell has not torn to shreds. None of these men who call themselves theologians, knows today whether one single word in the Bible is God's Word. One says: Whatever treats of Christ is God's Word. But none will say what, in his opinion, treats of Christ. No two of them are in agreement on what treats of Christ. But all seem agreed on one thing: None of the prophecies of the Old Testament treat of Christ. Moses did not write the five books ascribed to him. The book of Isaiah was not written by Isaiah, but had two, three or even four different writers. John did not write the fourth gospel.

Hold fast to the faithful word; that takes on a lot of meaning for us, when we consider that liberalism is an ever present threat also for the Lutheran Church in our own country. We must stand against liberal theology and higher criticism and never lose sight of 2 Tim. 3, 15: "*ALL* Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and 2 Peter 1, 21: "The holy men of God *spoke (and wrote)* as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." That is reason enough why a bishop dare in no wise let go of the faithful word.

Also Union Movements must be judged in the light of this injunction. Are its promoters proving their determination to

hold fast to the faithful word and the sound doctrine? What future developments will be we can not now tell. But past experience demands vigilance; it fairly pleads: Hold fast, let nothing go of this Word.

This injunction is the strongest argument there is against every church union which is not based on full and perfect unity in sound doctrine. They talk about the need of a united front, when we ought to be concerned about a sure and solid foundation. United front? The faithful word talks about one too, but not of men. "I in them, and thou in me," John 17, 23. "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you", John 15, 7. John 14-17 describes the united front which will accomplish the Lord's victories. United front? "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the ruler of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Therefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, etc." Eph. 6, 11ff. There is the united front which Paul's injunction brings about: Hold fast to the faithful word.

This injunction takes care of the "Open questions" too. The Word is not a faithful word if it permits the teaching of doctrines which in truth oppose each other.

This injunction also takes care of all religious fanaticism, enthusiasm, etc., which put human feeling above the Word.

Only by holding fast to every word of the faithful Word and to the *sound* doctrine will we be able to withstand. No wonder God demands of His stewards that they hold fast to the faithful word. There is no compromise possible here. Either a pastor does or he doesn't. Fundamental or nonfundamental, that plays no part; the Lord demands faithfulness to the sound doctrine as the Word teaches it.

If a man holds fast he can be or become a bishop. If he does not, he can not be or become a bishop, not in the truly orthodox Church.

Before we close this article we have to take a look at 2 Tim. 2, 24, 25, where we again find the *dei einai* as in 1 Tim. 3, 2-7 and Titus 1, 7-9. There is not much to say on this text because most of what could and should be said, has found expression in the foregoing.

The text reads: "And the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men (R. V. towards all), apt to teach patient (R. V. forbearing), in meekness instructing those (R. V. correcting them) that oppose themselves, if God peradventure will (R. V. if peradventure God may) give them repentance to the acknowledging (R. V. unto the knowledge) of the truth." To my mind each one of the changes in the R. V. is an improvement, especially "correcting" for "instructing" and "unto the knowledge" instead of "to the acknowledging."

First I shall draw the attention to the word "servant." In the Greek *doulos* = slave, bondsman, a man of servile condition. One who belongs bodily to his master and in every respect is dependent on him.

All Christians, all believers, are slaves of Jesus Christ. Therefore they call Him their Lord, as Thomas did saying: "My Lord and my God." Why are they His slaves? Because He has redeemed, purchased, and won them. He has redeemed them. They were lost and condemned sinners. He has rescued and delivered them from the bondage of sin and of the devil by giving Himself as a ransom for them. "Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity," Tit. 2, 14. See also Gal. 3, 13; 1 Pet. 1, 18, 19. So we are His own by His redemption. He has purchased us. Acts 20, 28. "Which (the Church of God) he has purchased with his own blood." So we are His own by purchase. He has won us. Won, by winning the battle He was fighting with the devil. The victory was His when He cried on the cross: "It is finished." It was publicly attested by His glorious resurrection. And for what purpose has He redeemed, purchased and won us? That we might be *His own*, live *under Him* in His kingdom and *serve Him*.

A slave is owned by his master. His master's will alone counts. He can not have or follow his own will, but has to follow his master's will. He can not go where he would like to go, but he goes where his master sends him. He can not do

what he would like to do, but does what his master orders him to do, how to do it, when and where. He can not leave his master if he wants to, he has to stay with his master, for he is owned by his master.

Paul in our text writes of the "servant" (*doulos*) of the Lord. "The servant of the Lord must not strive." The context tells whom he means: the teacher, the elder, the pastor. Thayer says: "Servants of the Lord are those whose service is used by Christ in extending and advancing *His cause* among men." The Apostles confessed of themselves that they were slaves of the Lord, of Christ. Paul does not want to be anything else. See Rom. 1; Gal. 1, 10; Phil. 1, 1; Tit. 1, 1. Peter the same, 2 Peter 1, 1; James too, Jam. 1, 1 and Jude, Jude 1. They did not find anything degrading in being slaves of the Lord. On the contrary, they gloried in it. They knew it was grace, unmerited, undeserved grace of Christ that He had made them His slaves and used them as His slaves. And they fully understood what the word slave meant, and they served their master gladly, willingly, even risking their lives in His service.

And we pastors are such slaves, servants of the Lord, serving Him by preaching, proclaiming, teaching the Gospel of salvation, of our redemption by Christ. Can there be a higher calling, than to be a *doulos* of Christ to serve Him in spreading the glorious news for the sinner of God's grace and love, of Christ the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, of His full redemption of the whole sinful mankind, of forgiveness of sin by grace for the sake of Christ's merits, through faith in Christ alone? Are we such happy, willing, faithful slaves? Are we always conscious of the fact, that we are *douloi*, not masters? Are we always willing to go where He sends us? Are we willing, simply to do His work and do it so as He wants it done? Willing ever to do His will? He is the best master to serve. Are we faithful in our work? Do we not waste our time with trivialities?

Then let us see what Paul has to say here about the qualifications of a pastor, of a *doulos* of Christ.

1. The *doulos* of the Lord *must not strive*. *Ou dei machesthai*. In v. 23 Paul had told Timothy: "But foolish and unlearned (R. V. ignorant questioning refuse) questions avoid." Why? "Knowing that they do gender strifes." And then he

continues: "And the servant, *doulos*, of the Lord must not strive." *Machesthai* = fight, quarrel, wrangle, dispute. Luther translates: "Ein Knecht aber des Herrn soll nicht *zänkisch* sein." But as we had this before, it is not necessary to say more.

2. The *doulos* of the Lord *must be gentle*. *Ēpios* = mild, gentle. Some, as Lachmann, Westcott-Hort have *nēpios*, but *ēpios* is the better attested text. Luther translates: "Freundlich." Mild and gentle, friendly a bishop, a slave of the Lord, should be, not quarrelsome. He should be mild and gentle just like his master. Mild, gentle, and friendly towards all, young and old, men and women, Christians or no Christians, believers or no believers. The unchristians and unbelievers are more easily won for Christ, if the servant of the Lord deals with them in a gentle way. Saying this I am well aware, that it is not always easy to be and to stay mild and gentle. But in such hours look at the Lord and let not yourself be carried away by your irritations. — But let us always be conscious of the fact that *ēpios* does not give the license to the pastor to carry on his work superficially. It means that we should preach the law, admonish, correct, rebuke, but in such a way that our hearers must feel: He means well, he has our welfare at heart.

3. A *doulos* of the Lord *must be apt to teach*. *Didaktikos* = apt and skillful in teaching. We had this word in 1 Tim. 3, 2.

4. A *doulos* of the Lord *must be patient*. *Anexikakos* = patient of ills and wrongs, forbearing. Schierlitz: "Langmütig, Unrecht ertragend." Luther translates: "Der die Bösen tragen kann mit Sanftmut." The R. V. has "forbearing." — *Anexikakos* is a hapax legomenon. But even if we did not have the word before, we had what the word expresses.

5. A *doulos* of the Lord *must be in meekness instructing* those (R. V. correcting them) that oppose themselves. The R. V. by translating "correcting them," gets the sense of the Greek much better and clearer, than the A. V. does by translating "instructing." Of what kind of people does Paul speak here? Of those "that oppose themselves." Oppose themselves to what? To what the servant of the Lord proclaims, to the Gospel, to the faithful word and to the sound doctrine. How should he treat such? He should be "in meekness correcting them." In meekness, *en praytēti* = in gentleness, mildness, meekness. Correcting them

Paideuō = 1. to train children, erziehen; 2. to chastize or castigate with words, correct. In our text we have to take it in the second sense, to correct. Thayer notes: "Of those who are moulding the character of others by reproof and admonition." But it must be done in gentleness and meekness having the one aim to win them. For this correcting in meekness has the most wonderful object, 1. "if peradventure God may give them repentance," work *repentance*, *metanoia*, a change in their heart and mind by His Word, 2. into the *knowledge*, the *epignōsis*, of the *truth*, the Word and in it Christ, and so 3. "may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil."

So we have seen from the faithful word itself what that man must be who desires the office of a bishop. And I am convinced that frequent and thorough study of these "must's" and "must not's" will make us feel conscious of the responsibilities our office places upon us; will make us see our shortcomings; will make us strive evermore to measure up to the standards God has set for us as His stewards; and will make us entreat our God to forgive our many shortcomings and sins and to endow us with an ever richer wisdom from on high and to grant us His Holy Spirit in an ever richer measure.

In Dr. K. Zorn's book *Vom Hirtenamt* I find at the close of his exegesis of Titus 1, 5-9, p. 202.203, this excursus which certainly belongs here: "Das, was in dem jetzt betrachteten Schriftabschnitt gesagt ist, gilt sicherlich auch heute. Es gilt heute in erster Linie den Beamten der kirchlichen Gemeinschaften, welchen der Auftrag geworden ist, darauf zu sehen, daß die einzelnen Gemeinden mit tüchtigen Dienern am Wort versehen sind, und welche vakanten Gemeinden solche vorzuschlagen pflegen. Es gilt aber ebenso den Gemeinden, welche ja ihre Diener am Wort zu erwählen haben. Es gilt wiederum den Beamten der kirchlichen Gemeinschaften, welchen der Auftrag geworden ist, im Namen der Gemeinden Lehrer für deren kirchliche Ausbildungsanstalten zu wählen, namentlich für die, in welchen solche Jünglinge ausgebildet werden, die "ein Bischofsamt begehren," 1 Tim. 3, 1. In zweiter Linie gilt es allen denen, welche schon im Bischofsamt sind, welche im heutigen Sinne organisierte Gemeinden zu versorgen haben, oder welche Teile solcher Gemeinden, z. B. Kinder, Schüler zu versehen haben; also es gilt Pastoren, Schul-

lehrern, Anstaltsprofessoren! Alle diese sollen sich prüfen, ob sie die besagten Eigenschaften haben, und darnach streben, daß sie das meiden, was sie untüchtig, das immer mehr gewinnen, was sie tüchtig macht. Und — um auf die erste Linie zurückzukommen — es gilt für die Beamten der kirchlichen Gemeinschaften, welche fürwahr auch "Älteste" oder "Bischöfe" sind, und für die Gemeinden oder deren Vetretern, welche diese zu wählen haben. Beamte der kirchlichen Gemeinschaften dürfen die angezeigte Untüchtigkeit nicht haben, sondern müssen die angezeigte Tüchtigkeit haben. Wie sollen sie sonst auf Tüchtigkeit sehen, ihr Amt recht ausrichten können? Ja, wie sollen sie sonst darauf sehen, daß in dem Kreise ihrer Amtstätigkeit alles christlich, ordentlich, ehrlich, nach Gottes gnädigem und heiligem Willen zugeht."

And these again are golden words.

W. BODAMER.

Die Verwertung und Bewertung der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments in die griechische Sprache, der Septuaginta, wie auch der Abschriften des Alten Testaments mit ihren Varianten im Neuen Testament seitens des Herrn Christi, der Evangelisten, Apostel, und durch sie des Heiligen Geistes.

Die Septuaginta, die griechische Übersetzung des Alten Testaments.

Die Geschichte dieser Übersetzung. Die Geschichte derselben steht nicht ganz fest. Nach einer verbreiteten Legende soll Ptolemäus II. (Philadelphus I.), der zweite mazedonisch-griechische König über Ägypten, die Übersetzung der Septuaginta veranlaßt haben. Nach Alexanders des Großen Tod im Jahre 323 vor Christo wurden seine Eroberungen unter seine Generale verteilt. Der erste Ptolemäus, Feldherr unter Alexander und dessen Jugendfreund, erhielt unter anderen Ländern auch Ägypten. Sein Sohn Ptolemäus II. folgte ihm und regierte von 285 bis 247. Dieser tat viel für die Entwicklung der Künste und Wissenschaften. So baute und vermehrte er die großartige Bibliothek in Alexandrien, deren wertvolle und nicht zu ersetzende Sammlung von Manuskripten schon um das Jahr 640 nach Christo soll zerstört worden sein. Man soll der

Sage nach sechs Monate lang die öffentlichen Bäder damit geheizt haben.

Das über Ptolemäus Gesagte macht das, was die Sage über die Entstehung der Septuaginta sagt, etwas wahrscheinlich: zwei- und siebenzig jüdische Gelehrte sollen aus Palästina nach Alexandria geschickt worden sein, um das hebräische Alte Testament in die griechische Sprache zu übersetzen und sollen diese Übersetzung in zwei- und siebenzig Tagen vollendet haben. Dies geschah im Jahre 250 vor Christo. So viel wäre über die Geschichte der Septuaginta zu sagen.

Die Septuaginta füllte ein Bedürfnis. Nach einer Seite hin war die Kenntnis der hebräischen Sprache schon lange bei den Juden zu einer mittelmäßigen herabgesunken. Die aramäische Sprache hatte im Volke die hebräische ersetzt. Zwar waren auch an Stelle der hebräischen Schrift aramäische Schriftzeichen eingeführt worden, aber die Sprache des Alten Testaments blieb die hebräische. Dem muß hinzugefügt werden, daß die Einführung der Vokalzeichen, die Trennung der einzelnen Wörter voneinander und die Teilung in Verse, wie sie heute im massoretischen Text vorliegen, erst lange nach Christo dem Texte hinzugefügt wurden. Zieht man dies alles in Betracht, dann muß man annehmen, daß der hebräische Text des Alten Testaments der Mehrzahl im Volke ein fast verschlossenes Buch war.

Auf der anderen Seite kam dies hinzu, daß durch die Eroberungszüge Alexanders des Großen, der im Jahre 325 vor Christo bis an den Indus-Fluß in Indien vorgedrungen war, fast alle Länder am Mittelländischen Meer erobert und den unterjochten Völkern die griechische Sprache aufgedrängt hatte, diese Sprache sozusagen zur Weltsprache geworden war, zur Umgangssprache der Völker untereinander und darum allgemein die bekannteste Sprache. Daß auch in Palästina die griechische Sprache nicht unbekannt war, darauf weist einmal dies hin, daß Alexander der Große alle Länder am Mittelländischen Meer erobert hatte, darunter auch Palästina; zum andern dies, daß ja viele Juden sich Geschäfte halber in anderen Ländern aufhielten; endlich auch der verschiedene Stil der heiligen Schreiber in ihren Schriften, was auf eine natürliche Aneignung der griechischen Sprache ihrerseits hinweist.

Alles dies in Betracht gezogen befriedigte die Septuaginta ein großes Bedürfnis; sie trug viel bei zur Erhaltung, noch mehr zur Ver-

breitung der Kenntnis des Alten Testaments mit seinen Weissagungen auf Christus, wodurch sie dem Neuen Testament, das ja mit seiner Botschaft von der Erfüllung dieser alttestamentlichen Weissagungen die Kenntnis dieser voraussetzt, ein rechter Wegweiser und Gegebener wurde. Der Wert und die Bedeutung der Septuaginta war darum für jene Zeit wie auch später kein geringer.

Die **Genauigkeit** der Septuaginta - Übersetzung. Was die Genauigkeit der ursprünglichen Übersetzung, 250 Jahre vor Christo gemacht, betrifft, darüber läßt sich kaum etwas sagen. Dazu müßte man diese ursprüngliche Übersetzung, ihr Manuskript, und den damals benutzten hebräischen Text zur Hand haben. Beide sind längst nicht mehr vorhanden. Manuskripte aus jener Zeit hatten kein langes Leben, da das Material, das benutzt wurde, durchaus nicht dauerhaft war. Wenn demnach die Genauigkeit der Septuaginta-Übersetzung in Betracht kommt, kann es sich nur um einen Vergleich späterer Abschriften der Septuaginta mit späteren Abschriften des hebräischen Urtextes, soweit diese vorliegen, handeln, etwa um codices aus dem 4. und 5. Jahrhundert und die editio sixtina, 1586, mit dem massoretischen Text, vom 16. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert. Prof. Eberhard Nestle, seit dem Jahre 1898 Prof. am evangelischen Seminar in Maulbronn, Württemberg, gest. 1913, sagt in seinem Aufsatz: „Griechische Bibelübersetzungen“, Enzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie von N. Hauck, Prof. in Leipzig und Mitarbeiter von Herzog und Plitt: „Die Genauigkeit der Übersetzung beziehungsweise die Übereinstimmung mit unserem massoretischen Text ist bei den einzelnen Büchergruppen sehr verschieden. Im Pentateuch weichen beide Zeugen nicht sehr voneinander ab, außer in Exodus von Kapitel 36 an und in Numeri; nichtsdestoweniger stimmt die LXX an mehr als 1,600 Stellen mit dem Samariter gegen den massoretischen Text überein. In Wirklichkeit wird unsere heutige massoretische Rezension später als jede der beiden genannten sein, die beide unabhängig voneinander aus hebräischen, einander noch ähnlichen Handschriften geflossen sein werden . . . Besonders groß sind die Abweichungen in Jeremia und im Hiob.“ Dieses Urteil, wie schon gesagt, kann sich nur auf die Texte beziehen, die einem Vergleich beider miteinander zur Verfügung stehen. Man darf von diesen aus nicht auf die Originaltexte schließen.

In dem Buch *Theologia Viatorum*, einer Sammlung von theologischen Aufsätzen, 1938, München, befindet sich auch einer von

Günther Harder, S. 33–52: „Die Septuagintazitate des Hebräerbriefs“. Harder führt in diesem Aufsatz zuerst eine Anzahl Zitate aus der LXX im Hebräerbrief an, in denen die LXX nicht mit dem hebräischen Text stimmt, aber trotzdem vom Hebräerbrief zitiert wird. Der Verfasser weist nach, daß die LXX öfter nicht nur nicht mit dem Wortlaut des hebräischen Textes stimme, sondern dem Text auch einen anderen Sinn gegeben habe. Ein besonderes Beispiel bietet das LXX-Zitat, so auch im Hebräerbrief, aus Psalm 40, 7. Der hebräische Text lautet, so auch bei Luther und in der King James Version: „Ohren hast du mir geschnitten“. Die LXX übersetzt: „Den Leib hast du mir bereitet“. So auch Hebr. 10, 5, ebenso King James und Luther.

Weiter führt Harder aus, welche Schlüsse man aus diesen Abweichungen gezogen habe. Am drastischsten ist ohne Frage Girsch, den Harder so zitiert aus seiner Schrift: „Das Alte Testament und die Predigt des Evangeliums“, Tübingen, 1936: „Es gibt keine einzige positive Beziehung des Neuen auf das Alte Testament, bei der letzteres nicht in seinem Sinn umgebogen wäre“. Ferner: „Gewiß müßte man nun sagen, daß die Deutung des Alten Testaments durch den werdenden christlichen Glauben ein geschichtlicher Gewaltakt gewesen ist, der in dem unmittelbaren gegenständlichen Sinn des Alten Testaments keine sachliche Begründung hat“.

Harder faßt das Ergebnis seiner Untersuchung in folgenden Punkten zusammen:

1. „Die Tatsache, daß Hebr. die LXX zitiert, steht fest.“
2. „Da, wo der LXX-Text von der hebräischen Vorlage abweicht, geht Hebr. durchschnittlich mit dem LXX-Text.“
3. „Gerade die Abweichungen des LXX-Textes vom hebräischen sind es in einer Reihe von Fällen, deretwegen Hebr. die betreffenden alttestamentlichen Stellen zitiert, eine Tatsache, die man nicht übersehen darf.“
4. Die moderne Auslegung wird dieser Tatsache nicht gerecht. Entweder erklärt sie nichts, oder sie versucht es mit Hilfskonstruktionen, um den LXX-Text als dem hebräischen sinntreulich hin-zustellen, oder sie erklärt die Zitate für Vergewaltigung und Umdeutung des hebräischen Textes vom christlichen Glauben her.“
5. „Luther (Harder zitiert ihn aus seiner Hebr.-Vorlesung) läßt nicht den alttestamentlichen Schriftworten nachträglich eine christ-

liche Deutung oder Umdeutung zuteil werden, sondern er zeigt auf, daß die zitierten Stellen, will man sie als Gotteswort ernst nehmen, überhaupt nur verstanden werden können, wenn sie von Christus oder über ihn gesprochen gedacht werden, weil das in ihnen redende Subjekt oder ihr Objekt erst mit Jesus Christus gegeben ist.“

6. „Die LXX-Übersetzung ist nicht nur Übersetzung, sondern Auslegung. Sie ist christologische und eschatologische Auslegung, die das Volk Gottes, das allein das Alte Testament als **Wort Gottes** hören kann, diesem gibt. Anders als in dieser christologischen und eschatologischen Weise ist das Alte Testament nicht lesbar, bzw. hörbar, und auch zur Zeit der Apostel nicht gelesen worden.“

Harder hätte hier sein auf Jesu eigene Worte hinweisen können: „Suchet in der Schrift; sie ist es, die von mir zeugt“. Zeugt die Schrift von Jesu, dann liest und versteht sie der nur richtig, der sie auf Jesum bezieht.

7. „Der Schriftbeweis des Hebr. ist nicht als literarische oder religionsgeschichtliche Beurteilung und Verwendung alttestamentlicher Texte anzusehen, sondern als die **Bezeugung** der das im Alten Testament redende Gotteswort hörenden Gemeinde dafür, daß sie **gehört hat** — so wie sie **Gott überhaupt reden hören kann** —, daß Gott in Jesus Christus für sie gehandelt hat.“

Angeichts des vorliegenden Gegenstandes bleibt nicht auch das bestehen, was bereits gesagt worden ist, daß nämlich in unserer Zeit kaum mit Sicherheit ein Abweichen der LXX vom hebräischen Text festgestellt werden kann? Wir müßten dazu das ursprüngliche Manuskript der LXX haben und auch die von jenen Übersetzern benutzten hebräischen Handschriften. Beide haben wir nicht. Die ältesten noch vorhandenen LXX-Handschriften sind Vaticanus, B, Sinaiticus, S, beide aus dem 4. Jahrhundert, und Alexandrinus, A, aus dem 5. Jahrhundert, also ca. 600 Jahre nach dem Entstehen der LXX im Jahre 250 vor Christo in Alexandrien. Zu jenen 600 Jahren wurde die LXX viel abgeschrieben und nicht wenige Varianten entstanden dadurch. So steht es auch mit dem hebräischen Text. Wir haben heute den massoretischen Text aus den Jahren 600–1100, allerdings auf Grund vieler Notizen, mündlich und schriftlich, und auf Grund vieler vorhandenen Manuskript-Prüfungen sorgfältig bearbeitet. Da ist es richtig, wenn man die beiderseits noch vorhandenen Manuskripte miteinander vergleicht und dabei Abweichungen konstatiert. Will man aber das, was dabei zutage tritt, auch

auf die beiderseitigen Handschriften, 600 und mehr Jahre früher vorhanden, anwenden, dann geht das nicht.

Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Kanons, das gilt auch vom neutestamentlichen, ist verwirrend und nicht wenig entmutigend. Hier gilt eins, nämlich dies, daß die Schrift sagt: „Meine Worte vergehen nicht“. 1 Petrus 1, 24. 25: „Alles Fleisch ist wie Gras und die Herrlichkeit der Menschen wie des Grasses Blume. Das Gras ist verdorret und die Blume abgefallen; aber des Herrn Wort bleibet in Ewigkeit. Das ist das Wort, welches unter euch verkündet ist“. Der hat in der Veränderlichkeit dieses Lebens, durch menschliche Sünde und Fehlbarkeit verursacht, einen festen Stab, der sich klammert an das Wort: „Des Herrn Wort bleibt in Ewigkeit“.

Dennoch ist die Würdigung der Septuaginta zu allen Zeiten eine große gewesen. Kohnert, in seiner „Dogmatik der ev.-luth. Kirche“ weist auf die Tatsache, die ja den Ausschlag gibt, hin, daß die Evangelisten und Apostel im Neuen Testament beim Zitieren des Alten Testaments einen überraschenden Gebrauch von der Septuaginta gemacht haben. Er fügt hinzu: „Die alten Kirchenväter aus den ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christo zitieren ebenfalls nach der LXX, ja, sie legen dieser eine solche Bedeutung bei, daß sie dieselbe dem hebräischen Grundtext gleichstellen und sie als göttlich inspiriert betrachten“.

Nestle führt in dem schon genannten Aufsatz Joh. Pearson, Bischof von Chester, an, nämlich: „Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta hat am besten Joh. Pearson zusammengefaßt, wenn er in seiner Rede von 1665 ausführt, wie sie sehr nützlich und notwendig sei: 1. zum guten Erfassen der hebräischen Wahrheit; 2. zur Bestätigung der Gültigkeit der apostolischen Zeugnisse; 3. zum rechten Erkennen des ursprünglichen Stils des Neuen Bundes; 4. zum richtigen Auslegen der griechischen und lateinischen Väter; 5. endlich zur genauen Kenntnis der griechischen Sprache in jener Zeit. Sie ist daher allen Gelehrten, hauptsächlich den Theologen, aufs beste zu empfehlen.“ Joh. Pearson schrieb im Jahre 1665 ein „gediegenes Vorwort“ zur Cambridge Ausgabe der Sixtina.

Nestle führt auch Prof. Hitzig, theolog. Seminar in Heidelberg, an, der an seine Studenten folgende Aufforderung zu richten pflegte: „Meine Herren, haben Sie eine Septuaginta? Wenn nicht, so verkaufen Sie alles, was Sie haben, und kaufen sich eine Septuaginta“.

Der alttestamentliche Kanon und seine Anordnung in der

Septuaginta. Da die ursprünglichen Manuskripte längst nicht mehr vorhanden sind und wir nur Abschriften derselben haben, müssen wir von diesen auf jene schließen. Da die Wahrscheinlichkeit dafür spricht, indem man kaum einen Grund finden kann, weshalb einer der frühesten und späteren Abschreiber sollte etwas geändert haben an der Anordnung der alttestamentlichen Bücher in der Septuaginta, indem er sie umstellte oder eins derselben ausließ, schließt man, was ja berechtigt ist, von den noch vorhandenen Manuskripten aus auf die ursprünglichen. Was ergibt sich da?

Rohnert sagt in seiner Dogmatik, S. 108: „Um das Jahr 250 vor Christo nämlich kam die griechische Übersetzung des Alten Testaments zustande, die sogenannte Septuaginta, welche die 22 alttestamentlichen Bücher als einen bereits abgeschlossenen Kanon enthält, und zwar in der Reihenfolge der Lutherischen Bibelübersetzung“. Diesem Urteil schließt sich auch Nestle an.

Anderes ist die Anordnung der alttestamentlichen Bücher in der Sixtina, der von Papst Sixtus V. autorisierten Herausgabe der Septuaginta. In dieser findet man die kanonischen Schriften und die Apokryphen durcheinander geworfen, so daß z. B. auf „Weisheit Salomos“ das apokryphische Buch der „Weisheit Sirachs“ folgt: Wenn man sich auf Rohnerts Urteil stützt, daß nämlich die Anordnung der Bücher in der Septuaginta die der Lutherbibel war, dann muß man schließen, daß die eigentliche Septuaginta nicht wie die Sixtina die kanonischen Schriften mit den Apokryphen vermischte. Daß die Sixtina das tut, kann nicht überraschen, da ja die Päpsten wegen mancher unorthodoxen Aussprüche in den Apokryphen, die ihnen aber passen, diesen gerne ein kanonisches Ansehen geben möchten und sie darum in den Kanon versetzen. Hierüber später mehr in bezug auf die Codices B, S und A.

Der alttestamentliche Kanon wurde bereits um das Jahr 450 vor Christo durch Esra und Nehemia gesammelt und war in der Zeit des Perserkönigs Darius II. vollendet. Diese Bücher des Alten Testaments genossen das Ansehen heiliger Schriften. Ihre Zahl betrug 22, wie auch Josephus sie angibt und sie Bücher nennt, die „mit Recht Vertrauen genießen“. Die alttestamentlichen Apokryphen erschienen erst später; sie waren ursprünglich in der griechischen Sprache verfaßt. Ob die ursprüngliche Septuaginta diese Apokryphen bereits enthielt, wird sich kaum feststellen lassen. Es können auch spätere Abschreiber sie dem alttestamentlichen Kanon in der

Septuaginta hinzugefügt haben, wie man ja auch nach Christo versuchte, nichtkanonische Schriften dem neutestamentlichen Kanon hinzuzufügen.

Die diesem Aufsatz zugrunde liegende Septuaginta-Ausgabe.

Die *Sixtina*, die von Papst Sixtus V. autorisierte Ausgabe der Septuaginta. Sixtus V. war Papst von 1585–1590, also etwa dreißig Jahre nach Schluß des Tridentiner Konzils. Die von diesem Papst autorisierte LXX, unter dem Namen *Sixtina* bekannt, eine Bearbeitung des Codex Vaticanus, wurde von Franciscus Zanetti (1587) gedruckt. Wer die Revision überwachte, ist nicht gesagt, nur dies, daß unter jedem Kapitel reichhaltige Variantenansammlungen aus Handschriften, Kirchenvätern usw. angefügt waren.

Nestle sagt von dieser Ausgabe: „Am einflußreichsten wurde und ist die *Editio Sixtina*“. Darum ist auch in der Folge die *Sixtina* oft nachgedruckt worden. Nestle sagt dazu: „Wiederholungen der *Sixtina* sind: Paris 1628, von Joh. Morinus; London 1653, von Roger Daniel; London 1657, von Roycroft; Cambridge 1665, Field; Amsterdam 1683, Someren und Boom; Leipzig 1697, Joh. Fried jun. von Ulm; Amsterdam 1725, von Mill; Leipzig 1730, Reineccius, Halle 1759–1762, Waisenhaus; Dyfjord 1798–1827, Solmes-Parsons; London 1821, Bagster; Benedig 1822, Ulich; Leipzig 1824, von Leander von Eß. Nestle führt noch weitere Nachdrucke der *Sixtina* an und fügt hinzu, daß in fast allen diesen Ausgaben der Text der *Sixtina* von 1586 ungeändert war abgedruckt worden. Jedenfalls zeigt dies, daß man auf die *Sixtina* lange Zeit hindurch großen Wert gelegt hat.

Der hier benutzte Nachdruck der *Sixtina*

ist der im Jahre 1824, Leipzig, von Leander von Eß beauftragte. Auf der Titelseite steht: *Vetus Testamentum graecum juxta Septuaginta Interpretes ex autoritate Sixti Quinti, Pontificis Maximi editum. Juxta exemplar originale Vaticanum, Romae editum 1587, quoad textum accuratissime et ad amussim recusum, cura et studio Leandri van Ess, sanctae theologiae Doctoris, Lipsiae 1835.*

Einige Anmerkungen:

1. Der Codex Vaticanus, in der vatikanischen Bibliothek zu Rom, stammt neben dem Codex Sinaiticus aus dem 4. Jahr-

hundert und gehört somit zu den ältesten Handschriften, die wir besitzen. Darum auch zu den zuverlässigsten; denn das wird man zugeben müssen: Je näher der Schuß zum Zentrum, desto besser ist er. Der Codex Vaticanus enthält nicht das ganze Neue Testament; Hebräer, von 9, 14 an, 1. und 2. Tim., Titus, Philemon und Offenbarung fehlen. Er enthält aber die Septuaginta. Diese diente der Sixtina als Grundlage, von der die Van Essche Ausgabe wieder ein Nachdruck ist, der demnach auf einer der ältesten Handschriften der LXX sich gründet.

2. In die Ausgabe von van Ess wurden die Varianten nicht aufgenommen.

3. Die Angaben der Kapitel stimmen nicht immer mit unserer Lutherbibel; darum man oft lange suchen muß, bis man das gewünschte Kapitel und Vers findet. Hier und da sind auch zwei Psalmen zu einem verbunden worden, so auch mit Kapiteln. Die von Luthers Kapitelfolge in der van Esschen LXX abweichende Kapitelfolge zeigte sich besonders beim Propheten Jeremias. Jedenfalls war es in der Sixtina und im vatikanischen Codex genau so. Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Textes zeigt uns, daß derselbe im Laufe der Jahrhunderte manche Änderungen erfahren hat durch die vielen Abschriften, die nicht immer mit der nötigen Vorsicht gemacht wurden. Die Hauptsache ist die, daß wir uns durch diese Geschichte in keiner Weise irremachen lassen, sondern dem Beispiel unsers Herrn Christi folgen, der, wiewohl er die Unzuverlässigkeit der Menschen genau kannte, ohne Wanken an der Zuverlässigkeit des Alten Testaments festhielt, das ihm Gottes unmittelbares Wort war, und darum seine Hörer immer wieder ermahnte: „Suchet in der Schrift!“

Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im Neuen Testament wurden nach dieser van Esschen Ausgabe geprüft.

Bei dieser Arbeit wurden sämtliche neutestamentliche Bücher durchgesehen und jedes Zitat wurde geprüft. Es war keine schwierige Arbeit, aber im höchsten Grade interessant und befriedigend, indem das bestätigt wurde, was Rohmert und andere über die Verwertung der LXX im Neuen Testament sagen.

Es wurden hauptsächlich solche Stellen in Betracht gezogen, wo ausdrücklich steht: „Wie geschrieben steht“ und Ähnliches, also solche Stellen, die ausdrücklich als Zitate vermerkt sind. Das

griechische Neue Testament — es standen nur spätere Ausgaben des von Tischendorf aufgefundenen, mit andern Codices verglichenen, bearbeiteten und herausgegebenen Codex Sinaiticus aus dem 4. Jahrhundert wie die von Nestle und Oskar De Gebhardt zur Verfügung — hebt in den genannten Ausgaben die alttestamentlichen Zitate entweder durch Sperr- oder Fettdruck hervor. Es finden sich aber manche Zitate, besonders in der Apokalypse, bei denen nicht steht: „Wie geschrieben steht“ oder eine andere passende Zitateinführung.

Das Resultat dieses Vergleichens war überraschend, einmal in bezug auf die Menge der Zitate, sodann in bezug auf solche Bücher, die besonders reich an Zitaten sind, und solche, die wenige Zitate nur oder gar keine aufweisen wie die Schriften Johannis, endlich in bezug auf die Wörtlichkeit der meisten Zitate, zumal der langen, wie im Lukas-Evangelium, Apostelgeschichte und im Hebräerbrief. Dieser letztere Umstand mag sich dadurch erklären lassen, daß die heiligen Schreiber sich bei kurzen Zitaten mehr auf ihr Gedächtnis verließen, bei längeren dagegen nicht. Wir machen ja oft dieselbe Erfahrung.

Eine Liste der Zitate nach den einzelnen Büchern, nur ihre Zahl angegeben:

1. Indem diese Liste gegeben wird, diene folgendes zur Erklärung: Die Liste bringt zuerst die Gesamtzahl aller Zitate eines Buches aus der LXX;

2. dann die Zahl solcher Zitate, die wörtlich sind. Zu diesen wurden auch solche gerechnet, bei denen eine Abweichung, doch nur eine ganz geringe, aber nie den Sinn ändernde, sich zeigte. Es widerstrebte dem Unterzeichneten, ein durchaus wörtliches Zitat um einer geringfügigen Abweichung willen aus der Liste der wörtlichen Zitate zu entfernen;

3. dann die Zahl solcher, die nicht wörtlich waren. Auch diese jedoch lassen erkennen, daß die LXX benutzt wurde.

4. Zuweilen haben die heiligen Schreiber mehrere Zitate in eins zusammengezogen.

5. Es soll auch gezeigt werden, welche neutestamentlichen Schreiber viel und am genauesten zitiert haben und welche wenig oder gar nicht.

6. Dann soll auch gezeigt werden, aus welchen alttestamentlichen Büchern am meisten zitiert wurde.

7. Was einem beim Prüfen der Zitate aus der LXX ganz besonders auffällt, ist dies: Alle Zitate wurden von den heiligen Männern Gottes gewählt, wann und wie es ein Bedürfnis erforderte, um ihren Ausführungen durch ein alttestamentliches Zitat ein besonderes Gewicht zu verleihen. Man merkt, sie waren nicht kritisch in ihrer Auswahl. Das würde darauf hinweisen, daß sie der LXX trauten. Gewiß spielte ihr Gedächtnis dabei eine große Rolle, indem sie solche Zitate gebrauchten, die ihnen bekannt waren und die beim Niederschreiben ihnen in den Sinn kamen. Dabei konnte es passieren, daß sie nach dem Gedächtnis zitierten, wobei sie freilich immer den Sinn trafen, aber nicht immer die genauen Worte der LXX, was öfter der Fall ist. So oft sie jedoch eine LXX zur Verfügung hatten und es sich um ein längeres Zitat handelte, schlugen sie lieber die LXX auf und schrieben das Zitat wörtlich ab, verließen sich aber auf ihr Gedächtnis nicht. Das erklärt es, daß besonders die längeren Zitate, zumal im Hebräerbrief und in der Apostelgeschichte, am wörtlichsten sind.

8. Es mag interessieren, daß in der Epistel Judä B. 14 das Buch Henoch, eins der alttestamentlichen Pseudepigraphen, zitiert wird, nämlich B. 9, der Streit des Erzengels Michael mit dem Teufel über dem Leichnam Moses, und B. 14 ein längeres Zitat. Luther ist in seiner Vorrede zur Epistel Judä nicht gut auf diese zu sprechen. Er wirft ihr vor, sie bringe Geschichten und Worte, die nicht in der Bibel stehn. Aber zur Verteidigung der Epistel Judä, was dies betrifft, könnte darauf hingewiesen werden, daß Paulus in Athen aus den heidnischen Poeten zitierte und daß Lukas durch den Heiligen Geist dies mitteilt und jenes Zitat wiederholt; Apostelgesch. 17, 28: „Denn in ihm leben, weben und sind wir, wie auch etliche Poeten bei euch gesagt haben. Wir sind seines Geschlechts“. Ersteres ist das Zitat, wie ja das Versmaß anzeigt: En autoh gar zohomen kai kinoumetha kai esmen. Nach einer Notiz aus der Seminarzeit sollen Aratus und Kleantes die Poeten sein. Letzterer war ein griechischer Philosoph in Athen und dichtete in Hexametern verfaßt ein Lied „auf den höchsten Zeus“.

Es folgt nun die Liste der Zitate, nach der LXX geprüft:

	Gesamt- zahl	Wörtlich	Nicht wörtlich
1. Ev. Matthäus	25	16	9
2. Ev. Markus	9	5	4

3.	Ev. Lukas	17	11	6
4.	Ev. Johannes	7	2	5
5.	Apostelgeschichte	24	19	5
6.	Römer	48	32	16
7.	1. Korinther	12	4	8
8.	2. Korinther	8	6	2
9.	Galater	4	4	0
10.	Epheser	9	7	2
11.	Philipper	2	1	1
12.	Kolossier	2	1	1
13.	1. Thessalonicher	0	0	0
14.	2. Thessalonicher	1	1	0
15.	1. Timotheum	2	2	0
16.	2. Timotheum	3	3	0
17.	Titus	1	0	1
18.	Philemon	0	0	0
19.	1. Petri	13	7	6
20.	2. Petri	1	0	1
21.	3 Episteln Johannis	0	0	0
22.	Hebräer	49	36	13
23.	Jacobi	3	3	0
24.	Judä	0	0	0
25.	Offenbarung Johannes	11	2	9
	Summa	251	162	89

Einige Bemerkungen zu dieser Liste:

1. Die längsten Zitate: Matth. 13, 14, 15 (Jes. 6, 9f.): „Sie hören und verstehen nicht“; Matth. 15, 8, 9 (Jes. 29, 13): „Dies Volk nahet sich zu mir mit seinem Munde“; Luk. 4, 10, 11 (Psalm 91, 11, 12): „Er wird seinen Engeln Befehl über dir geben, daß“; Apostelgesch. 2, 25–28 (Psalm 16, 8–11): „Ich habe den Herrn allezeit vor mir“; Apostelgesch. 4, 25, 26 (Psalm 2, 1): „Warum toben die Heiden“; Apostelgesch. 8, 32, 33 (Jes. 53, 7); Apostelgesch. 28, 26, 27 (Jes. 6, 9f.); Röm. 4, 7, 8 (Psalm 32, 1, 2); Hebr. 1, 8, 9 (Psalm 45, 7); Hebr. 1, 10–12 (Psalm 102, 26–28); Hebr. 8, 8–12 (Jer. 31, 31–34); Hebr. 10, 5–9 (Psalm 40, 7–9). Das zuletzt genannte Zitat ist das längste von allen. Allgemein sind, wie schon einmal bemerkt, die längeren Zitate am wörtlichsten.

2. Am meisten zitiert haben Matthäus (25), Lukas, Evangelium und Acta (41), Paulus in Römer (48), Hebräer (49). Sieben Bücher haben wenige oder gar keine Zitate: 1 Thessal., Titus, Philemon, 3 Briefe Johannis. Was die Apokalypse betrifft, zeigen

die griechischen Testamente viele Zitate an, besonders Nestle in seiner Ausgabe. Beim Vergleichen mit der LXX wurde aber gefunden, daß es sich hier nicht um ein Zitieren im eigentlichen Sinne handelt, sondern mehr um Benutzung einiger alttestamentlicher Ausdrücke und um eine freie Wiedergabe des Sinnes alttestamentlicher Stellen. Ohne Frage ist unter den neutestamentlichen Schreibern Johannes der, der von der LXX am wenigsten Gebrauch gemacht hat.

3. Die alttestamentlichen Bücher, aus denen am meisten zitiert wird, sind: 5 Bücher Moses (70), Psalmen (68), Jesaias (55), Sprüche Salomonis (8). Von Josua bis Hiob fast keine Zitate, auch nicht aus den späteren Propheten.

4. Etwas Eigentümliches drängt sich einem auf, wenn man darauf achtet, wie im Hebräerbrieff die Zitate eingeführt werden, und man diese Weise mit der in den andern Büchern vergleicht, nämlich eipen viermal, legei 21mal, ohne Einführung dreizehnmal. Einmal nur steht: legei to pneuma to hagion, einmal martuereitai, einmal phesin, einmal: legei kuerios.

Matthäus führt meistens so ein: „Die Rede durch den Propheten“ und nennt seinen Namen. Auch gebraucht Matthäus die Worte „Wie geschrieben steht“. Markus ist ähnlich, so auch Lukas. Paulus macht es so: „Wie geschrieben steht“; „David spricht“; „Wie er auch in Hosea sagt“; „Jesaias aber schreit über Israel“; „Wie Jesaias zuvor gesagt“; „Was sagt die Schrift“.

Sollte das andeuten, daß der Hebräerbrieff nicht durch Paulus verfaßt wurde, wiewohl er in den ersten Jahrhunderten fast allgemein als Autor angenommen wurde? In Anbetracht dessen, daß jeder seine eigentümliche Weise hat und sie beibehält, wenn er redet oder schreibt, wäre es nicht so weit vom Wege ab zu sagen: Wie der Schreiber des Hebräerbrieffes die Zitate einführt, ist nicht Pauli und der anderen Weise; das macht die Autorschaft dieses Brieffes, was Paulus anbetrifft, unwahrscheinlich.

Heute wird Apollo, der treue Genosse Pauli, vielfach als Autor angenommen. Genau läßt sich das freilich nicht feststellen. Dem würde nicht widersprechen, daß der Inhalt des Hebräerbrieffes einen Schreiber voraussetzt, der große Bekanntschaft hatte mit der alttestamentlichen Gottesdienstordnung mit ihren Gebräuchen. Apollo war ein alexandrinischer Jude „mächtig in der Schrift“; Apostelgeschichte 18, 24.

Zwei Septuaginta-Ausgaben, viel später herausgegeben als

die von van Eß, wurden dem Schreiber dieses Aufsatzes kürzlich zur Verfügung gestellt zu dem Zweck, Vergleiche anzustellen. Beide sind fein ausgestattet und geben, besonders die von Swete, zahlreiche Varianten an, zumal, wo die späteren Handschriften, die aus dem 6. Jahrhundert und später, eine andere Lesart als die des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts aufweisen. Diese sind:

Alfred Rahlfs, D. D., Ph. D., zwei Bände, Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1935. A. Rahlfs Erklärung über die Handschriften, die er benutzte: „Die vorliegende Handausgabe der LXX gründet sich **hauptsächlich** auf die drei berühmten, ursprünglich das ganze A. und N. T. enthaltenden Bibelhandschriften B, S, A.“ B, der Codex Vaticanus, 4. Jahrhundert, in der Vatikanischen Bibliothek. S, der Codex Sinaiticus, 4. Jahrhundert, von Tischendorf entdeckt, erst in St. Petersburg (Seningrad), dann an das Britische Museum verkauft. A, der Codex Alexandrinus, 5. Jahrhundert, ebenfalls im Britischen Museum.

Henry Barclay Swete, D. D., drei Bände, Cambridge, at the University Press, 1934. Diese Ausgabe benutzt auch die Codices B, S, A, daneben aber auch einige aus späteren Jahrhunderten; doch werden jene drei am meisten berücksichtigt.

Der **praktische Zweck** eines Vergleichens dieser drei Septuaginta-Ausgaben miteinander ist der, zu zeigen, ob und wie weit sie voneinander abweichen. Da alle drei sich vornehmlich auf B, S und A stützen, van Eß ausschließlich auf die Sixtina, die sich allein auf B stützt, werden nicht viele Varianten zu erwarten sein. Der Vergleich wird das zeigen, daß besonders B und S, A weniger, zumeist miteinander stimmen. Swete, der mehr Varianten anführt als Rahlfs, zeigt, daß die meisten Varianten aus A und späteren Codices stammen. Darum: Je älter die Handschrift, desto genauer und zuverlässiger ist sie. Also zeigt der Vergleich jener drei Ausgaben der LXX zugleich auch, wie viel jene ältesten Codices voneinander abweichen. Die vorhandenen Varianten in bezug auf B, S und A, das sei zugleich gesagt, sind ungemein unbedeutend. **Nicht eine**, soweit sie geprüft wurden, änderte irgendwie den Sinn, weder nach oben noch nach unten. Darum brauchte auch die Bewertung der Zitate in der oben gegebenen Liste, wörtlich und nicht wörtlich, nirgends geändert werden. Was für B gilt, gilt ebenfalls für A,

besonders S. Zweimal nur wurde gefunden, daß die Lesart in S besser mit dem Zitat im N. T. stimmte als die in B. In beiden Fällen handelte es sich nur um ein Wort. Es darf hierbei nicht vergessen werden, daß diese Prüfung nur eine limitierte sein konnte.

Ein Beispiel: Gal. 4, 27 und 4, 30 wurden geprüft. In bezug auf erstere Stelle waren keine Varianten angegeben, weder für B, noch S und A. In bezug auf letztere Stelle hat A ou gar meh, so auch B. Das stimmt mit dem Zitat im N. T. A fügt Ismaehl hinzu, B nicht. Das Zitat im N. T. hat Ismaehl nicht. A läßt tautehs zweimal aus; B hat es, das Zitat im N. T. nicht. Während B meta tou hüou mou Isaak hat, hat das Zitat im N. T. meta tou hüou tehs eleutheras. Das sind ausnahmsweise viele Varianten, aber keine ändert den Sinn in irgendeiner Weise.

Neben den Zitaten aus Acta und Hebräer, 73 Zitate, davon 55 wörtlich, wurden geprüft: Genesis, Kap. 1, 31 Verse; Psalm 2, 12 Verse; Psalm 23, 6 Verse; Psalm 51, 21 Verse; Psalm 90, 17 Verse; Jes. 53, 12 Verse. Verglichen mit van Gß variierten Kahlfs und Swete so: Genesis 1 N. 4, S. 8; Psalm 2 N. keine Varianten; S. eine; Psalm 23 N. keine, S. auch keine; Psalm 51 N. 3, ebenso S.; Psalm 90 N. 3, S. 5; Jes. 53 N. 7, S. 5. N. und S. stimmten mehr miteinander als mit van Gß.

Was die Zitate in Acta und Hebräer betrifft, wurden in bezug auf diese N. und S. ebenfalls mit der Ausgabe von van Gß verglichen. Dabei zeigte sich, daß S. in den 24 Zitaten aus Acta, von denen manche ziemlich lange waren, nur fünfmal abwich, N. siebenmal. In bezug auf die Zitate aus Hebräer, 49, wich N. sechsmal von van Gß ab, S. ebenfalls. Also in 43 Zitaten aus Hebräer und in 19 resp. 17 Zitaten aus Acta herrschte volle Übereinstimmung. Dasselbe gilt dann auch selbstverständlich in bezug auf die drei Manuskripte B, S, A, die jenen drei Ausgaben zugrunde liegen, wobei A mehr von B und S abweicht als B von S.

Es sei noch einmal wiederholt, daß sämtliche Varianten, die gefunden wurden, nicht eine aufweisen, die irgendwie etwas an dem Sinn ändert. Es sind alle Varianten von der Art ohne Ausnahme, daß man ihnen keine Bedeutung zumessen darf.

Freilich wurde nur ein Bruchteil des N. T. geprüft, aber doch in jedem Teil des N. T. etwas. Das Geprüfte sollte ein ziemlich zuverlässiger Maßstab in bezug auf das ganze N. T. sein. Übrigens sagt Tischendorf in seiner Schrift „Haben wir den echten Text“ Ahn-

liches in bezug auf die Varianten des N. T., wobei er alle Schriftzitate in den Vätern des 2. Jahrhunderts und später, nicht nur die Codices des N. T. berücksichtigt.

Die **Anordnung** der Bücher in den drei Ausgaben. Alle enthalten auch die Apokryphen. Zwischen den kanonischen Büchern und den Apokryphen ist keine Grenze gezogen. Sie erscheinen durcheinander. Ohne Frage war das so in den drei großen Handschriften. Der Gedanke liegt nahe, daß diese Anordnung auf den Einfluß der römischen Bischöfe zurückzuführen ist. Der alttestamentliche Kanon stand schon lange vor Christo fest. Josephus bezeugt das auch. Es ist bezeichnend, daß die Schriften des N. T. keine Zitate aus den Apokryphen enthalten, wenigstens wurden keine gefunden mit Ausnahme von Judä, der aus dem Buche Henoch zitiert. Somit liegt der Gedanke nicht fern, daß die römischen Bischöfe für diese Nichtbeachtung der Grenzen zwischen den kanonischen Büchern und Apokryphen verantwortlich sind. Die katholische Kirche lehrt nach Rohnert: „Die Heilige Schrift enthält nicht alles, was dem Menschen zur Seligkeit zu wissen nötig ist; es müssen vielmehr noch ergänzend hinzukommen die Apokryphen, welche ebenso wie die kanonischen Bücher göttliche Autorität haben“.

W. Soenecke.

(Schluß folgt.)

The Church and Christian Liberty

(A Paper Delivered at the Convention of the Synodical Conference at Cleveland, Ohio, August 1 to 4, 1944, by Prof. E. Reim)*

The general topic of this essay as announced in the various church papers is "Christian Liberty." This subject can certainly not claim the distinction of novelty in a gathering of Lutherans. In our Synodical Conference circles it has been treated frequently and thoroughly. It was a favorite topic of Luther, as witness his famous tract *On the Liberty of a Christian*. It shows up again and again in the writings of the Apostles, particularly of

* This essay has already appeared in the 1944 *Proceedings* of the Synodical Conference. If it is reprinted here, it is only by request, and as a convenience for our readers in their filing.

Paul. It goes back to the Son of Man Himself, "who made Himself of no reputation and took upon Him the form of a servant" (Phil. 2:7), but who could nevertheless declare to them that believed on Him: "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31f.), emphasizing this still more by assuring us, "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (v. 36).

But while this, therefore, is not a new subject, it should certainly be an attractive and a fascinating one. If men prize civil liberty so highly that untold thousands have suffered and died in the never-ending struggle against tyranny and oppression, how desirable must not, then, be the liberation of the soul from the power of Satan unto a state of eternal freedom. And if experience teaches that the ordinary human liberties are least appreciated when they are most fully possessed and when, as a result, men have come to take them for granted, then the time to keep the full meaning of our Christian liberty ever before our eyes is that time and condition in which we find ourselves now, when by the grace of God this spiritual freedom has not only been established, but we have been led into it by His Spirit, have enjoyed its fullest blessings for generations, and are perhaps letter-perfect in theoretical knowledge concerning it. Then it behooves us very humbly and prayerfully to beseech our Lord to fill our hearts with the warmth of His Spirit and with a profound appreciation of this priceless gift, lest we, too, come to take for granted and hold cheaply this "glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. 8:21).

Another reason for keeping this doctrine ever fresh in our minds and hearts lies in its basic nature. It is the very cornerstone of all our Christian faith and hope. If in First Corinthians 15 Paul stakes everything on the one fact of the resurrection of Christ, it is because without this the redemption of the Christian is null and void. The ransom would have been paid in vain. Conversely, then, even as the established fact of the resurrection assures the reality of the redemption, so every blessing which depends thereon is thereby made secure. All our blessings are wrapped up in this single and simple statement, that "Christ has redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, purchased and

won me from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil . . . that I may be His own and live under Him . . . in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness." Since to bring this about is the great aim and object of all revelation, we may safely say that there is no doctrine of Scripture which does not, sooner or later, tie up somewhere with this basic truth of the liberation of the soul by Christ. Small wonder, then, that Paul was so urgent toward the Galatians: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (5:1), and that he was so determined against the false brethren to whom, he says, "we gave place by subjection [that is, by a yielding of this liberty], no, not for an hour." He had one great thing in view, "that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you" (Gal. 2:5). Note that Paul makes no distinction between the various doctrines of Scripture. The whole truth of the Gospel was for him at stake in this single issue.

One other reason comes to mind for holding this doctrine in highest esteem, namely, what this freedom wherewith our Lord has endowed us does for man. In describing our previous state, Scripture employs the most dismal and degrading of terms. "Ye were *dead*" — ye were "*darkness*" — ye were the servants [literally, the *slaves*] of sin." But in outlining the result of this liberation God's Word does not rest with the mere implication that these oppressive conditions are now removed. That would still be only a rather negative type of freedom. Scripture rather shows the positive quality, the richness and glory of this liberty, by calling these erstwhile slaves by such glorious titles as children of God, His sons, and such as He has "made kings and priests unto God" (Rev. 1:6). It is not surprising that the world cannot see or sense this glory with which our gracious Lord has invested even the humblest Christian. It is another matter, however, when even the Christian himself is not always as aware of this as he should be. Need more be said to justify a restudy of this topic on this occasion?

In order, however, that we may not lose ourselves in generalities, a specific point of departure and method of approach will be desirable, one that would limit the field of discussion. Such a limitation suggests itself when we note that although this Christian

liberty is a highly individual matter, inasmuch as every single Christian has been personally endowed with every blessing that is included in this royal grant of our Lord, yet it is at the same time something which all Christians possess alike. In so far as they, therefore, can recognize each other through their mutual confession of a common faith, their joint possession of this liberty becomes a matter of mutual rejoicing, of mutual concern, of mutual obligation. The Church thus comes to have a very definite interest and responsibility in the matter. Since we are gathered here as a convention of the Synodical Conference of North America, the broadest outward manifestation of our fellowship of faith, it may well prove profitable to study our general topic from this particular angle that we here discuss

The Church and Christian Liberty

I

In this perfect and glorious gift the Church has an inexhaustible subject for profitable study and wholesome contemplation.

The perfection and glory of a Christian's liberty! There is a striking passage in 1 Peter (1:10-12) in which the Gospel which had then been prophesied and preached is spoken of as something which the angels desire to look into. The general connection makes it clear that the object of interest is the salvation of mankind which is there foretold in prophecy and described in its fulfillment, the outgrowth of that divine plan which God had established in order to free men from the bondage into which they had gotten themselves — in other words, their liberation and the resultant liberty. Let fallen man, who has so infinitely much at stake, and who nevertheless so often fails to value his redemption as he should, learn from these messengers of God how perfect must be the gift which his Lord has in store for him. If we will only search, the evidence will meet us on every hand.

If, for instance, we trace the origin of this liberty, our search takes us into the eternal councils of the Trinity, where God not only determined to bring about the redemption of man, not only entrusted the task to the One who alone could accomplish it, but in which He foresaw and foreordained every one of His elect to the faith by which they should enter upon their great heritage, the

liberty of the children of God. By all of this the heart and mind of God toward fallen man is so clearly revealed that the Son uses it as the ultimate proof of the love of His Father: "God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son." St. Paul does the same, but with a specific including of the Savior's participation, when with wonder and admiration he says, "God commendeth His love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, *Christ died for us*" (Rom. 5:8). Much more might be added along this line, but surely nothing higher can be said than this, that as the first mark of the glorious perfection of our liberty we find that it has its source in the eternal love of God.

The full import of this does not, however, appear until we recall that the objects of this love, the intended beneficiaries of this great undertaking, the ones who are to profit by the sacrifice which must be brought, are not God's friends, not even such whose attitude is a disinterested and neutral one, but are nothing less than enemies of their Benefactor. Christ died for us *while we were yet sinners*. Here all things really come together, the utterly undeserving nature of those who are to be freed, the selfless purpose on the part of Him who does the freeing, and the supreme cost of this freedom, which He so willingly met. Terrible though the price was, it could not prevent the achieving of the desired end: to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

Further evidence of the glory and perfection of this freedom appears when we observe its extent, its range. First of all as to persons. Not the Calvinistic theory that this grace was never intended for all and the liberation is therefore only for the chosen few, but the simple truth that Christ died for *all* (2 Cor. 5:14, 15) upon which the Apostle bases the glorious conclusion (v. 19) that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself. Just as there can be no assured comfort in the preaching of grace unless we preach universal grace, as justification must have the objective basis of an accomplished fact if it is to be grasped with certainty by a subjective faith, as the Gospel must remain an unconditioned Gospel if it is not to become what Paul calls "another Gospel," a counterfeit of the true, so the liberty which is to be proclaimed to the captives is perfect because it has been won for all, and stands as an accomplished fact to which every enslaved soul can

be pointed so that it may freely enter into the glorious liberty which is the gracious gift of its Redeemer.

The same holds true of the scope of this freedom. St. Paul calls upon us to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and to be not again entangled with the yoke of bondage (Gal. 5:1). By this expression he obviously refers to the principal objective of our liberation, as it is specified when ye are told that God's Son came to redeem them that were *under the Law*. When Luther explains that we are redeemed "from all sins, from death, and the power of the devil," he is but unfolding, upon the sound basis of Scripture, the glorious range and extent of this liberty.

Blessed is the soul which knows this freedom and has accepted it at the hands of its great Deliverer. Such a soul can face the Law of God, with its tremendous and staggering demands without cringing. It knows that this Law has been perfectly fulfilled by the faithful Substitute of impotent man. It faces the threats and penalties of the Law without flinching, knowing that full satisfaction has been rendered in its behalf. It knows that since it is clothed with the perfect righteousness of Christ, it stands beyond the reach of the Law, since the Law is not made for the righteous man (1 Tim. 1:9). Such a soul, though surely not occupying the status of a servant, but rather of a son, and therefore not under this Law, yet knows how to make the best use of this revelation of God's will, employing it effectively in the struggle against the ever present and rebellious flesh, and drawing upon it for guidance and instruction as it endeavours, in a new and sanctified obedience, to conform faithfully to the will of its God. In all these efforts, however, it still retains its perfect freedom, is under no compulsion, since its regenerate will has come into complete harmony with the will of God.

This in brief is the glorious liberty of the children of God. Its spiritual nature has surely become evident. Nevertheless there is often more than a little tendency to confuse this with the civil liberties of men, particularly with that provision which we value above all others in our national constitution, the right to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience. This is brought out by the stress of these times. Our Church does not take a pacifist attitude toward war. It never has. But where churches

that do take such a stand or individual conscientious objectors are occasionally charged with failing to support the cause which forms the very core of their teaching, a confusion of these two liberties is obviously taking place. More frequently, however, the argument takes this form, that some churches or groups which have formally gone on record with strong statements against participation in any future war effort now seek to justify an about-face in their position by implying that in order to retain the substance of their Christian teaching it is necessary that a democratic form of government with its several freedoms be kept in force. Here it is well to keep our thinking clear. It would be a sorry state of affairs if our possession of our spiritual liberty were in any way dependent upon our personal, civil freedom. Fortunately this is not the case. When the Apostle Paul in his Letter to the Romans referred to the glorious liberty of the children of God, when he assured his Galatians that they had been called unto liberty (5:13), he was speaking to a people who enjoyed practically none of the freedoms which we have come to take for granted today, and most of whom were members of some subject nation. Yet this did not impair their spiritual freedom in the least. When Paul and Silas lay shackled in the Philippian prison, brutally deprived of the right to a fair trial, which pertained at least to Paul by virtue of his Roman citizenship, they nevertheless remained in full possession of the liberty that was theirs through Christ, and before long they became the one to set their jailer free from his spiritual bondage. If we draw the proper conclusions from these instances, we must surely see that even if all our civil rights were revoked and every trace of religious liberty destroyed by foes from within or without, our essential Christian liberty would nevertheless not in the least be impaired thereby. Those who will hold fast to their Lord even in the midst of such severe trials will be His children still, in the fullest sense of the word, persuaded that neither death nor life, neither angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, their Lord. (Rom. 8:38f.)

It would be a grave mistake, however, to infer from this that the Church can therefore afford to be indifferent to the prospect of losing even the slightest part of our freedom of worship. We

have every reason to hold this special gift of God in highest esteem. Our Lord has established it in His gracious providence, and it certainly is to serve a definite purpose in His kingdom. It is to be valued accordingly. Paul teaches us to pray for kings and all that are in authority that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty (1 Tim. 2:2). He knew from experience exactly what persecution meant, and hoped with all his heart that his young assistant Timothy might be spared the ordeal. We should know how little we may trust our own strength and fortitude in case such trials of faith should come upon us. We should know how seriously some phases of the work of our Church would be hampered if we should suffer any curtailment of the freedom which our government grants us. Therefore we as a Church certainly need to be on our guard. Even though what was said before remains completely true, namely, that our spiritual, inward liberty is not contingent upon the preservation of our outward, civil rights, yet it would not be an easy thing to bear if we should have to tell ourselves that we contributed, even though only slightly, to such a deplorable outcome.

It would be pointless to mention these things if we were dealing with theoretical possibilities only. But we are facing realities. No one can deny that Government has embarked on the field of religion, first, through providing central facilities for religious activities in a large number of defense housing projects, through paying salaries, in whole or in part, to religious workers in various state institutions, to chaplains in hospitals, schools, or the armed forces,* and then through formulating and administering the policies whereby such work and workers are to be governed. The temptation is strong to enter upon such arrangements for the sake of the opportunities thus offered. But the danger is that by accepting momentary advantages, the Church virtually gives its approval to the system and forfeits its right to protest when the

* Objections to this point were withdrawn after a declaration to the effect that this statement does not involve a judgment on the theological right or wrong of the chaplaincy question, since this question does not come within the scope of this paper, but represents the personal fears and misgivings of the essayist concerning a trend of the times, and sounds a warning against commitments which might weaken our position.

trend continues and its disadvantages and dangers begin to appear. There are even now two bills before Congress, the Lynch and Dickstein bills, which would definitely limit freedom of speech in religious matters by closing the mails to any writings of a polemical character. This should show the need for a longrange view on the part of the Church. We cannot for the sake of some immediate gain afford to trade away the precious right of protest. Eternal vigilance is the price also of religious liberty.

Just as the basic spiritual freedom of the Christian is, however, not contingent upon these civil rights, so its perfection consists also in this, that it is not conditioned by social problems. It is well to remember this also in view of the manner in which modern churches have frequently sought to justify their excursions into the field of economics, housing conditions, labor relations, race problems, international politics, and peace policies by claiming that these things are a necessary part of the mission of the Church. It is said that you can't preach the Gospel to a man with an empty stomach. There is just enough truth in this statement to make it misleading. It is true that a Christian will in such a case deal not only the Gospel but also his bread to the hungry. He will do the one thing and not leave the other undone. But he will not do so because of any fear that his Gospel will lack effectiveness or that its blessings will not fully materialize unless these other matters are attended to first. And certainly this parallel does not imply that the Church must solve all manner of social problems in order to render its Gospel effective. It has a clear call to preach the latter, but none which applies to the former. It has the example of Paul, who could send an Onesimus back to Philemon without first solving the question of slavery in the Roman Empire, who could invest the servant with all the dignity of his spiritual freedom in Christ and commend him to Philemon as a brother without first inducing the master to emancipate the slave. This is the same Paul who was so sensitive to the slightest hint of danger threatening the spiritual liberties of his Christians. Nor is there any inconsistency in his respective stand on these two issues. He knew that this liberty is not conditioned by any social problem. Let the Church of today keep the same truth in mind, and it will not be led astray by the glamor of a social gospel, but will rather remain true to its real mission.

For, after all, the true mission of the Church is very clearly defined, not only in the Great Commission of its Lord, according to which it is to preach the Gospel to every creature, but also in terms which reflect the fact that this Gospel is above all a message of freedom. When our Savior preached to His countrymen in the synagog at Nazareth, He found occasion to give them a description of His own mission in a prophetic passage which is most unusual because of the manner in which it lingers upon the thought of freedom and liberation as marking the work of the Messiah and providing the content and substance of His message. Taking the text as we find it in Isaiah (61:1), we read: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon Me; because the Lord hath anointed Me to preach good tidings to the meek; He hath send Me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord and the day of vengeance of our God." If we keep in mind that this "acceptable year of the Lord" was the great year of jubilee of ancient Israel, in which liberty was the keynote, which was to bring to every unfortunate Israelite who had fallen into slavery a free return to his possession and his family (Lev. 25:10); and if we add the other terms (the liberty that is to be proclaimed, the captives who are to hear this, the prison that is to be opened, the changed fortunes of those who were bound), then we become aware how strongly the thought of liberation dominates the imagery of this entire text, how well it serves to define the peculiar nature of the Savior's work. Then we understand that even the fact that this will be "a day of vengeance of our God" does not conflict with the bringing of this liberty, but is rather a part of it, that essential part where "God breaks every evil will and counsel that would not let us hallow the name of God nor let His kingdom come."

We are liable to be confused by the fact that we use, and that Scripture uses, other terms for this work, in order to bring out some particular point of view or to show some side of it which may be peculiarly necessary for our comfort. We speak of justification, atonement, satisfaction, redemption. Every one of these terms calls to mind an entire train of ideas, adding to the wealth of our Christian thought. We can ill afford to lose sight of a single one. Yet they may all be summed up in this one com-

prehensive and descriptive definition of the Gospel: to proclaim liberty to the captives. Taking these terms one by one, justification leads us into the judgment hall of God, where with all mankind we stand at the bar of divine justice, undeniably guilty on every count of the endless indictment which is there preferred against us, without even a shadow of an excuse to offer in extenuation of our sins, until there appears One whose work in our behalf was so perfect that an immediate verdict of acquittal results, and we go free. — The word atonement brings up the picture of the great reconciliation with our God and of the sacrifice which made it possible that we be restored to the status from which we had fallen, and become once more what man was from the beginning destined to be, free children of our heavenly Father. — Speaking of the satisfaction rendered by our blessed Savior, we are naming that thing which weighed so heavily in the scales of divine justice as to tip them in our favor and thereby make our liberation possible: the perfect obedience and infinite suffering and death of our Lord. — And when we finally speak of our redemption, the thought is, of course, of our previous enslavement from which we have been brought back to freedom by our Redeemer, by whom we “were bought with a price.” — The same principle applies when we come to the appropriation of the liberty, the way in which this freedom becomes our own. Since we confess with Luther that we cannot by our own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, our Lord, nor come to Him, the operation of the Holy Ghost, who alone can work faith in our hearts and who is the sole agent of our conversion, definitely comes under the head of a liberation. Where we were utterly helpless, bound by the power of our own carnal mind, which is enmity with God, where we were helpless to the point of being dead in trespasses and sins, this gracious Spirit has quickened us with His Word and freed us from the powers that held us fast, whose grip we would never have been able to break. — Proclaim liberty to the captives! We cannot preach the Gospel without doing so. And the more we penetrate into the wonders of this truth, the more strongly the note of liberty will ring through our words, until this becomes the joyful keynote of our ministry. You can trace it throughout the writings of Paul. It transformed the life of Luther. It will do as much for us.

Surely, the Church will not count it an irksome, cramping

restriction to be told that to preach this liberty is its single mission. If it senses the glory and perfection of this freedom, it will not look longingly abroad for other fields in which to demonstrate its usefulness. For this is the most important work on earth. If churches have succumbed to the lure of the social gospel, if they have felt it necessary to supplement the simple preaching of the Word with other activities that promise greater drawing power, this is a plain symptom of their failure at least to a degree to realize the supreme worth of the liberty which it is their privilege to proclaim. The cure will, of course, lie in a renewed, interested, intensive study of this inexhaustible subject. This cannot but prove profitable and wholesome, a salutary countermeasure to the spiritual decline which inevitably underlies the warning symptoms referred to before.

What is the record of the Synodical Conference in this respect? Going into the past for at least part of our answer, we find much that is reassuring. Even a cursory scanning of the topics discussed at synods and conferences, of the articles printed in the synodical publications of that day, will show a marked tendency to favor those subjects that lie at the heart of the Gospel, which pertain to the theme of spiritual liberty in its broadest sense. Closer study reveals the thorough and profound nature of much of this work, so that we at this later day stand humbled by these achievements of our fathers. Turning to the present, we can say that the wholesome effect of this tradition is with us still. Our present-day Church is, generally speaking, still ready to recognize the singleness of its mission. The social gospel has not yet gained official standing in our midst. We are still ready to go with Paul when he says, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. 1:16.). Yet we must grant that we are often more than a little impressed by the argumentation of those who tell us that the Church should make its influence felt in a wider field, be it political or economic. There is a well-defined tendency to justify at least tentative steps in this direction, and this without going into the important question whether the Church has a clear and unmistakable call to engage in such undertakings or not. But the most widespread evidence that our day has lost at least something of the single-mindedness of our fathers is that we are resorting to an

ever-increasing measure of activities and devices, in the hope that they will do what our hearts tell us the Gospel alone can achieve — to keep our people loyal to our Church. For this tendency there is no sudden cure. But if we will, individually and jointly, turn with renewed earnestness and interest to that subject which even the angels desire to look into, and search and study it with prayerful devotion, our conception of our mission in this respect will become clarified, our aims and objectives will be ennobled, our work will become of a higher type, and we and our congregations will be most richly blessed.

(To be continued)

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

The Doctrinal Affirmation — A Closer Scrunity. — In our last number (p. 55) we recorded the fact that the Doctrinal Affirmation, the "single document" representing the latest results of negotiations between the commissions of the American Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod, in a substantial number of points retains the wording of the Brief Statement (Missouri's original platform) without change. At the same time we stated that this will "not relieve us of the necessity of subjecting the changes which do appear to closest scrutiny." This we propose herewith to do.

The article "Of the Means of Grace" is obviously a most important one. Because here also the Affirmation retains the very words of the Brief Statement practically throughout, it may seem almost picayune to point to the one change which has been made, particularly since the statement under consideration makes perfectly sound Lutheran sense when it reads: "Likewise the object of the Lord's Supper, that is, of the ministration of the body and blood of Christ, is the communication and sealing of the forgiveness of sins . . ." The omission of the words "none other than" before "the communication and sealing of the forgiveness of sins" seems perfectly harmless, even justified for reasons of literary style. Or one might assume that the term was dropped in order to allow for the inclusion of spiritual effects, such as the strengthening of faith, of the Christian life of sanctification, and of Christian fellowship and confession. Yet the entire picture changes as soon as we note that the Missouri commissioners twice reported themselves to be at variance with some members of the A. L. C. committee over the question of a possible

physical effect of the Lord's Supper.* It was such sheer speculation that the Brief Statement was rejecting when it declared the object of the Lord's Supper to be *none other than* the communication and sealing of the forgiveness of sins. It was for this that the A. L. C. commissioners were contending when they urged that a possible physical effect . . . *should not be denied*. Thus, even in an article where there has been almost no change in the text, the *position* taken by the Brief Statement has been surrendered. §

* * * *

The case becomes somewhat different when we take up the article "Of the Holy Scriptures." Here we find that many of the amplifications of the 1938 Declaration have been incorporated in the new document, statements which emphasize particularly the living, thinking personality of the writers, and militate against the mechanical process of a so-called dictation theory. The most significant change, however, is again an omission whereby the following section of the Brief Statement is eliminated:

"Since the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God, it goes without saying that they contain no errors or contradictions, but that they are in all their parts and words the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters, John 10, 35."

The issue here is not whether or to what degree the sacred writers

* The trend of these discussions and the nature of these possible physical effects may be gathered from the following discussion of 1 Cor. 11:27, 29f. in Dr. Reu's *Lutheran Dogmatics*: "In this passage Paul, indeed, only mentions sickness and physical death as proofs of divine disapproval, but very likely these are merely the symptoms of the process of inner decomposition, the end of which is eternal death unless it is halted by repentance."

"Perhaps we may be allowed to infer from this physical result of unworthy eating that a worthy participation in the Lord's Supper will also have a physical effect (Ignatius: PHARMAKON ATHANASIAS). We would then have another characteristic distinguishing the Lord's Supper from the Word. But the matter is problematical. It would be very difficult to show precisely in what the physical effect consists. It cannot be a preparation for the resurrection, because, to mention only one reason, the Scriptures reveal that the resurrection will be Christ's own immediate act of power." (Vol. II, 78f.)

§ As this issue of the *Quartalschrift* goes to press we learn that the version of the Affirmation which appears in the official *Proceedings* of the A. L. Church differs from the Concordia Publishing House edition at several points, and that the article which we have been discussing does not appear at all. Since the A. L. C. report brings only those articles in which the Brief Statement has been modified, this would seem to imply that the article on the Means of Grace has been received without change, which would, of course, remove the occasion for our criticism. We know of no explanation for this discrepancy in the texts, but must, of course, confine ourselves to the one which has been officially submitted to us, *viz.*, the C. P. H. edition.

participated as living, thinking personalities. The question is rather whether we may speak of the infallibility of the Scriptures as something which is certain *a priori*, whether the fact of divine inspiration does not in itself constitute a guarantee that every word of Scripture is to be accepted as infallible truth, even in those matters which may seem to have little to do with religion.

On this question there have been three schools of thought among Lutherans in America. One group would limit the inerrancy of Scripture to its central truths, assuming the possibility and even probability of error in matters which lie at the periphery. — Another maintains the infallibility of the Bible as an article of faith, because, being the Word of God, it is the Scripture which cannot be broken. This has been the established position of the Synodical Conference, to which it has hitherto adhered to the point of denying church fellowship to those who teach otherwise. It is the position which is so clearly expressed in the passage from the Brief Statement which we have quoted above. — A third school of thought has in a general way stood for the inerrancy of Scripture, but has made a rather emphatic point of continuing fellowship with those who speak of the possibility, or even the presence, of error in the Holy Scriptures, provided they limit this to such matters as do not belong to the doctrine of salvation. They justify this attitude by claiming that John 10, 35 and 2 Tim. 3, 16 do not constitute cogent proof for teaching that Scripture is the infallible truth in all its parts and words.

In view of this situation we can come to no other conclusion than that the Affirmation's omission of this pertinent sentence from the Brief Statement constitutes a serious weakening of the Synodical Conference position. Paragraph 4 does, indeed, contain the rejection of an opposing error, yet one wonders why the positive statement was dropped from the thetical part of the article.* It says much that needs to be said, and says it well. It is valuable because it specifically rejects a widely current, but erroneous view. But it does not (indeed, cannot, being part of the earlier document) answer the question why the Affirmation has *rejected* the Brief Statement's clear teaching that the Holy Scriptures "*are in all their parts and words the infallible truth,*" and that this "goes without saying" where the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration is taken seriously.

* In the parenthesis this last paragraph even takes over a part of the omitted section. It reads: "We reject the doctrine, which under the name of science has gained wide popularity in the Church of our day, that Holy Scripture is not in all its parts (for example, in historical, geographical, and other secular matters) the Word of God, but in part the Word of God, and in part the word of man, and hence does, or at least might, contain error. We reject this doctrine as horrible and blasphemous, since it flatly contradicts Christ and His holy Apostles, sets up men as judges over the Word of God, and thus overthrows the foundation of the Christian Church and its faith."

In our last number we not only spoke of the need of close scrutiny of this Affirmation, but continued: "Before one can arrive at a final verdict it must even be asked whether, in view of later developments articles written in 1932 still cover all issues adequately." A remark in the January issue of *The Confessional Lutheran* seems to bear upon a case of this kind.

The subject under discussion is Millennialism. The Brief Statement had declared: "With the Augsburg Confession (Art. XVII) we reject every type of Millennialism, or Chiliasm, the opinions that Christ will return visibly to this earth a thousand years before the end of the world and establish a dominion of the Church over the world . . ." The Affirmation makes this read, ". . . every type of Millennialism, or Chiliasm, which teaches that Christ will return visibly . . ." A careful comparison will show that while the Brief Statement clearly wanted to reject *every* type of Millennialism, the Affirmation may readily be understood to reject only those types of Millennialism, or Chiliasm, which teach that Christ will return *visibly* to this earth a thousand years before the end of the world. According to the report in the *Confessional Lutheran* this is precisely what occurred at an intersynodical conference when a millennialistic program of events (as given in Dr. Reu's *Lutheran Dogmatics*) was defended on the ground that the return of Christ which shall usher in the millennial reign is not thought of as a *visible* return.

We are firmly convinced that when the authors of the Brief Statement wrote "every form of millennialism," they meant just that; — that when they wrote of "opinions that Christ will return visibly . . . a thousand years before the end," they were not making room for an exception in favor of an invisible return, but were simply describing Millennialism in its commonly accepted form; — that if they were writing their Brief Statement today, after this modern variant of Millennialism has come to light, they would have dropped the word "visible" and simply rejected *every* opinion that Christ will return to this earth a thousand years before the end of the world, overthrow Antichrist, cause the resurrection of the martyrs who shall reign with Him, and finally bind Satan for a thousand years.

They would have been the last to claim that their Brief Statement of 1932 would cover all future contingencies.

We hope to continue with this study of the Affirmation in our next number, God willing.

E. R.

Introducing Weekday Religious Education into the Public Schools.
— Restoring the Bible and religion to our public schools is, according to the *Christian Statesman* of December, 1944, part of an extensive program carried forward by the *National Reform Association*. In its annual meeting, the 81st in its history, Rev. E. M. Hertzler, field

representative of religious education in the public schools for the National Reform Association, informed its members of his work in cities from 10,000 to 60,000 population, mostly in Ohio, and a few in Indiana and Michigan. "In every city," he informs us, "the first person approached is the Superintendent of Schools, explaining the need for weekly religious education in the schools, outlining the high type of program the National Reform Association proposes, its professionally trained leadership, and its voluntary participation on the part of the pupils. . . . Following a conference with the Superintendent of Schools of a city, I seek an audience with the Ministerial Association of the city, or at least its chairman. Unfortunately, the ministers are slow in appreciating the need of such cooperative educational effort on the part of their churches. They are fearful of controversial issues, the financial burden involved etc. However in some communities there is an enthusiastic interest in the program and definite steps are taken to organize for the establishment of a weekday religious education program in their city." Even labor organizations have grown interested in this program and have invited this field representative to present the program to them. Another phase of this work is "speaking at college chapel sessions in the interest of enlisting qualified students to consider the challenge of teaching weekday religious education classes." Rev. Hertzler sums up the result of his work in these words: "My experience of the past months gives great confidence of the general acceptance of religious education in the public schools within the next twenty-five years."

The *National Reform Association* through this its field representative regards the public schools as its mission field, as the only institution through which those children of the nation can be reached, whose homes fail to teach religion to them and who are indifferent about having them attend the churches for religious instruction. "There are," we are told, "17,000,000 such children of public school age in the United States, who receive no religious education whatever. That these millions of children can only be reached by placing courses of religion into the public schools" is the conviction of this representative.

We as Lutherans are certainly of one mind with the representative of the National Christian Association in our desire to reach as many of these 17,000,000 unchurched children as we possibly can. Yet we cannot look upon the public schools as the institutions through which they may and must be reached. The public school is a governmental institution and as such a school which must adhere to the American principle of separation of Church and State, and cannot permit the teaching of sectarian doctrine. Sectarian doctrine could only be taught in our public schools, if the Constitution of the United States were changed to this effect and if all the churches of our country, despite their confessional differences, unite in the endeavor to train

teachers for the work of giving religious instruction to the churched and unchurched children of our public schools. The latter is the very thing that *The Elgin Plan of Weekday Christian Education* sponsored by *The Elgin Council of Christian Education* seems to have accomplished. An article in our issue of *The Christian Statesman* contains a conversation between a brother and a sister. The former tells his sister that they had studied about the Church in the public school. "The Church — you mean your church?" the sister asks. "Sure, mine," the brother answers, "and all the others too. You know there were fourteen different kinds of churches in our room — but we'd never have known, only one day we counted 'em up." And then he continues, as he grows more enthusiastic: "You forget all about your denomination, and just remember you are trying to be a Christian." When finally asked what "Council" is providing these instructions, he answers: "Oh, it's a cooperative organization of all the Protestant churches in the city." Only one thing is wanting in this Elgin Plan: A declaration on the part of our government that the constitution has been changed to conform to this sectarian weekday education, that it is constitutional, and that in the future all secular education in the public schools will not only not be without its "motivating religious core," but will also not be without its "sectarian dogma."

No, the parochial school is the only constitutional and truly confessional means of providing the youth of our land with religious instructions. We must of course deplore the fact that the number of Christian Day Schools in our country is woefully inadequate to carry out such a program. Comparatively few Christian parents are conscious of their Christian duty of giving their children a Christian education, let alone of reaching out through their schools to the many children whose homes fail to teach them religion at all. Still this is no reason why we should lose hope or depart from the well-beaten path which our children have trodden on their way to their parochial school. We'll also do well to remember that we are not alone in emphasizing the necessity and distinctiveness of Christian education in the parochial school. If space in this issue permits we'll present our readers with some of the principles of Christian education as we find them laid down in *Christian . . . Home and School Magazine*, a publication of the *National Union of Christian Schools of the Christian Reformed Church*.

P. PETERS.

Promoting the Cause of Christian Education. — The *National Union of Christian Schools* through its publication *Christian . . . Home and School Magazine* endeavors to promote activity of the Christian School movement in its own circles and in circles other than its own. In the January number an appeal "Let Us All Do Better During 1945" presents the various ways in which the cause has been making progress during 1944: "Phenomenal growth of our schools

in certain sections of the country, new interest awakened even among those who do not belong to our group, rather general acknowledgement of the fact that there is something radically wrong with public school philosophy" (p. 6).

As to the phenomenal growth of their own schools the 1944 *Christian School Annual*, cited in the March number of this magazine, gives the following details: "Last year there was an enrollment increase of 815 pupils; this year the increase is 1,341 pupils. Last year's increase was 5½%, the greatest for over a score of years; this year the increase is 8½%, the greatest increase for many a year" (p. 3). In addition to this increase of pupils the number of teachers giving Christian instruction this year in these Reformed schools "is about forty more than the previous year." The *Union of Christian Schools* is even considering a system of Christian education for the Chicago area that includes all the grades from one through fourteen, that is through the second year of college. This plan comprises an elementary school for each locality consisting of grades one through six, and a junior high school consisting of grades seven through ten. Then for the entire Chicago area there would be one school consisting of grades eleven through fourteen. The one great advance of this plan is, according to its sponsors, the promise of better teachers, the elementary teachers being trained specifically for grades, the high school teachers being qualified to teach high school subjects, and the senior high school teachers being able to meet the requirements of college courses (February, p. 5).

As to the new interest awakened among those who do not belong to their group the January number, 1945, reports: "The promotion activity of the Christian School movement is entering a new phase. We are beginning to have a number of Christian schools in circles other than that of our Holland people and their descendants" and adds: "In view of correspondence received, a number of other schools will be organized shortly, all outside of our circles. Associated with these schools in circles other than our own are enthusiastic supporters of the Christian school idea." The confession which follows this report is noteworthy: "It took much faith and courage to promote Christian education in circles which are totally unfamiliar with our Christian school program. The leaders from these communities promote the cause of Christian education with a zeal not always found in our circles."

The third way in which the cause of Christian education has been making progress, according to this magazine, is the "rather general acknowledgement of the fact that there is something radically wrong with public school philosophy." This reason also finds expression in these words: "People outside of our own church circles are beginning to realize that we have something in our Christian schools which the public schools cannot offer" (March, p. 10). What is it,

the reader will want to know, that the Christian schools have which the public schools cannot offer? "Christian education," we are told, "is not just a cheap imitation of public education in which some Bible is added. It has distinct principles, purposes, and objectives." Contrasting the fundamental principles of education on which state-supported schools are based with those on which the Christian schools are based the assertion is made: "Since both our principles of education and methods of teaching depend on certain fundamental views of God, the child, the world, the Bible, sin, etc., the difference between these two systems is not gradual nor insignificant (as some persons suppose) but absolute and final." And that which gives content and finality to the distinctiveness of Christian education is put in these words: "Geography, history, science, etc., are brought under the light of the Bible study, and the Divine, Christological purposes" (February, p. 17).

In view of the aforesaid it is not at all surprising that this school journal does not only speak of the progress of its good cause and of the different ways in which this cause is making progress, but that it also emphasizes the "spiritual" basis upon which it must be founded and the principle, whereby it must be guided. But "where are the men of principle?" it asks and adds: "It's the things that arrest the attention of the mob that are being stressed by some of the prominent advocates: the size and the appeal of the gymnasium, the possibility of attracting students who do not belong to our circles — this, with the excuse of 'letting our light shine' —, the advisability of hiring teachers for the commercial department who have rendered good service in some public school of high standing, etc., etc. Now, it's this kind of emphasis that's going to spell the inevitable downfall of our whole educational system. It may take a little while, but, mark my words, once we forsake the fundamental and distinctively *spiritual* basis upon which that system was founded, we're lost. When we begin to place our trust in wordly ideas and ideals, we can see the handwriting on the wall" (p. 6).

Not only the indifference toward principles, but also the indifference towards the cause of Christian education as such is being censured by this Christian school journal. We are reminded of the fact, that though the families of the Christian Reformed Church have during the past 20 years increased about 30%, the pupils of the Christian school have increased less than 20%. This fact induces the editorial writer to ask the significant question: "*Can we as a denomination remain disintegrated educationally?*" (Italics ours.) As another sign of indifference toward the cause of Christian education mention is made of the teachers' shortage by reason of which four Christian schools were not able to function; and many of their existing 100 schools suffered because of the shortage of teachers. In this connection it is also pointed out that at the beginning of the schoolyear

the school boards had to call for 130 new teachers; yet of these only 30 came from the Reformed teachers' college, Calvin. The fear is expressed that a large percentage of the remaining 100 teachers have not enjoyed the distinctive Reformed teacher training so necessary for their teachers (p. 3).

Twofold is the plea which is being made by this school magazine for the promotion of the cause of Christian education, a plea for more men-teachers and a plea for more school-minded members. The argument for men-teachers in preference to lady-teachers, who, just when they begin to know what teaching is all about enter upon 'another state of life,' reads: "We need more men-teachers for the simple reason that the training of the child for citizenship in the kingdom of heaven (as well as in the earthly Republic) is a life task. It takes several years to become a good tool-maker. Yet, the making of a good tool fades into insignificance in comparison with that exalted task which has as its goal: 'that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work'" (March, p. 5). This does not only make the having of men-teachers "desirable, but *definitely necessary*," if Christian schools are to flourish and to make progress. The plea for more school-minded Christians is no less forceful: "Every true Christian should express his Christianity in a two-fold direction: In reference to the 'unchurched' he should be mission-minded. In reference to the 'churched' he should be Christian-school-minded . . . A church which is not mission-minded is a dying church. A local Christian school society which is not Christian school promotion minded is a dying school society. Let us promote our Christian school while it is still our privilege as citizens of this country" (March, p. 6).

No, we are not alone in emphasizing the necessity and distinctiveness of Christian education as realized in our country and, for that matter, in other countries through the parochial school. Reformed educators and Roman-Catholic educators do this with no less, and in some instances, with more emphasis and enthusiasm than we do. We are alone, however, in setting forth Lutheran principles to be observed in our Christian teaching, which — and of this we are convinced — are the principles of the Word of God throughout.

P. PETERS.

What Others Say Of Our Parochial School. — In the January number, 1945, of *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* Frank H. Clutz, author of an article on *Lutheran Unity And Diverse Cultures*, speaks of the individual contributions of each Lutheran church body in our country toward the complete Lutheran unity. After having referred to the new constitution of the Synodical Conference, adopted 1938, and after having mentioned its purpose, "to give outward expression

to the unity of spirit existing among the constituent synods; . . . to cooperate in matters of mutual interest," he comes to speak of "the German tradition as seen in the Missouri Synod" and adds: "The parochial school system and the 'closed' communion in the Missouri Synod are two reflections of the firmness for doctrinal position. The strength of this body has rested strongly on the thoroughness of the catechization of its members. In the parochial school constant teaching of the Catechism and Church History are carried on. When a parish has no parochial school, as is the case in some of the cities and among the more progressive (!) churches, children attend confirmation class three times each week for two or three years. Adults are received into membership only after intensive training for several months. Church members then really know what belonging to the church means. Based on this foundation, it is possible to require people to announce their desire to commune, to counsel with them about their spiritual welfare, and to close communion to those who have not been confirmed. Two indications give evidence to the effectiveness of this procedure. (1) The statistical report of the membership in the last *Lutheran World Almanac* lists as confirmed members 813,720; as communing 813,720. In other words, unless a member communes he is not counted a member. As a matter of comparison, the listing for the United Lutheran Church in America shows, as confirmed members, 1,054,449, and as communing, 711,431; a difference of 343,068. (2) Lutheran service pastors report that the greater share of the Lutheran boys who look up the Service Centers are Missouri Synod members. Indoctrination of this kind and centralized authority have dangers and drawbacks, without doubt (!), but credit must be given for devotion to principle and purity of doctrine. Some measure of these qualities is needed by other Lutherans."

P. PETERS.

Ben-hadad I. — Historians and commentators encounter great difficulty in answering the question whether Ben-hadad, son of Tabrimmon, son of Hezion (1 Kgs. 15, 18), the contemporary of Asa of Judah (912-872) and of King Baasha of Israel (910-887) is identical with the Ben-hadad of 1 Kings 20 and 2 Kings 6 and 9, the contemporary of Ahab (875-854), and of Jehoram (854-843). If such is the case then Ben-hadad reigned 40 to 50 years. Yet most historians and commentators speak of Ben-hadad II as the contemporary of Ahab and Jehoram or of Elijah and Elisha, identifying him with the Hadadezer in the Assyrian inscriptions mentioned as reigning in the middle of the 9th century.

Professor Albright in the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (October, 1942) claims to have found evidence that the first two kings of this name are one and the same, and must both be called Ben-hadad I (p. 26). This evidence the well-known American

archaeologist finds in the votive stele erected by Ben-hadad I of Damascus to the god Melcarth. It is described in the *Bulletin* as "the first inscribed monument of significance found bearing the name of a king of Damascus (Aram)" (p. 23). The inscription as translated by Professor Albright reads as follows: The stele which Bir-Hadad, son of Tab-Ramman, son of Hadyan, king of Aram, set up for his Lord Milqart, (the stele) which he vowed to him when (lit., and) he hearkened to his voice.

The name Bir-Hadad is the Aramaic form of the Hebrew Ben-hadad, son of the god Hadad. Since this Bir-hadad calls himself the son of Tab-Ramman, son of Hadyan, he can be none other than the Ben-hadad, the son of Tabrimmon, the son of Hezion of 1 Kings 15, 18. "The patronymic makes it certain that this Ben-hadad was the Biblical Ben-hadad who fought against Baasha" (p. 27). But is he also the Ben-hadad who besieged Samaria in the time of Ahab (1 Kgs. 20, 12) and again in the days of Elisha (2 Kgs. 6, 24, 26)? Since the year of the erection of this stele is not mentioned in the inscription, the date at present can only be judged from the epigraphic criteria. According to Professor Albright the script fits into the middle of the 9th century. Should this be correct, then our question can be answered in the affirmative, then Ben-hadad I was the contemporary of Baasha, Ahab and Jehoram. His first invasion of Israel in the 36th year of Asa (2 Chron. 16, 1) Professor Albright dates about 879 B. C. and his death about 843 B. C. This is also the year of the death of Jehoram, king of Israel (comp. the Approximate and Comparative Dates in Halley's *Handbook*).

Jehoram was succeeded by Jehu, Ben-hadad I by Hazael. Both were anointed by the prophet Elijah as kings of Israel and Syria respectively. The successor of Hazael was his son, Ben-hadad (2 Kgs. 13, 3), whom we must call now Ben-hadad II. Ben-hadad II is the Bir-Hadad of the so-called Zakir Stele, set up by Zakir, king of Hamath (*Bulletin*, p. 24f.). The Hadad-ezer of the Assyrian inscriptions can, as Professor Albright suggests, be an alternative name of Ben-hadad I, even as Ben-hadad II or Bir-Hadad of the Zakir Stele was called Mari by the Assyrians (*ibid.* p. 24). This would represent an interesting parallel to the double nomenclature of the kings of Judah, as Uzziah, for inst., also had the other name of Azariah (2 Kgs. 15, 1. 13).

While the Bible student will appreciate the fact that the name and the patronymic of Ben-hadad of 1 Kings 15, 18 has been found on a stele erected by him, still he will not read this inscription without giving thought to the name of the god, for whom Ben-hadad set up this stele and to whom he vowed it. The name Milqart or Melqart, Graeco-Roman Melcarth, does not occur in the Bible, yet is none other than the Tyrian Baal, whose cult Jezebel, Ahab's queen, advocated so ardently. Melcarth's mother or wife, Asherah, is men-

tioned together with Baal in 1 Kings 18, 19. (A. V. has "groves"). Although Melcarth was the chief deity of Tyre, yet he was not only the god of this Phoenician city. His name, meaning "King of the City," does not justify us to speak of him as such only. "King of the City," as Professor Albright holds in the light of the religious poems of Ugarit (Ras Shamrah), means "king of the underworld". As such he was worshipped, as lord of the underworld and of its fertility-producing powers. In addition to this he was also recognized as the *Baal-shamem*, the lord of heaven. To the voice of this god the Syrian king harkened, and by means of his worship and cult Ahab's queen sought to crowd out the true worship of Jehovah in Israel. When Elijah's prayer on Mt. Carmel was answered by the "Lord God of Israel", a victory was not only gained over the four hundred priests of Baal, not only over Jezebel of Tyre and Melcarth of Tyre, but over a god, who was worshipped as the lord of heaven and of the underworld. This was the significance of the cry of all the people, when they saw it: "The Lord, he is the God; the Lord, he is the God" (1 Kgs. 18. 39).

P. PETERS.

Büchertisch

Reaching Youth for Christ. By Torrey Johnson and Robert Cook. Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Illinois. Price, \$1.00.

This book tells us of the "Youth for Christ" movements which have sprung up in our large cities, throughout the United States. It begins by informing the reader of the launching of the "Chicagoland Youth for Christ" movement in the summer of 1944, which succeeded in having 2,000 and more men and women, especially young men and women, in attendance at Orchestra Hall every Saturday night for 21 weeks. There follows a description of the half-hour broadcasts, which were held every Saturday night from Orchestra Hall climaxed by five to seven minute messages. The book closes with a selection of 22-minute messages delivered during the rallies at Orchestra Hall.

The organizers of this "cooperative and interdenominational" movement learned from experience that "organization is not the prime factor, as you might suppose. It is important, but more well intentioned schemes have gone adrift upon the rocks of organizational prayerlessness than anywhere else!" They add: "God's expeditors were forced to God's expedients — and how glad we are now that it was so!" (p. 35). Finally all organizers are admonished: "Keep your offerings on a high spiritual level" (p. 41).

To judge from the messages selected for publication in this book, the "Chicagoland Youth for Christ" set a good example in keeping its offer-

ings on a high level. Especially the "broadcast messages" excel in presenting the Cross of Christ "graphically and forcefully." The comparisons drawn between the great events of our time and those of Christ's mission and work create "a true-to-life approach and a very effective gospel appeal." — We regret, however, that the authors of this book do not recognize Baptism as a means of grace (p. 26). Yet our Lutheran Radio preachers can learn much from this book, although we do not and cannot subscribe to any "interdenominational" movements.

P. PETERS.

In Thy Light. By Walter Bauer, Ph. D., Valparaiso. Published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Price 75 Cents.

In twelve short radio addresses the author undertakes to set forth the philosophy of life and education for which his school, Valparaiso University, stands.

These addresses are pleasing. They begin and end with a very well chosen pair of topics, "Behold the Man" and "The Kingship of Jesus." They also presuppose a foundation of sound Christian principles throughout. In connection with John 18, 37 ("To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice") occurs a statement which seems particularly appropriate to our day and its spirit.

"Accordingly, the only means which the Church has at its disposal is the truth; that is, the message of the love of God in Christ Jesus. The brightest eras in the history of the Church were those in which it operated exclusively with the truth. The darkest eras were those in which a carnal-minded leadership relied upon physical force to extend or defend the interest of the Church. We need to keep this truth in mind, for there are always those who, like Simon Peter, are ready to draw the sword for the kingdom of God." (p. 65.)

We also concur most heartily when in discussing the "re-education of mankind" the author not only says, "In the first place we must re-educate the heart of man," but immediately makes it clear that by this he means repentance in the Biblical sense. But when he goes on to speak of re-educating the mind of man, and then speaks of "re-educating mankind in terms of the divine revelation which centers about . . . Christ," — when a statement is quoted to the effect "that the eternal truths laid down by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount and by St. Paul in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians must constitute the basis of a better world," — when all this leads to the conclusion that "Christianity is the source of all that is best in our civilization" (p. 19), then we seem to feel ourselves entering a different

theological climate. There is much more about the benign influence of Christianity upon the course of human progress, of our civilization failing through the drift back into paganism, of helping to stem this tide and to point the way to God and peace and progress.

We mention these things because they illustrate a trend that becomes particularly apparent when the Church, at least to a degree, seeks to vindicate itself in the eyes of the world, to "sell itself" upon the strength of its usefulness to the commonwealth. This results in a tendency to stress the by-products of Christian teaching rather than its central blessing. As this process continues, the Church becomes increasingly preoccupied with the problems of this life, while its interest in "the life in the world to come" almost imperceptibly recedes into the background. The example of many modern Protestant Churches where this trend has run its course should justify our speaking a word of warning while there yet is time.

E. R.

Cross and Affliction. By Rev. R. C. Rein. Revised and enlarged edition. Concordia Publishing House. Price 40 Cents.

This neat and attractive booklet of 77 pages will serve admirably as an appropriate gift for a troubled Christian in any walk of life. The 28 meditations are divided into two parts, the Christian's Cross, and the Christian's Affliction. This method enables the author to discuss the former in the exact sense of the word without thereby depriving the troubled and afflicted Christian of the rich comfort which the Word of God holds for him. These meditations are outstanding in their extensive and appropriate use of pertinent passages of Scripture. The accompanying poetry is perhaps not always so well chosen. But this is only a minor flaw in an otherwise excellent contribution to our Lutheran devotional literature.

E. R.

Symbols. A practical Handbook. Compiled by Arthur R. Kretzmann. Published by the Walther League. Price \$1.00.

On 88 mimeographed pages, attractively bound, the author presents a large selection of Church symbols, together with explanatory notes, Scripture references, color guide, and other pertinent material. The symbols are given in the form of simple line drawings, and will lend themselves well for mimeograph work. The book makes available much material which is otherwise found only in very expensive works.

E. R.

Encyclopedia of Bible Life. By Madelaine S. Miller and J. Lane Miller. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, New York and London. Price, \$4.95.

This *Bible Encyclopedia* contains 461 double-column pages of reading matter, 100 full pages of illustrations, 1,694 subjects in 22 sections, 12 pages of full color maps, and 5 indexes. We cannot list all the sections of this reference work in this review, but titles like agriculture, animals, apparel, flowers, geography, musical instruments, worship etc., etc., will convince our readers that no less than 1,694 subjects are actually covered by means of sections representing such a wide range of content.

The authors, Dr. and Mrs. Miller, were well prepared and equipped to write such an extensive reference work, which will help people to go through the Bible with a more intelligent comprehension and realization of the social and religious background of Bible life. They made no less than nine journeys to Palestine and Asia-Minor to gather material through cameras and notes supplemented by extensive research. While the authors speak of the Bible as "a concrete, picture-filled book," their aim is "to make a significant contribution to visual biblical education by presenting to teachers, ministers, and students a compact source-book of fully illustrated information bearing upon the people" of the Bible and by helping "readers to walk in the streets, eat in the homes, and worship in the temples of men and women who lived in the lands where our Bible was worked out."

This encyclopedia "does not aim to be a work on biblical archaeology." Yet it contains an informative section of 22 pages on archaeology. The authors accept the point of view of the distinguished archaeologist, Dr. W. F. Albright, "that to date nothing has been unearthed which seriously challenges the main trend of events recorded in Scriptures." They "see in Biblical archaeology a blow to destructive criticism and believe that a balanced critical appreciation of the Bible will bless students who place textual criticism and archaeological findings side by side as they sincerely seek the beauty and the truths offered by sixty-six 'little books,' *Biblia*." This "balanced critical appreciation of the Bible," however, leaves room for the methods of Higher Criticism (pp. 28, 452), for "anachronisms" (p. 28), folk-tales (p. 27) and sagas (p. 152) in the Bible, for archaeological periods far exceeding any chronological data of the Bible (pp. 235, 463), and for a development of Israel's religion (pp. 451, 460), which does not do justice (p. 337) to prophetic revelation as set forth by the inspired writers of both the Old and New Testament. Although most of the material is presented by the authors in a matter-of-fact manner interspersed with a generous use of Scripture citations, still the reader of this *Encyclopedia* will want to assure himself whether their "critical appreciation of the Bible" coincides throughout with the revealed facts.

P. PETERS.

The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible. Edited by George Ernest Wright and Floyd Vivian Filson with an Introductory Article by William Foxwell Albright. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1945. Price, \$3.50.

This *Atlas* is one of a series of books published by the Westminster Press designed to give the results of modern scholarly research to students of the Bible. *The Westminster Aids to the Study of the Scriptures* and *The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible* together with the *Atlas* go to make up a well-known trio of this series.

The Westminster Atlas contains thirty-three maps in full color and two in black and white. "A special process using handdrawn maps photographically reproduced by half-tone engravings" has been adapted to this atlas as the very latest method of map reproduction. Four of these maps are maps of the foreign empires that belong into the historical and geographical framework of Scriptures, one is a map of all the excavated sites in modern Palestine, while the remaining maps set forth clearly the geography of Palestine throughout the history of the Old and New Testament.

These maps are accompanied by corresponding and explanatory discussions, for instance on "The Land of Canaan before the Israelite Conquest," "The Political History of Israel and Judah," "The Journeys of Paul," "The History of Jerusalem," a. o., covering 79 pages of reading matter including two indexes to the maps and to the texts. "The Rediscovery of the Biblical World" and "The Chronological Outline of Ancient History" introduce the reader to the work as such.

"The Stone Age, beginning 200,000 to 500,000 years ago" as a part of "The Ancient World before the Patriarchs" (p. 15), and chapters 1 and 26 in Numbers as "the misplaced census records of the time of David" in the article on "The Exodus from Egypt" (pp. 37f.), will not escape the eye of the critical reader and will make it quite evident to him that the authors of this *Atlas* are also having recourse to archaeological periods far exceeding any chronological data of the Bible and to the methods of Modern Criticism, which, although they present a "saner view," are, however, altogether hypothetical. Archaeology and High Criticism have done much to revise even geographical handbooks of the Bible. Guthe's *Bibelatlas* published in 1911 made this quite clear at the time. The *Westminster Historical Atlas* is following in its footsteps. We certainly appreciate having all real advances, which have been made in the geographical study of the Bible lands, listed in this *Atlas*, which undoubtedly will be used by American scholars for years to come. Yet the warning words of Dr. Albright in his "Introductory Considerations" are very timely and appropriate in more than one sense of the word: "There is danger in seeking new discoveries and novel points of view at the expense of more solid earlier work. This is particularly true in fields like Biblical archaeology and geography" (p. 9). This warning voiced by an eminent American

archaeologist should be kept well in mind by all who study and seek to evaluate the information contained in modern Biblical handbooks.

P. PETERS.

Born Crucified. By L. E. Maxwell. Moody Press, Chicago, 1945. 191 pages. Price, \$1.75.

The title alone might seem to indicate that this book is another addition to the huge bulk of literature dealing with the earthly sufferings of our Lord. Instead, however, the reader will discover that *Born Crucified* is a fervent appeal to genuine sanctification by a man whose words breathe a sincere faith in, and a profound devotion to, the Redeemer. The implied subject of the title is not Christ, but the Christian. The author credits the French preacher, Lacordaire, with first having employed the phrase and adds, "By this he meant that all the members of the divine Head died *in* and *with* the last Adam, when He laid down His life on Calvary. These pages are an attempt in a small way to set forth . . . in simple sermon and exhortation, 'The Cross in the Life of the Christian'."

Another quotation from the Preface will help us understand still better the aim of the writer. "This book is written to show the believer that, from the moment he is saved, he is so related to the Cross, that, if he henceforth fails to live by the Cross, he is an utter ethical contradiction to himself and to his position in Christ."

In other words, each of the terms composing the striking title has its own sphere of significance. The participle *Born* connotes the new creation that has occurred in conversion. "We are actually new creatures in Christ." The contents of the book, therefore, are addressed exclusively to newborn men and women, to justified children of God. Upon such the author attempts to impress what he considers the overwhelming urgency for a truly sanctified life as he finds it expressed in the other participle *Crucified*. He quotes Paul: I am crucified with Christ (Gal. 2:19); One died for all, then were all dead (II Cor. 5:14); especially Paul's argumentation in Rom. 6. He wishes to assure the readers that if and when they identify themselves with Christ in His death and resurrection by letting "faith fasten on the fact of my death to sin through my actual life-union with Christ," then will they gloriously conquer sin after sin in their lives. He cites the example of two young women who replied to an invitation to attend a ball: "We are very sorry, but it will be impossible for us to attend. We died last week. We are Christians." "They had declared their testimony in baptism the previous week, as dead, buried, risen, and henceforth Christ-ones only."

It is to those who are publicly engaged in the ministry of the Word that we warmly recommend the book. They will find that it searches out the inmost recesses of the heart and inspires a fervent

desire to have Christ truly live in one. On the other hand, they will recognize certain characteristics of extreme enthusiasm (Schwärmerei), of pietism, and of a tendency toward perfectionism in the author's preachments, which a Lutheran pastor wisely avoids in his own teaching and preaching. After all, Scripture employs such expressions as "crucified with Christ" first and foremost as an assurance to the wretched and repentant sinner that he is completely rescued from sin and freed entirely from the thralldom of Satan and death, and that he is safely hid away with his dear Savior from the anger and wrath of a just and holy God.

Yet, when all faults have been clearly noted, we still maintain that the reading of *Born Crucified* will prove to be a personal blessing to our brethren in the ministry. S.

America, Turn to Christ! Radio messages of the Lutheran Hour from Easter through Christmastide, 1943. By Walter A. Maier. 341 pages. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1944.

The Foreword contains thirty pages of testimonial letters. The author addresses himself to America in twenty-two sermons.

S.

Great Songs of the Gospel. Compiled by Alfred B. Smith. Moody Press, Chicago, Ill. Stiff paper covers. 135 pages. Price, 25 cents per copy.

This little collection of hymns is not, as one might be led to believe by the title, a compilation of "great songs" in our Lutheran sense of the words. Its place of publication, the Moody Press, clearly indicates the type of hymns which it contains. It will prove of interest to those who specialize in the history of church music and to anyone who feels the urge to become more closely acquainted with the character of the hymns widely used at camp meetings and revival meetings. S.

General Course of Study for Lutheran Elementary Schools with Supplement. Published under the Auspices of the Board of Christian Education, Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri.

Every teacher will find a wealth of stimulating and instructive material in this comprehensive Course of Study. S.

* * *

Alle hier angegebenen Sachen können durch unser Northwestern Publishing House, 935-937 North Fourth Street, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin, bezogen werden.

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben von der Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Synode von
Wisconsin und anderen Staaten.

Jahrgang 42

Juli 1945

Nummer 3

OPENING ADDRESS

Delivered at the Lutheran Theological Seminary,
Thiensville, Wisconsin, April 4, 1945,
On John 3, 25-30

“As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.” Thus spoke the risen Savior to his disciples on Easter evening. The heavenly Father had sent Him to perform the greatest of all tasks, one which He, the incarnate Son, alone could perform. It was the task of redeeming sinful mankind. Christ did perform that task. As He appeared to His disciples on Easter evening He had brought it to a triumphant completion for all times. With the greeting: “Peace be unto you,” He bade them to rejoice in this completed work, to find personal comfort and salvation in it. Yet having thus greeted them He called their attention to the work which they were now to perform: “As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.” In the power of the Holy Spirit they were now to proclaim the life-giving, faith-engendering message of His redemption among men. They were to preach the Gospel, so that sinners everywhere might become partakers of salvation and as such be ever more fully sanctified and strengthened in faith and preserved unto eternal life.

This is still the one great task which is committed to Christ's church of believers. Unto the end of days it is entrusted to each and every true Christian. And it is wholly in the interest of this task that our Seminary is again opening a new school year today. Through the power and under the guidance of God's word you, who are resuming or beginning your work as students here, are to be given the thorough training which may in due time Scripturally qualify you as such whom groups of Christians here and there can call to preach and to teach the Gospel publicly in their name. This function for which you are seeking preparation

is set before you under a vivid and inspiring picture in the Scripture text chosen for this opening service. It is the picture of the friend of the bridegroom. May our meditation upon it help you to enter upon this term of training with the deep realization: WE ARE PREPARING OURSELVES TO LABOR AS FRIENDS OF THE HEAVENLY BRIDE-GROOM.

Jesus Christ, God's eternal Son, left His glorious throne in heaven and came into the misery and humbleness of this sinful world in order to become the bridegroom of human souls. He wishes to bless them with the precious bridal gifts of pardon and eternal life, earned by His vicarious obedience and death. In love He longs to make all sinners His bride. Through faith He would clothe them with the snow-white bridal dress of His righteousness and with the beautiful veil of salvation. He desires to take them finally to the marriage feast of heavenly bliss and joy. Thus He is heaping great honor upon us. For it is honor indeed that we, all marred and made unsightly by sin, should be thus chosen as the beloved bride of the heavenly bridegroom, who is the Lord of lords, holy and almighty. That in bitter battling He rescued us from the disgraceful clutches of Satan and made us His own should enkindle our hearts with deep and abiding affection toward Him.

Yet we who by faith have become Christ's bride are now also to act as the friend of the bridegroom. In the Jewish wedding ceremonies the friend of the bridegroom was the man whom the bridegroom specially appointed to speak for him to the bride, to ask and win her hand for him, and to arrange the marriage. He who was thus chosen looked upon his task as a very responsible, yet privileged assignment. Thus when he saw his work successfully accomplished as the wedding feast commenced the friend of the bridegroom was filled with deep joy. He rejoiced greatly as he actually saw the bridegroom welcoming and receiving his cherished bride.

Now our text shows us how John the Baptist was pleased to labor as such a friend of Christ, the heavenly bridegroom. He regarded it as a great privilege to be instrumental in leading sinners to the Savior, and his joy was boundless at seeing Jesus actually receiving them and blessing them with gifts of salvation. As the God-appointed forerunner of Christ John was in a special

way the friend of the heavenly bridegroom. In a lesser measure, however, all Christians and especially all Christian pastors and teachers are called upon to fill the same position. From John the Baptist, therefore, let us gain a proper understanding of this function. When Jesus first began to minister in public as the Savior, when He began to preach and to teach, to baptize and to work miracles also John still continued to preach and to baptize for a time. Yet it was not rivalry, not the desire to be and to remain important himself that prompted him to go on with his work. It was love for his Savior. John was convinced that he could serve Christ better thus than by joining His outward train of followers. For there were still many hearts to prepare for Christ, many hearts that still needed to be brought to the knowledge of their damning sin and guilt and that might then be moved to seek out Jesus by being told of His ability and willingness to save to the uttermost.

Some of John's followers did not understand, however. Between them and some Jews arose a dispute about purifying, *i. e.*, about the baptism of Jesus as compared with that of their own master. These disciples were unwilling to admit that Jesus stood above their master John, and that people ought now to turn from him to Christ. With a touch of jealous resentment against Jesus they brought the matter to the attention of their master. They would not even mention Christ's name, but described Him as the one who had been with John on the other side of Jordan, concerning whom John had given testimony. They reported: "Rabbi, He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to Him." They spoke as though their master John had done much for Jesus in testifying of Him, and as though Jesus was now competing with him in an unfair manner. They were wrought up over the fact that Jesus was baptizing and that multitudes were turning to Him.

John, however, thought differently. He would not share their jealousy and resentment. He answered and said: "A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven. Ye yourselves bear me witness that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before Him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom." John did not lose sight of the position that God had entrusted to him; and just as clearly did he see the heaven-appointed office of

Jesus. For him Jesus, and Jesus alone, was the Christ, the heaven-sent bridegroom of souls. Not for a moment did John want to play a part which God had not given to him. Again and again he testified that he was not the Christ, but merely the Lord's forerunner, sent to prepare His way. Christ was the bridegroom and He and no one else was to receive the bride. John clearly realized that his own task was to win the hand of the bride for the bridegroom. He knew that it was his task to make the bride's heart ready for Him and then to speak to her about the greatness of the bridegroom, extolling His infinite power and love, setting forth her great need of His fellowship and the blessedness of belonging to Him and of serving Him.

With great earnestness, fervor and faithfulness did John indeed speak for the heart and hand of sinners whom Christ sought as His bride. We see him in the Gospels as one whom God had thoroughly trained and instructed for his task. He was steeped in Scripture, he was proficient in dividing the word of truth and in apportioning to each soul what it needed. He preached the law in all its sternness, the Gospel in all its sweetness, and thankful service with truly practical insight. He struck crushing, humbling blows at all the varied fetters of sin, in which the people of his day were held bound: at the self-righteousness of the Pharisee, at the worldliness of the Sadducee, at the cupidity of the publican, at the violence and discontent of the soldier, at the sensual lust of a Herod, and at the pride of being God's chosen people in which the Jews in general sought a vain refuge. But for those who confessed their sins and sought remission in baptism he bare record of the Christ who was at hand, testifying that He was the Son of God mighty to save, one so great in person that he himself was unworthy even to do the slave's task of unloosening the latchets of His sandals. Yet of Christ's mighty person he gave the comforting testimony which is ever since enshrined in all Christian hearts: "Behold the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

But as John functioned thus as the friend of the heavenly bridegroom he preached with more than his voice. He put his entire person, life and conduct into the service of his task. He sought no comfort, no ease, no glory, no recognition that might interfere with his task or run counter to its interests. Laboring faithfully, fervently, and fearlessly he let the demands of his

task shape and determine his entire life and fortune. Thus he was willing to let the desert be his habitation, locusts and wild honey his daily fare, a simple garment of camel's hair his clothing, the prison fortress of Machaerus his place of retirement, and Salome's charger his funeral bier. Still John did not view his work for Christ as a heavy burden, but as a privilege. He was the *friend* of the bridegroom. He himself had found in Jesus the Messiah, his joy and rest, an abiding comfort against sin and guilt, and a sure hope of eternal joy. To function as the friend of this heavenly bridegroom, of the Savior of the world, was therefore to John a higher honor than any in the power of men to bestow. To testify to men about the glorious might and the saving love of this Savior was to him life's noblest employment. Inducing hearts to turn in humble trust to Jesus was to him life's greatest privilege.

To have God through His word mold you into such consecrated, faithful, proficient friends of the heavenly bridegroom — that ought to be the cherished objective of your seminary work. You, too, have been called out of darkness to the marvelous light of the Gospel. By faith you have seen Christ's glory, His glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. From His fulness you have all received grace upon grace, grace to strengthen you against the lusts of the flesh, grace to be comforted against all adversities, grace to find meaning in your life, grace to lift your eyes hopefully to the eternal mansions on high. All this grace has surely also attached your hearts to Christ in deep affection. Thus to labor and function as true friends of the heavenly bridegroom must needs appear also to you as life's noblest employment, as a singular honor and privilege.

If, then, you will ever keep this privileged task before your mind for which you are seeking preparation, all the seminary courses are bound to take on real meaning and purpose for you. Then you will want to become truly steeped in Scripture through exegesis and isagogics, and ever increasing proficiency in Greek and Hebrew will strike you as a matter of urgency. You will want to draw abundantly from the treasure store of Scripture, in order to learn ever better how to present the law in all its sternness, the Gospel in all its sweetness, and a life of thankful service with truly winsome and practical force. You will welcome dogmatics, symbolics, and church history as effective means for your training in the sacred art of rightly dividing the word of truth. Mindful

that you are preparing yourself for the vital task of turning sinners to Christ you will also want to learn all that you can about the most effective means for reaching their mind, heart and will with God's word. Thus homiletics, catechetics, pastoral practise, liturgics and pedagogy will gain your wholehearted interest. Like John you, too, will want to gain a clear understanding of all the fetters that are holding the minds and hearts of people bound against the Gospel, and therefore you will appreciate the valuable help which church history can offer to you in this respect.

Yet not only John's proficiency as a friend of the heavenly bridegroom is to be an inspiration to you. His complete consecration to his work, his faithfulness, his single minded pursuit of his hallowed task deserve to be your inspiring example in equal measure. The work for which you are preparing yourself calls for complete consecration, which needs to begin even now. The temptation which according to our text came to John will also come to you, namely the temptation to lose sight of the real purpose of the holy ministry and to look for honor, recognition, comfort and ease running counter to its interests. As your training here draws to an end your flesh, abetted by suggestions from the outside, may easily be tempted to look for something outwardly appealing in the way of a call. Then John's word will come in good stead: "A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven." Temptations will continue to come to you when you have entered upon your hallowed calling. As in the case of John they will often come to you through those through whom they really ought not to come, through undiscerning disciples, undiscerning church members, who will suggest measures, policies, and practises which promise popularity and recognition, which would spare you many labors and crosses, but which would stand in the way of turning hearts and lives effectively to Christ and His salvation. Then you will need to remember with John that you are but the friends of the bridegroom, that the important thing amidst your work is ever this that Christ increases, even though you yourself decrease thereby.

Still the work for which you are seeking preparation promises and holds out a joy which is all its own. Upon this joy John's heart was fixed while he looked away from the honors and benefits which men generally seek at their tasks. In our text we hear him speaking very definitely of joy in connection with his work:

“the friend of the bridegroom which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom’s voice; this my joy is therefore fulfilled.” Joy came to John in seeing his work as the friend of the heavenly bridegroom crowned with success. Joy came to him when he saw those to whom he had preached turning to Christ and clinging to Him. Far from arousing jealousy the sight of the multitudes turning from him and following Jesus filled his heart with boundless delight. He had joy in seeing Christ increasing. It was a rich and lasting joy. John will have it to all eternity. Had he shared the ill-advised thoughts of his disciples, had he sought to remain important by retaining a great following, he would have had but a transient and hollow joy.

This is the joy promised to all who labor faithfully as friends of the heavenly bridegroom. It is the rich joy of seeing Christ increased in human souls, the rich joy of seeing human hearts and lives turned to Him from sin, vanity and death, the rich joy of knowing that you have been instrumental in leading immortal souls to the peace, the joy, the comfort, strength and eternal hope which is to be found in Christ and in Him alone. It is a lasting joy. Indescribably great will this joy become when in the city of God we shall finally know of all whom with the Gospel we have helped to make partakers of eternal happiness to our Savior’s glory. Then first will we realize fully what an honor it was that we were privileged to be the friends of the heavenly bridegroom.

CARL LAWRENZ.

Pastoral Table of Duties

According to the Pastoral Letters

II. The Pastor as an Example for the Believers

In our first article on the “Pastoral Table of Duties” we saw the “must’s” and “must not’s” regarding the qualifications of a pastor according to 1 Tim. 3, 2-7; 2 Tim. 2, 24, 25; Titus 1, 6-9.

In this article we want to learn that the pastor should and must be, according to the Pastoral Letters, an example and a pattern for the believers, as 1 Tim. 4, 12 and Titus 2, 7, 8 will show.

1 Tim. 4, 12 reads: “Let no man despise thy youth, but be thou an example of the believers in word, in conversation (R. V.

in manner of life), in charity, in spirit (omitted by R. V.), in faith, in purity."

Titus 2, 7. 8 reads: "In all things showing thyself a pattern (R. V. ensample) of good works, in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity (omitted in R. V.), sound speech that cannot be condemned."

According to these words the pastor should be a good example and pattern, ein Vorbild, for his flock. He should be that in his office, in his private and public life, in his own and other people's homes, in his behavior, his teaching and preaching, in his doctrine. In all these he shall be an example and pattern worthy of emulation. He dare not be a bad example which would shock, offend and scandalize the believers (his flock) and the unbelievers (the world).

In Phil. 3, 17 the Apostle Paul speaks of himself as such an example when he writes: "Brethren, be followers (R. V. imitators) together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an example." And in 2 Thess. 3, 9 he writes: "We make ourselves an example unto you, to follow us (R. V. that ye should imitate us)." Here in 1 Tim. 4, 12 and Titus 2, 7 he tells these two men: "Be an example and a pattern of the believers." And the Apostle Peter in 1 Pet. 5, 3 exhorts the elders to be "examples to the flock." — Do we need more to impress on us how very grave and necessary the injunction to be a good example for the believers is for the pastor?

The word used in Scripture for example and pattern is *typos*. This word is found relatively often in the New Testament. In the A. V. it is translated into various English words. For example: John 20, 25: "print"; Acts 7, 43: "figure"; v. 44: "fashion"; Hebr. 8, 5 and Titus 2, 7: "pattern"; 1 Tim. 4, 12 and 1 Cor. 6, 10; "example"; 1 Cor. 10, 11 and 1 Pt. 5, 3: "ensample". — Sometimes, as in 1 Cor. 10, 6. 11, it is a bad example to be avoided; sometimes, as in 1 Tim. 4, 12 and Tit. 2, 7, it is a good example to be followed.

The pastors are exhorted in 1 Tim. 4, 12 and Tit. 2, 7 to be good examples and patterns. Buechner writes: "Especially it behooves the pastors and teachers to be good examples in their everyday life, so they may not tear down more by a scandalous and offensive life than they build up by their teaching." And he is right. The pastor who is winebibber, a drunkard, a striker,

a brawler, a lover of money, avaricious, geizig etc., will tear down more than his preaching and teaching can build. For then he is not a good example, but a *skandalon*, a stumbling block. The inevitable question must follow: "If the pastor can do these things, why can't I?"

We know that the good example of a pastor could save no one. Salvation depends altogether on the power and efficacy of the Word. On the other hand, he who is a bad example is a hindrance to the Gospel. His hearers, who know his life too, compare it with his preaching and naturally ask: "If what he preaches is right, then why does he not live accordingly?" They are led to doubt the truth of his message and, of course, his personal integrity. They have a right to ask: "Does he himself believe what he teaches and preaches?" And so the devil has his opportunity to pluck the good seed of the sermon right out of the hearts of the hearers and to plant in its place the wickedness expressed in the words: "If he can do it, why can't I?"

Here is an illustration. In the spring of 1939 the Luth. Free Church of Poland received a very urgent call from a group of people to serve their field. The State Church pastor who had served them was a very bad example for his flock. In every respect he was the opposite of what he should have been according to the Word of God. Women were not safe in his company. One of our pastors went to investigate why they had called on the Free Church to serve them. He asked first: "Why do you want the Free Church to come here and serve you?" "Because we can no longer stand to have N. N. as our pastor. We brought charges against him before the Consistory (the governing body of the Lutheran State Church), but we were not even given a hearing. We begged of the Consistory to move him, but nothing is being done. We can not depose him because that is the function of the Consistory. But we can no longer stand to have him as our pastor." Then our pastor explained at length what the Luth. Free Church stands for in doctrine and practice. When he came to the point regarding church discipline, he noticed growing restlessness among the people. Finally one of the congregations arose and said: "If the Lutheran Free Church stands for this, then we can't have it and don't want it." Why not? They wanted to get rid of the pastor because of his scandalous life, but they

did not want any interference with their own way of life which they had fashioned after the pastor's pattern.

Another thought. — The pastor is always a pastor in every one's eyes, not only when he is in the pulpit or about his pastoral duties. In church or out of church, no matter what he is doing, he is looked upon as a pastor and must live accordingly. As a Christian he too, everywhere, "follows after sanctification." Hebr. 12, 14.

In 1. Thess. 5, 12, 13 the Christians are admonished as follows: "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you and are over you in the Lord and admonish you; and *to esteem them very highly* in love for their work's sake." But it takes something to merit such esteem from the Christians.

This will not do it: A Polish State Church pastor was invited to a Leichenschmaus (funeral lunch). When he came into the house of mourning he removed his gown, hung it on a peg and said to the people in the room: "So, da haengt der Pastor." (There hangs the pastor.) In his mind the gown made the pastor and the removal of the gown removed all need of pastoral and Christian restraint.

A good example *at all times*, no matter where he is or what he is wearing; that is the meaning of the injunction: "Be thou an example of the believers."

But before we can examine the separate items of the divine injunction written in 1. Tim. 4, 12 and Tit. 2, 7, 8 we shall have to examine the context. In what connection does Paul issue this injunction?

In 1. Tim. 4, 11 Paul tells Timothy: "These things *command and teach*." Command, *parangelle* and teach, *didaske*. Timothy had authority (Tit. 2, 15) to command and teach. What? *Tauta*: these things. All that Paul had written in this chapter, especially v. 7ff, and all that he had written in the entire letter. But Timothy was a relatively young man. The men he was to command and teach were older than he, some old enough to be his father. Paul saw the danger of this condition. Therefore he wrote: "Let no man despise thy youth." Since Timothy had not, most likely, even reached the age of maturity, forty years according to Jewish reckoning, the danger was very real that they who were older would resent his authority to command and to teach them. "Let no man

despise thy youth." Neither young or old. Without a doubt, Timothy read this letter and this sentence to the elders and the congregations.

Paul did not, however, want Timothy merely to assert his authority as Paul's representative. He wanted Timothy to discover how he might overcome the handicap of his youth. "Be thou an example of the believers." So make them forget thy youth and accept thy commanding and teaching. And in the following verses Paul shows Timothy how to become an ever better example. "Give attendance to reading," the Scriptures of course, v. 13; "neglect not the gift that is in thee," v. 14; "meditate upon these things," "give thyself wholly to them," v. 15; "take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine, continue in them," (R. V. in these things), v. 16; "that thy profiting may appear to all," (R. V. that thy progress may be manifest to all). — That is Paul's plan to gain respect, confidence and love and to wipe out the danger inherent in Timothy's youthfulness.

Our pastors are young when they enter the ministry, much younger than Timothy was. How they ought to be led to win confidence and respect by being good examples of the believers, by giving attendance to reading and studying the Scriptures, by not neglecting the gifts they have, by meditating and giving themselves wholly to these things! That would do away with every attempt to command and teach by means of authority built on nothing more than the power of the office of the ministry.

"Be thou an example of the believers." According to 1. Tim. 4, 12: 1. "In word;" 2. "In conversation" (R. V. in manner of life); 3. "In charity;" 4. "In spirit" (omitted in R. V.); 5. "In faith;" 6. "In purity." According to Tit. 2, 7,8 we add: 7. "In good works;" 8. "In doctrine." In the doctrine: a. "Uncorruptness;" b. "Gravity;" c. "Sincerity" (omitted in R. V.); d. "Sound speech that cannot be condemned."

Let us not forget to note: "Be thou an example of the believers." *typos ginou tōn pistōn*. They are the Christians who put their faith and trust wholly in Christ's blood and righteousness. Specifically, of course, Paul here refers to the believers in the congregations under Timothy's supervision, to any and all of them, young and old, men and women, elders and members, Timothy should be and become ever more an example and pattern to

be followed. *Parechomenos typon*: Offering himself as a pattern after which they could fashion their lives.—Automatically Timothy would then also be a pattern to the unbelievers, to them “who are without,” Col. 4, 5.

1. The pastor should be an example *in word*. *En logō*.—This refers to the words a pastor speaks. No matter when, where, and what a pastor speaks he should be a good example. In the pulpit or the classroom, at a sickbed or on the street, in his own or another’s house, he shall never forget the injunction *typos ginou en logō*. That will effectively seal his lips to boisterous talk, to lewd and spicy stories, to doubledealing slang like golly, gosh, etc., which are just a deceitful way of taking the name of the Lord in vain.

Speaking of all Christians, Eph. 4, 29 and 5, 4 states: “Let no corrupt communication (R. V. speech) proceed out of your mouth,” nor “filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient” (R. V. befitting). And Col. 3, 8: “But now ye also put away . . . blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another.” How much more do these words apply to a pastor who should be an example of the believers *in word*. How he should strive to speak “that which is good to the use of edifying that it may minister grace to the hearers.” Eph. 5, 22. And Col. 4, 5: “Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt.”

The pastor who gives serious attention to these words of Scripture will always be able to find the right word at the right time in any situation.

2. The pastor should be an example for the believers *in conversation* (R. V. manner of life). German: Lebenswandel. Luther: Wandel. *En anastrophē*: In walk, *i. e.*, in manner of life, in behavior and conduct. This word occurs in Gal. 1, 13; Eph. 4, 22; James 3, 13; 1. Pet. 1, 15; 1, 18; 2, 12; 3, 1.2.16; 2. Pet. 2, 7; 1. Tim. 4, 12. The A. V. consistently translates it with “conversation”; the R. V., in all but two instances, with “manner of life”; in 1. Pet. 3, 1 it has “behavior,” and in 2. Pet. 2, 7 “life.”

This injunction certainly covers much ground. It makes imperative that the pastor’s entire manner of life in his official, public and private capacity be a good example to the believers. Whatever he is doing and wherever it may be, he must be that;

in church, in the classroom, at home, on vacations, on the street, at a funeral, at a sickbed, at a wedding.

A pastor never dare say: "I don't care what people think or say about what I do; I don't care whether they like it or not."—He has to care if he does not overlook what Christ said Matth. 18, 7: "Woe to that man by whom offense cometh"; or if he takes note of what Paul says of himself and his co-workers: "Giving no offense (R. V. occasion of stumbling) in anything, that the ministry (R. V. our ministration) be not blamed, but in all things approving (R. V. in everything commending) ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, etc." 2. Cor. 6, 3-10.

A pastor's way of life is to be governed by considerations, not of law, but of what is edifying. He may, for example, do something in one congregation without giving any offense at all, while in another he would give grave offense by doing the very same thing. Here the word of Paul applies: "All things are lawful unto me; but all things are not expedient; all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any." 1. Cor. 6, 12. Compare also 1. Cor. 10, 23 and note the word "edify," *oikodomei*. Think also of Luther's famous sentence: "Ein Christenmensch ist ein freier Herr ueber alle Dinge und niemand untertan; und ein Christenmensch ist ein dienstbarer Knecht aller Dinge und jedermann untertan."

That brings up Christian liberty. That is the liberty "where-with Christ has made us free" from "the yoke of bondage," the law and its curse, "the commandments of men," Matth. 15, 9, the regulations, resolutions, and rules of the church. Thus this liberty gives the Christian the right to do all things. Paul says that: "All things are lawful to me." This liberty is ours because we are "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people," *i. e.*, God's people. 1. Pet. 2, 9. And it is complete liberty as Jesus Himself says: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John 6, 36. Complete liberty! Yet Paul who was fighting all his life for just that is obliged to issue the warning: "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty (R. V. your freedom) for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another." Gal. 5, 13. Complete liberty, but the Christian can not use this liberty as he

pleases. He always asks: Are all things which are "lawful" to me also "expedient," that is, profitable, advisable, wise, apt and suitable? *Must* or *should* or *may* I make use of my Christian liberty in all things, at all times and under all circumstances and conditions? "Must?" That excludes itself, for it takes away liberty. It makes a law of liberty. That will not do. "All things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any." That takes care of the "should" too. But how about the "may?"

1. Cor. 8, 9 God tells us: "But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to them that are weak." And in 1. Pet. 2, 16: "As free, and not using your liberty as a cloak of maliciousness (R. V. wickedness), but as the servants of God." And here Christ's "new commandment" is in place: "That ye love one another." John 13, 34; 15, 12.15. Paul puts it this way: "Let all your things be done with charity." 1. Cor. 16, 14. (R. V. Let all that ye do be done in love.)

Christian liberty at the expense of Christian love is always out of place. Too bad, however, that this argument is frequently used as a club to try to force a man who is using his Christian liberty to submit to that which is against his conscience; for the sake of love, of course. If he does not submit, he is condemned as one who has sinned against love.—Christ says: "Love one another." Read again 1. Cor. 16, 14. Also Eph. 4, 2: "Forbearing one another in love." That kind of love is mutual, not one-sided. It most certainly could not force a man to act against his conscience, even his erring conscience. Yes, a Christian can do much for the sake of love; but when love is used as a club to make him submit then he gets his feet set on this Rock of Gibraltar: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." Gal. 5, 1.

A proper understanding of the correct use of our Christian liberty is given by Paul in Rom. 14. V. 13 he warns: "That no man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way." And V. 21 he states: "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor anything (R. V. to do anything) whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." Paul would rather forgo the use of his Christian liberty than to offend his weak brother and jeopardize his salvation. That makes clear that we *may* not make use of our Christian liberty in all things, at all times and under all circumstances and conditions.

But if any one tries to interfere with and infringe on my Christian liberty by imposing on me "Menschengebote," commandments of men, then I must stand on Paul's words: "All things are lawful for me." Nobody on earth has a right to curtail the priceless heritage I have as a child of God. I dare not listen to the Pharisees, the bigots, the enthusiasts, the sects, when they tell me that I sin when I smoke, chew, use snuff, drink anything intoxicating, play, laugh, etc. I dare not listen to every resolution, rule and regulation of a church body, if it is against my Christian conscience, curtails my liberty and "puts a yoke upon the neck of the disciple." Then a Christian must stand firm and obey God's word: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." It is for the Christian to decide whether he can with a good conscience submit to rules, resolutions and regulations, for he belongs to the "chosen generation, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, the peculiar people." 1. Pet. 2, 9.

In the use of his Christian liberty also the pastor should be an example of the believers, by using it wisely and to the edification of his flock.

A pastor's recreation must be considered under this injunction. What about attending baseball, football, basketball games? Hunting, fishing, going to movies? Playing cards (of course, not for money, for then it would be gambling), etc.? Here, too, this holds good that no one dare infringe on the pastor's liberty. On the other hand, a conscientious pastor will know what to do and what not to do, if he keeps in mind 1. Cor. 6, 12: "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient." And 1. Cor. 10, 23: "All things are lawful for me, but all things *edify* not." And Rom. 14. — But any pastor might in connection with his recreation activity profitably meditate on the second part of Paul's statement: "All things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any."

3. The pastor should be an example of the believers *in charity*. *En agapē*. *Agapē* means affection, good will, love, benevolence. Schierlitz: "Die aus Achtung entstehende Liebe." Thayer notes: "Of the love of men to men, especially of that love of Christians toward Christians which is enjoyed and prompted by their religion, whether the love be viewed as in the soul, or as

expressed." In Latin: *Caritas*. English: Charity. The German language has no word besides *Liebe*, love. Only since the advent of Christianity has this kind of love, *caritas*, become known as love of the neighbor.

Love as it expresses itself in charity is the daughter of faith. Love and charity are bound to be in every heart where there is faith in Christ Jesus as the Redeemer and Savior. That is love of God, of the brethren, of neighbors, even of enemies. And that love is active. It can not remain buried in the heart. It is active in word and deed. Word-love is nothing more than empty and pious talk. James takes care of that in James 2, 15.16: "If thy brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them: Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?" Pious phrases are not charity.

In the R. V. love is consistently substituted for charity wherever the latter occurs, because the word charity today has taken on the specific meaning: Almsgiving.

Opportunity to practice charity is never lacking. At home we have the poor always with us and, in a wider circle, we can take part in the organized charity of the church (orphanages, homes for the aged, hospitals, schools for the deaf, etc.).

And, according to Scripture, charity is a serious obligation. 1. Cor. 14, 1: "Follow after charity." Col. 3, 14: "Above all things, put on charity." 1. Pet. 4, 8: "Above all things have fervent charity among yourselves." 1. Tim. 1, 5: "The end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart." In charity the pastor should be an example to be followed. Especially in the Pastoral Letters the pastor is exhorted to "follow righteousness, faith, *charity*, peace." 2. Tim. 2, 22. And it doesn't take people long to find out whether a pastor merely preaches, or also practices charity. Of course, we have to preach charity. Such is the duty of our office. But can we also say what Paul wrote to Timothy: "Thou hast fully known my . . . charity," 2 Tim. 3, 10? Since our example means so much, let us not only preach charity, but also practice it, lest only preaching it to others we ourselves "should be rejected." 1. Cor. 9, 27.

Let us not forget, though, that charity is love, Christian love. For the world also speaks of charity. It dances for charity,

eats for charity, plays for charity, etc. But its charity has nothing to do with love. The Christian in his charity practices what Christ says: "Love one another." And he is mindful of this too: "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Matth. 25, 40.

4. The pastor should be an example for the believers *in spirit*. The R. V. and all of the newer Greek Testaments omit these words because they are found only in the later codices.—Charity, love and all Christian virtues are fruits of the Spirit. He creates the Christian's spirit. The spirit behind a pastor's work, his motives, his objectives, his concerns, all these are soon manifest to his flock.

5. The pastor should be an example for the believers *in faith*. *En pistei*. But faith is invisible. Only the Lord can see it. Can the pastor, then, be an example in faith? By his very manner of life, his work, his entire conduct among his people he soon proves whether or not he has the living and saving faith in his heart. People quickly sense and know a man's faith. When we consider, in addition, that without faith no pastor could meet the qualifications he "must" have, we can understand that he can be an example of the believers in faith.

Was there ever a time when the need of being an example in faith, true and steadfast and living faith in the good Shepherd, was more urgent than in our present critical and evil days?

The battle to the death between faith and the enemies of Christ is at hand. The enemies are marshaling their forces and resources to wipe the way of faith in Christ from the face of the earth. And these enemies are everywhere. The most dangerous of them are in the church. There it is that the unionists, the synergists, the enthusiasts, the advocates of salvation by works, the enemies of the Bible, of verbal and plenary inspiration, are doing their utmost to demolish the Church, while the devil and the world stand by and celebrate a jubilee. Could any other situation cry more desperately for pastors to be examples in faith — and faithfulness? Could anything stir their hearts more deeply to "fight the good fight of faith" and "earnestly to contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints?" Jude 3.—From the outside, too, the testing-time of our faith is at hand. Com-

munism, Bolshevism and State-Churchism will cruelly and severely test our faith. Oh, to have Luthers then to say: "Hier stehe ich, ich kann nicht anders, Gott helfe mir. Amen!"

6. The pastor should be an example for the believers in *purity*: *En hagneia*. *Hagneia*: purity; sinlessness of life. Schierlitz: "Reinheit im moralischen Sinn." Benseler: "Fromme Reinheit in Worten und Werken, *sanctimonia*." Luther: "In Keuschheit." *Hagneia* is more than sexual purity, chastity. The English word purity gives the exact meaning of *hagneia*: purity in thought, word and deed, in heart and mind. Such purity is the possession of them alone "which have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Rev. 7, 14. Where faith rules, there purity will rule.—And when Luther translates *hagneia* with Keuschheit, chastity, I am sure that he meant more than restraint in actual sins against the sixth commandment. He meant also to encourage chastity of mind and heart, of thought and word and deed.

"Thought." A man is ruled by his thoughts. Clean, chaste, pure thoughts make a clean life. They even rule his speech. The Word of God says: "Wes das Herz voll ist, des gehet der Mund ueber." Again it says: "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts . . . these are the things which defile a man." Matth. 15, 19, 20.—"Word." Our words should be true and pure and edifying. But to how many would Christ have to say again: "O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Matth. 12, 34. Words reveal the evil thoughts people try so hard to hide. Therefore: "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers." Eph. 4, 29.—"Deed." Probably not one who is reading this, will not be reminded of an example of the havoc which a pastor's immoral life creates in the church.

These, then, are the things Paul includes in his admonition to Timothy: *Typos ginou*. In them be and become ever more an example of the believers. Thus you will win their hearts and confidence and esteem and respect. Then you can command and teach. Then your youth will not matter.

Now to Tit. 2, 7-8.

“In all things showing thyself a pattern (R. V. an ensample) of good works: In the doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity (omitted in R. V.), sound speech that can not be condemned.”

“Showing thyself a pattern.” *Seauton parechomenos typon*: Present yourself as a *typos*, a pattern which your flock can follow and imitate. The Apostle places this injunction into the midst of a series of exhortations which Titus should impress on a) The old men, b) The aged women, v. 3-5. c) The young men, v. 6. d) The servants, v. 9, 10. Between c and d Paul tells Titus to show himself a pattern in all things; to them, of course, whom he is admonishing, by himself living the virtues he asks of them.

7. A pastor should in all things be a pattern of good works. *Peri panta seauton parechomenos typon kalōn ergōn*. *Parechomenos*: Pres. ptcp. middle voice: to offer, to show, or to present one's self. Schierlitz: “Sich erweisen als.” Luther translates the sentence: “Allenthalben aber stelle dich selbst zum Vorbild guter Werke.” The pastor should present himself as, and prove himself to be, a pattern of good works in all things. Not only preach good works, admonish other people to do them, but he himself should be rich in them and so be a pattern in this respect, a pattern worthy of emulation.

The exegetes are not agreed on the proper position of *peri panta*. Should it be connected with v. 6 or with v. 7? Should we read: *Sōphronein peri panta* or *peri panta parechomenos*. It makes sense both ways. Nestle connects it with *sōphronein*. The English, German, and Polish translations connect it with *parechomenos*. I shall follow them.

In all things, no matter what he is doing, the pastor should be a pattern of good works, not of evil works. He dare not be a pattern of the “must not's” in the list of the qualifications of a pastor.—“Of good works.” We Christians have been created “in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God has before ordained that we should walk in them.” Eph. 2, 10. All Christians are to bear the fruits of faith, good works. They should be rich in good works. 1. Tim. 6, 18. And Christians will. Certainly then the pastor who has the qualifications demanded by God for his office will be a pattern of good works—the fruits of his faith—which the believers can imitate.

There is no need of entering in on a discussion of "good works."

The point here is that we pastors, professors, and teachers should be patterns, Vorbilder, in good works, by living and walking in and doing them. This injunction makes the conscience ask a lot of questions. Am I and have I been such a pattern? Do believers and unbelievers see in me zeal for good works? Am I indifferent? Does my life lack good works? As servants of Christ and stewards of God's mysteries our responsibility in this respect is very great, for it affects the welfare of God's kingdom and the welfare of the souls of men. Yes, it affects the world. This responsibility God lays on us with these words: "Be thou a pattern of good works." How we must blush in shame when we read the book of Acts and the Epistles and compare our good works with the pattern laid down by the apostles!

About our responsibility over against the world Christ says: "So let your light shine before men, that they may see your *good works* and glorify your father, which is in heaven." Matth. 5, 16. And Peter writes: "Having your conversation (R. V. behavior) honest among the Gentiles: that, whereas they speak against you as evildoers, they may be your *good works* which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation." 1. Pet. 2, 12. This is said to all Christians, but it concerns the pastor too. Or are we pastors not Christians? Has God not created us in Christ Jesus unto good works? Don't the believers have the right to expect us to be zealous in good works? And they notice quickly whether the pastor is a pattern of good works or not.

An illustration. The pastor of whom I speak usually left the church by way of the sacristy. But whenever a collection for God's work was taken up he left by way of the front door of the church in order that he might add his personal gift to the collection. After about a year of this an elder stopped him one Sunday and said in the presence of other elders: "Now this is funny, pastor. Every Sunday you leave the church by way of the sacristy except when a collection is being taken up. Then you leave by way of the front door and put your offering into the plate. Your predecessor always used the front door except when there was a collection; then he left by the sacristy door." This was said in a jocular tone. But then he finished in all earnestness: "And I tell you, pastor, *the people notice these things.*"

Another illustration. As a young man I once preached at a Mission Festival in a sister synod congregation. This congregation was known for its love for, and liberal contributions to, the cause of missions. The pastor was an elderly and highly respected man. When he told me the sum of the collection I was astonished and asked him: "Pastor, how do you accomplish this?"—"My young brother, this is my answer: *Ich geh mit gutem Beispiel voran*. My people know that I do not only preach about liberal giving for missions, but I also practice what I preach." And to this day I thank the old pastor for this lesson in Pastoral Theology. It made clear to me what Paul means when he says: "Be a pattern of good works."

I can not understand to this day how a pastor can announce a collection, admonish his people to give liberally, and then himself give but sparingly or not at all. Is he not a Christian? Doesn't he know the joy of giving? Does he not know the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, how He said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive?" Does he forget what God has given him? Are all the admonitions which he reads in the Bible, to give, to give willingly, richly, to sacrifice, nothing to him? Does he not know the word: "God loveth a cheerful giver?" And how can he forget that he should be a pattern of good works for the Christians?

It is self-evident that there are many other kinds of good works in which the pastor should be a pattern. The extensive discussion of this one will, however, suffice to demonstrate what Paul means when he writes: "Be thou a pattern of good works."

8. The pastor should be a pattern for the believers in doctrine: *En tē didaskalia*. The Greek has the article: In the doctrine. *Didaskalia*: Teaching, instruction, that which is taught, doctrine.

How much doctrine is stressed in the New Testament can be learned by taking a lexicon of the Greek New Testament and looking up articles on *didaktikos*, *didaktos*, *didaskalia*, *didaskalos*, *didaskō*, *didachē*. It is astonishing how frequently these words occur.

The Pastoral Letters also stress doctrine. We find the word *didaskalia*, doctrine, in 1. Tim. 1, 10; 4, 1.6.13.16; 5, 17; 6, 1.3; in 2. Tim. 3, 10.16; 4, 3; in Tit. 1, 9; 2, 1.7.10. — What

more could we need to impress on us the importance of doctrine in the eyes of God? And yet, just this stress on the doctrine is taboo in most church bodies, even some Lutheran bodies, today. But, though the very word doctrine brings a sneer to the faces of so many, God says that the pastor should be an example in doctrine.

Didaskalia, teaching, doctrine. Nothing but the doctrine of the Word of God, of course. "All scripture is profitable for doctrine," *pros didaskalian*, 2. Tim. 3, 16. The doctrine, then, is the teaching of Scripture, all Scripture; it is nothing more and nothing less than Scripture teaches, for the doctrine of which the Apostle speaks "is not drawn or developed from human reason, but is taken in all its parts solely from Holy Scripture." J. P. Mueller, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 38. He also quotes Luther (p. 38): "In the church no other doctrine should be taught or heard than the pure Word of God, that is Holy Scripture, otherwise both teachers and hearers shall be condemned." Gal. 1, 8 clinches the point: "But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

Now, in doctrine the pastor should be a pattern! His preaching and teaching must be nothing more or less than the Word of God; not his ideas, opinions, and notions, not his wisdom — only God's. Therefore he must be "nourished up in the word of faith and of good doctrine." 1. Tim. 4, 6. Consequently we can expect nothing less of the Seminary than that it lay a *good foundation* in the biblical doctrine, in exegesis, and in the history of doctrinal theology. But the Seminary can do little more than lay a good foundation and it must be impressed on the young pastor that his knowledge of the divine doctrine is not complete when he leaves the Seminary; that he must build on that foundation and study, look for more "nourishment." In the Scriptures, first of all. Then in the confessional writings of our church, in the Book of Concord. Then in the books on pure doctrine, in Luther's works, the works of our Lutheran dogmaticians, old and new. May I mention a few? Chemnitz: *Examen Concilii Tridentini*; Gerhard: *Loci Theologici*; J. F. Mueller: *Christian Dogmatics*; and then two monumental works: Hoenecke: *Dogmatik* and F. Pieper: *Christliche*

Dogmatik. Here this warning is in place: Beware of dogmatical and exegetical works of authors of the Reformed Church.

That warning is in place because Scripture and especially the Pastoral Letters stress "sound doctrine." So in 1. Tim. 1, 10: "If there be any other thing that is contrary to *sound doctrine*." 2. Tim. 4, 3: "For the time will come when they will not endure *sound doctrine*." Tit. 2, 1: "But speak thou the things which become *sound doctrine*." This stress on *sound doctrine* means stop, look and listen, for there are doctrines taught which are not sound, because they are not biblical. They are called in 1. Tim. 4, 1: "Doctrines of the devil." Christ and Scripture call them who teach such doctrines "false prophets." Matth. 7, 15; 1. John 4, 1. Of such, Christ says: "Beware." Matth. 7, 15.

So the pastor must be a pattern in the *sound*, biblical doctrine by "holding fast to the faithful word . . . , that he may be able by the *sound doctrine* both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." (R. V. both to exhort in the sound doctrine and to convict the gainsayers.) He dare not be a man "tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine," Eph. 4, 14; not a "reed shaken with the wind," Matth. 11, 7.

It is so important for the pastor to be this pattern in *sound doctrine* because his Lord and Master, whose servant he is, demands it; because the sheep of Christ which are entrusted to his care need it for their salvation; and because he has to give an account of his stewardship to the Lord.

But let us consider three other very timely reasons.

1. The trend of the times is to get away from the bugbear of doctrine, to let up on being so strict in matters of doctrine. That is the demand of both liberalism and unionism. Haven't you heard this: Strictness in doctrinal matters brings about schisms and separation. And this? Because you of the Synodical Conference are so strict in doctrine and demand unity in doctrine as the only basis for church fellowship, you are the cause of the awful condition which exists among Lutherans of the U. S. A. They are divided into hostile camps which fight each other rather than work in harmony. You must yield some; you must not be so strict in adhering to the faithful word and the sound doctrine. You must keep in step with the times. The times demand union, a united front. Forget about doctrine, keep in step with the

times and forget the past. — That is the siren song of unionism which is tempting the church everywhere. What can be our only answer? The proper answer will testify that the Word of God, the “beware” of our Lord, the admonition to “hold fast to the faithful word” and to “the sound doctrine,” is still our guide. All this demands honest self-examination in all of us. Where do I stand? — One fact is very noticeable in our circles today: Attention to doctrine is not as sharp as it ought to be. The study of conference announcements in our church papers shows an astounding lack of papers on doctrinal subjects. That is not healthy, for the times cry for doctrine, divine, unadulterated, sound, and firm doctrine.

2. The contact of our people with the sects and the liberal Lutherans who are not interested in sound doctrine is frequent in our day. They live among them, work with them in factories and offices. And people who are not interested in sound doctrine nevertheless are always fanatical in their interest in and propagation of pet theories. The Christianity of the sects is not scriptural nor doctrinal, but emotional. Faith and hope are built on feeling. That exposes our people to great danger. That danger was always present, but developments have made it graver today. Formerly our people were quite completely isolated from sectarianism through the difference in language alone. That is different now with the advent of English in our preaching and teaching. Mixed marriages also must be taken into account in weighing the danger of which we speak. Thus the possibility and danger of being influenced are graver today than they formerly were. — This calls for ever greater stressing of the sound doctrine.

3. Unbelief and open enmity against the cross are on the increase. Opposition against the Christian religion is constantly growing, the religion of repentance, of the forgiveness of sin by grace for Christ's sake and through faith alone. That calls for thorough indoctrination by preaching and teaching. Think of the many children who get their schooling in the public schools! There they are taught many things which are out of harmony with the Word. Nor can our Sunday Schools overcome that influence. Therefore indoctrination! They must learn to know sound doctrine for their salvation and “so they be ready always

to give answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them." 1. Pet. 3, 15. How else can they "fight the good fight of faith?" — We must bear this in mind when we instruct either children or adults for confirmation.

Now to Paul's detailed description of sound doctrine.

a. In doctrine (R. V. the doctrine) shewing uncorruptness: *aphthoria*. Schierlitz: "Unverdorbenheit; Unverfaelschtheit." Luther translates: "Mit unverfaelschter Lehre."

The pastor should be a pattern in doctrine by his uncorrupted and genuine preaching and teaching. Without additions or subtractions, without his own opinions, tastes or omissions, he should preach and teach it as the Scripture states it. — As a student I heard a sermon in a German Methodist church on Hebr. 6, 4-6: "For it is impossible for those who once were enlightened . . . , if they fall away, to renew them again unto repentance." The preacher began: "The Apostle Paul does say in our text that those who were once enlightened . . . if they fall away, cannot again come to repentance. I don't believe this. I think the Apostle wrote this because he did not know better." — Where did that leave the "uncorruptness"? That man followed his reason, not the Word of God which is the truth.

In our preaching and teaching we are not dealing with a human book nor with a book which might contain errors, but with God's Book which is the absolute truth and is absolutely free from error. "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of men; but the holy men of God spake (and wrote) as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2. Pet. 1, 21. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2. Tim. 3, 16. With fear and awe we must realize that that Book dare not be tinkered with. Our textbook is the Word of God. We use it as "stewards of God's mysteries." 1. Cor. 4, 1. Neither reason, nor feelings, nor philosophy dare interfere with a sound and true presentation of its doctrines. Anything short of preaching and teaching only the Word of God, the absolute and eternal Truth, makes a pastor a false teacher. And the congregation which is burdened with one like that must follow Christ's warning: "Beware of false prophets," and part company with their false teacher.

Tit. 2, 1 Paul writes: "Speak thou the things which become sound doctrine." (R. V. which befit sound doctrine.) *Hygiainousa*

didaskalia. *Hygiainousa* is the pres. act. part. of *hygiainō*: to be sound, to be in good health. In its literal sense we find this word in the New Testament only in Acts, Luke and 3. John; in the metaphorical sense only in the Pastoral Letters, but in each of the three: 1. Tim. 1, 10; 4, 6; 2. Tim. 1, 13; 4, 3; Tit. 1, 9.13; 2, 1.2.9. Here the sense is: Sound or healthy in faith, in charity, in patience, in doctrine, in words, in speech.

Hygiainousa, that word must be a true description of our doctrine. It must be healthy and unadulterated, "the sincere milk of the word." — 1. Pet. 2, 2. We are in our office to feed the Lord's lambs and sheep "the sincere milk of the word that they may grow thereby." (R. V. according to the Greek text: grow thereby unto salvation.) We dare not feed them the dry straw of pious phrases, but shall keep them in good spiritual health and growth by feeding them healthy doctrine.

The Holy Ghost's stress on healthy and uncorrupted doctrine must convince us that He is very much concerned about the preaching and teaching of sound doctrine. That gives us our cue. So must we be, for we are His slaves, His servants, His stewards. Good; but then let us dig ever deeper into God's Book, search, study and learn it, that we might acquire ever deeper understanding and knowledge of the *hygiainousa* doctrine. And may I stress this again and again, that the whole doctrine, whatever we preach and teach, must be sound, for each and every doctrine of Scripture is *hygiainousa*, healthy and health-giving to all who hear, learn and believe it. "Thus it is written" must be the imprint on every doctrine we preach and teach.

When we speak of fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines that does not mean that we can play around with the latter. They come from Holy Scriptures too and are divine doctrines and must be treated as such.

Who could dare to change one iota of divine doctrine? Whether it be the doctrine of inspiration, or of God, or of Christ's person, or of redemption, or of justification, or the doctrine of Sunday, of the Church, of the Millennium, or any other divine doctrine? Who could presume the right to add to or detract anything from any doctrine, or to change it in any way? "It is written" and "The scripture cannot be broken," John 10, 35 settles that once and for all. Paul's warning to the

Corinthians, 1. Cor. 5, 6, applies to us: "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." And when Christ warned His disciples He warned us: "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the Saducees." Matth. 16, 6. And that leaven was "the doctrine of the Pharisees and Saducees."

It works like this: If the "conduct of man" is put into the doctrine of conversion, or the "intuitu fidei" into the doctrine of predestination, or the "visible" into the doctrine of the Church, the *Una Sancta*, then the leaven of false doctrine is there. If a bodily resurrection of the martyrs before the Last Day, or a twofold coming of Christ, or a general conversion of the Jews are put into the doctrine of the Last Things, then the leaven of unsound, unhealthy doctrine is there. And those of us who lived through the heat of the controversies on Predestination, Conversion, Objective Justification, will always remember the devastation which such leaven can work in the church. — And the end of any church which does not insist on "uncorruptness" in the doctrine is presented to our eyes oftener than we care to see it. For example, what became of the Lutheran Church in Germany? The very cradle of the Reformation, because it did not insist on uncorruptness of doctrine, fell a prey to Pietism, Rationalism, Unionism, Liberal Theology, and Higher Criticism. In short, every "ism" of yesterday and of today could make its bed there.

Every page of church history warns: Beware of even a little leaven! St. Paul warns: "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears," 2. Tim. 4, 3. — Is that time not here? — In 1. Tim. 6, 3, 4 he writes: "If any man teach otherwise and consent not to the wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing." How many men like that are there not in the Church today, in the Lutheran Church here in the U. S. A.? Think of them in the U. L. Church and in the A. L. Conference as they deny plenary and verbal inspiration and the inerrancy of the Scriptures; as they fight against the Bible doctrine of inspiration in church papers, theological magazines and books; as they teach their students that the Bible is full of errors and con-

traditions. All that in spite of Christ's dictum: "The scripture cannot be broken." And the dictum of the Holy Ghost: "*ALL* scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2. Tim. 3, 16.

God, give us strength and steadfastness to show "in the doctrine uncorruptness," to hold fast to the faithful word, and so make us patterns of the believers in sound, healthy, uncorrupted and unadulterated doctrine! Amen!

b. "Gravity," *semnotēs*: Dignity, gravity. Schierlitz: "Ehrwuerdigkeit und was derselben zugrunde liegt, der Ernst, die Wuerde." Luther: "Mit Ehrbarkeit." This word occurs but three times in the New Testament and each time in the Pastoral Letters. In 1. Tim. 2, 2 the A. V. translates it with honesty, the R. V. with gravity. In 1. Tim. 3, 5 and Tit. 2, 7 both have gravity.

Uncorruptness is said of the doctrine itself, gravity of the way of presenting it. The seriousness of the doctrine precludes a flippant or vulgar presentation. This is God's doctrine which we proclaim and teach in Christ's stead for the salvation of sinners. Nothing dare detract from it nor distract the hearers. P. E. Kretzmann has the following to say in "Die Pastoral-briefe": "Was nicht zu dem Ernste der christlichen Wahrheit passt, hat kein Recht auf der Kanzel. Populaer, schlicht und einfaeltig zu reden heisst nicht vulgaer und nach Art der Gassenbuben zu reden. Die Art und Weise, den Predigtstuhl (d. h. die Kanzel, pulpit) in eine Theaterbuehne unzuwandeln und durch allerlei fragliche Methoden zweifelhafte Wahrheiten anschaulich zu machen, tut den Predigern, die sie gebrauchen, den Gemeinden, die sie dulden, nur Schaden und dem Worte Gottes nur Abbruch. Komoedianten gehoeren nicht auf die Kanzel. Mit Gottes Wort soll unter keinen Umstaenden Scherz getrieben werden."

The pastor is the servant of Christ and the steward of God. From his pulpit he is proclaiming the gospel message, i. e., the sound doctrine uncorrupted and unadulterated, "in Christ's stead." Both Christ and the hearers have the right to expect that this message be clothed in proper garments, in gravity and dignity. Christ preached that way, so did the apostles, so shall we. We are not actors or harlequins, but stewards of the mysteries of God.—This undignified pulpit-method is a development of modern times. It was introduced into the church by the

so-called evangelists and was quickly taken up by the sects in the hope that they could thereby fill their churches. — The advertisements of catchy themes for sermons also fall into this category. We are no Billy Sundays. God wants us to preach the Word in gravity. This, too, is a part of being a pattern of the believers.

c. "Sincerity." The R. V. omits this word because the Greek word *aphtharsia* is not found in any of the older codices. — Yet, what was written about "gravity" covers "sincerity."

d. And now the last point: "In sound speech." In sound speech that cannot be condemned. *Hygiēs*: Healthy, sound. *Akatagnōstos*: That can not be censured, condemned. Schierlitz: "Unverwerflich, untadelig." Luther: "Mit heilsamem und untadeligem Wort." Thayer: "Teaching which does not deviate from the truth," and so can not be censured and condemned.

Uncorruptness is said of the doctrine itself, gravity of the manner in which it is to be proclaimed; sound speech is the dress in which it is to be clothed. — It must be clothed in the garment of sound speech so that it cannot be condemned as to content or form. Christ's speech was so; therefore the Pharisees and Sadducees, the scribes, elders and priests could not catch Him in His speech no matter how closely they watched His every word. Christ's words were accurate and accurately chosen.

But sound speech includes something else; namely, that the sound doctrine be presented in popular, simple and clear words, words easily understood, words which are accommodated to the listeners. Just as surely as unsound doctrine clothed in plain and popular language does no good, so surely sound doctrine clothed in language which the listeners cannot understand is useless. The Apostle Paul writes: "And, brethren, when I came to you, I came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring (R. V. proclaiming) unto you the testimony of God." 1. Cor. 2, 1. And v. 4: "And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

It is not too easy to preach an English sermon in plain and simple and easily understood language, since so much of our English church language is not used in everyday conversation. So many of the terms come from the Latin. Possibly the younger generation which has learned the Catechism and Bible

History in English and has a fair knowledge of the English language can understand even the higher Latin words like regeneration, justification, etc., but that is not true of the older generation. Therefore it is so necessary to use language which both young and old can understand. In the pulpit we are not to show how many big words we know, but to bring the sound, saving doctrine to the souls of men for their edification and comfort. We are in this work for the sake of the souls which Christ "bought with a price, not with silver and gold, but with his precious blood and innocent suffering and death." These souls, the lambs and sheep of our Lord, He entrusted to our care; we shall feed them with the heavenly manna, the divine doctrine, the gospel of salvation by grace through faith in Him, so that they may be strengthened in faith and hope, comforted in trials and tribulations, strengthened to fight the good fight of faith and to withstand the temptations of their flesh, the world and the old evil foe.

This we shall accomplish if we bring the sound doctrine to them in sound speech, in words which fit the subject and can be understood by the hearers and which cannot be condemned as false, ambiguous, empty or meaningless. — We know — I spoke of it before — how the Pharisees and scribes "began to urge him (Christ) vehemently and to provoke him and seeking to catch something out of his mouth that they might accuse him." Luke 11, 53. 54. "Then went the Pharisees and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk." Matth. 22, 15. They found nothing in His words to accuse Him because His speech was sound. That we must aim at, "that those that are of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of us." Tit. 2, 8.

Most certainly these three words, "unconruptness, gravity, sound speech," impress on us how very carefully and conscientiously we must work out our sermons and catecheses. 1. Nothing but the sound doctrine. And we preach and teach that "unconrupted," just as we find it in the Scriptures. 2. We preach and teach it in gravity, in a dignified manner. 3. We use sound speech, sound words to express the sound doctrine.

That is what it means to be a pattern to the believers in sound doctrine. That is what it means to be faithful stewards of God and true servants and ministers of Christ.

In closing this part of the Pastoral Table of Duties let us nail down that the pastor should be an example and pattern to the believers in words, what he says; in conversation, what he does; in charity, in his love of his neighbor; in faith; in purity in thought, word and deed; in good works; in the doctrine, that he preach and teach it "uncorrupted, in gravity and in sound speech."

Are we such examples and patterns of the believers? A simple question, brethren, which awaits our answer. What will it be? I am sure that no one will say: Yes, I am. But I am also sure that most, if not all, of us will say: I try to be, but the harder I try the more I recognize my shortcomings and imperfections. My sinful flesh keeps me from perfection. Fine, if we acknowledge that. Then there is but one thing to do: Keep on striving toward perfection. Pray Him Whose servants we are for grace, forgiveness of our shortcomings, and an ever richer measure of His Holy Spirit that we may never grow weary of seeking to become perfect patterns and examples for the believers.

W. BODAMER.

Die Verwertung und Bewertung der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments in die griechische Sprache, der Septuaginta, wie auch der Abschriften des Alten Testaments mit ihren Varianten im Neuen Testament seitens des Herrn Christi, der Evangelisten, Apostel, und durch sie des Heiligen Geistes.

(Schluß.)

Die Bewertung der Septuaginta im Neuen Testament.

Ehe wir diese Sache genauer prüfen, wird es nötig sein, daß wir einen wichtigen Punkt, der hier in Betracht kommen wird, untersuchen und entscheiden. Wir alle bekennen uns zur *inspiratio rerum et verborum*, zur Sach- und Wortinspiration der ganzen Schrift Alten und Neuen Testaments. Dieses Bekenntnis hat seinen festen Grund in der Schrift. Ohne hier die vielen Stellen, die diese Inspiration bezeugen, als Zeugen heranzuziehen, sei nur auf ein Wort, nämlich 2 Petri 1, 21, das sehr wichtig ist, hingewiesen, nämlich auf

das **pheromenoi huepo pneumatos hagiou**. Zu diesem bedeutenden Wort **pheromenoi** sagt Schirlitz in seinem neutestamentlichen Wörterbuch: „Von der Stelle bewegt, fortgerissen werden, zumeist durch Einwirkung einer äußeren, gewalttätigen, mit sich fortreisenden Kraft“. Rohmert, Dogmatik, S. 60: „Denn nicht Menscheng Geist und Menschenwille hat die Weissagung hervorgebracht, sie entspringt nicht einer selbständigen Tätigkeit der menschlichen Schreiber, sondern die heiligen Menschen Gottes haben geredet, bezw. ihre Rede niedergeschrieben, getrieben oder vielmehr **getragen** vom Heiligen Geist. Sie trugen nicht, wie Bengel sagt, sondern sie wurden getragen; nicht aktiv, sondern passiv verhielten sie sich. Das Wort „tragen“, **pherein**, besagt mehr als treiben. Ein Getriebener kann allenfalls auch allein gehen, er geht nur schneller, wenn er einen Treiber hinter sich hat; ein Tragener aber befindet sich bezüglich der Fortbewegung in völliger Passivität. Und so war es eben bei den heiligen Schreibern. Alles, was sie gedacht, gesprochen und geschrieben haben, geschah unter dem Einfluß des Heiligen Geistes, so daß sie nirgends ihrem eigenen Willen folgten, sondern dem Heiligen Geist als williges Organ dienten“. Gerhard, Loci Theologici ed. Cotta 1762–1781: *Cum nec locuti fuerint nec scripserint humana sive propria voluntate, sed pheromenoi huepo tou pneumatos hagiou, acti, ducti, impulsu, inspirati et gubernati a Spiritu Sancto. Scripserunt non ut homines, sed ut Dei homines. hoc est ut Dei servi et peculiaris Spiritus Sancti organa.*

Dieses wichtige Wort **pheromenoi** sagt uns also, daß die heiligen Menschen vom Heiligen Geist völlig getragen, fortgerissen waren, ganz in seinem Besitz mit ihrem ganzen geistigen Wesen: Verstand, Wille und Gemüt, in seiner schaffenden Gewalt, ein Werkzeug, Griffel in der Hand eines guten Schreibers. Die heiligen Männer Gottes waren dabei im vollen Bewußtsein, sich dessen bewußt, daß sie so vom Heiligen Geist getragen wurden, und daß der Heilige Geist nun die dirigierende Kraft in ihrem ganzen Wesen sei. Sie wissen es, Paulus sagt: „Was wir auch reden, nicht mit von menschlicher Weisheit gelehrteten Worten, sondern mit vom Geiste gelehrteten“.

Will man dabei eine menschliche Seite hervorheben, dann ist es die, daß diese Menschen von Gott sich willig und freudig diesem Willen des Heiligen Geistes unterwarfen, ohne Widerspruch und Sträuben, in völligem Gehorsam. Dies bestätigen die Worte, die vorhergehen: **ou gar thellehmati anthropou ehnechthhe pote propehtheia**, nicht durch den Willen eines Menschen ist einst die Weis-

sagung hervorgebracht worden. Dies schließt die Tätigkeit des Willens jener Männer Gottes bei dieser Wirksamkeit des Heiligen Geistes völlig aus und sagt uns, daß dieser Wille gänzlich untätig war; aber ein Wille herrschte, der des Heiligen Geistes. Aber auch die Tätigkeit ihres Verstandes in der Hervorbringung der Weissagung, so daß alles nur auf die Wirksamkeit des Heiligen Geistes zurückzuführen ist. Stellen wir uns vor, welche inneren Akte sich vollziehen, wenn ein menschlicher Wille Weissagungen hervorbringen würde: Erstens würde der Wille sich in Bewegung setzen und beschließen: Ich will jetzt prophezeien. Diese Willensregung würde zum anderen den Verstand in Bewegung setzen, eine Prophezeiung zu ersinnen. Endlich würde dann das Hinaustragen dieser Prophezeiung folgen. So machen es die falschen Propheten, die ihre eigenen Gedanken haben und jagen: Der Herr hat es gesagt. Der Wille macht den Anfang. Wo demnach kein Wille zum Prophezeien entsteht, ist auch kein Ersinnen des Verstandes einer Weissagung und keine Publikation. Es ist alles in dieser Beziehung inaktiv. So war es bei den heiligen Männern Gottes. Ihr Wille und Verstand produzierte nicht; sie nahmen nur auf. Des Heiligen Geistes Wille regierte; alles kam aus seinem Willen und Verstand.

Man beschäftigt sich heute ungemein viel mit der menschlichen Seite im Akte der Inspiration, worüber wir, wie auch Rohnert bekennet, herzlich wenig sagen können. Es liegt herzlich wenig daran. Zu der ganzen Inspirationsfrage ist und bleibt das das Große, nämlich das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes. Die Beteiligung der Schreiber ist eine untergeordnete, die wir nach der Schrift, wie gezeigt wurde, so beschreiben, daß sie sich ganz dessen bewußt waren, was vor sich ging, bei der ihr Wille und Verstand nicht im geringsten selbständig handelte, sondern mit allem: Logik, Erkenntnis, Sprachkenntnis, Redegewandtheit, Mut, Begeisterung, Weisheit usw. völlig vom Heiligen Geist bewegt wurde. Ein anderes Ich erfüllte ihr Ich, das durchaus von ihm dirigiert wurde. So viel können wir sagen, mehr nicht. Und es ist gut, wenn wir keine Meinungen fassen über das, das uns verborgen ist, die „offenen Fragen“ lassen, uns genügen lassen an dem Stückwerk und auf die Ewigkeit warten, da wir erkennen werden, gleichwie wir erkannt sind.

Wie gesagt, man macht heute viel aus der Beteiligung der heiligen Schreiber im Akte der Inspiration. Das ist immer eine List Satans gewesen, daß er dazu verleitet, das minder Wichtige wichtig zu machen. So hat er viele dazu verleitet, daß sie auf die

Heiligung aus dem Glauben ein größeres Gewicht legten als auf die Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben. Und was war das Ende? Eine alles verderbende Überbetonung der Heiligung. So auch hier. Satan zieht die heiligen Schreiber in den Vordergrund, damit die Wirksamkeit des Heiligen Geistes in den Hintergrund trete, schließlich der göttliche Ursprung der Schrift überschattet werde durch den Anteil von Menschen, die Schrift ein Buch werde, in dem göttliche Offenbarungen vermischt sind mit menschlichen, oft irrtümlichen Ideen und so dem Glauben die Kraft Gottes zur Seligkeit schwankend gemacht werde zu seinem Absterben. Wir leben in einer Zeit, da man an den grundlegenden Wahrheiten rüttelt.

Wir können uns wohl keine bessere Vorstellung von der Beteiligung der heiligen Schreiber in dem Inspirationsakt machen, als wenn wir auf ihre **mündliche** Lehrtätigkeit, wie die Schrift sie uns beschreibt, achten. Auch da waren sie pheromenoi. 1 Kor. 2, 13: „Was wir auch reden, nicht mit von menschlicher Weisheit gelehrt Worten, sondern mit vom Heiligen Geist gelehrt“. Wie finden wir sie da? Bei völligem Bewußtsein, ungemein aktiv, begeistert, voller Liebeseißer, willig: „Wir können es ja nicht lassen“, scheinbar selbständig handelnd als nur vom eigenen Ich getrieben, aber nach ihrem eigenen Bekenntnis unter dem dominierenden Willen des Heiligen Geistes, der ihnen nach Wort und Inhalt darreicht, was sie reden sollen, und sich ihrer als seiner Werkzeuge bedient, wie es ihm paßt. „Wir reden mit vom Heiligen Geist gelehrt Worten, was wir auch reden“. Hier haben wir eine klare Vorstellung von der Beteiligung der heiligen Menschen Gottes im Akte der Inspiration. Wie die mündliche, so die schriftliche Inspiration.

Was bisher über die Inspiration der Schrift gesagt worden ist, gilt nicht nur vom Alten, sondern auch vom Neuen Testament. Das ist es, was Petrus durch den Heiligen Geist in dem ganzen hier angezogenen Abschnitt, besonders von B. 19 an, ausführt, daß er und seine Mitapostel nicht nur Augenzeugen sind der Macht und Zukunft des Herrn, ihr Wort nicht nur den Wert eines Augenzeugen hat, sondern: „**Wir haben auch** das festere, **bebaioteron**, Wort, fester als das eines Augenzeugen, das prophetische Wort, das vom Heiligen Geist eingegebene. Wenn man die Worte Petri, 2 Petr., 1, 19–21, genau prüft und sie in ihrem Zusammenhang betrachtet, dann kann man sich der Überzeugung nicht erwehren, daß hier ein Zeugnis des Heiligen Geistes vorgelegt ist, das in starker Weise die Inspiration sowohl des Alten als auch des Neuen Testaments bezeugt.

Beweise aus dem **Zusammenhang**, daß Petrus hier für sich und seine Mitapostel den Besitz des festeren prophetischen Wortes, nämlich das, das dieses Wort zu einem festeren macht, die Inspiration, beansprucht:

1. Würden diese Worte: „Wir haben“ usw. besagen: Wir haben auch das prophetische Wort, als ein festeres als unser Wort als Augenzeugen, das Alte Testament, dann würde ja Petrus seine ganze Absicht, den Christen etwas zu hinterlassen, damit sie eine Erinnerung haben nach seinem Abscheiden, 2 Petrus 1, 12–15, vereiteln. Was sollen sie mit dieser Erinnerung, da sie doch etwas Besseres haben?

2. Zum anderen würde Petrus mit diesen Worten: „Wir haben dazu auch das festere prophetische Wort“, das Bekenntnis ablegen, daß sein und seiner Mitapostel Wort nicht so fest ist wie das prophetische Wort; es fehlt jenem das, das dieses fest macht, die Eingebung des Heiligen Geistes. Es ist menschlich, dieses göttlich. Kann man dem entgehen?

Aus Vers 19A.

1. Aber sagt man: Die Worte: „Wir haben“ usw. darf man eigentlich nicht überetzen, wie Luther tut: „Wir haben ein festes prophetisches Wort“, St. James: We have also a more sure word of prophecy (hier der Komparativ beachtet), sondern so: Wir haben nun das prophetische Wort **als ein festeres**. Dazu dies: In den Schriften der Evangelisten und Apostel wird das Alte Testament freilich oft zitiert, aber die Apostel haben nicht die Erfüllung benutzt, um die Weissagung fester zu machen, sondern die Weissagung, um die Erfüllung fest zu machen. Ihr Wort als Zeugnis der Erfüllung war in sich so fest wie die Weissagung, aber ihre Zuhörer erkannten das nicht. Darum griffen sie in die alttestamentliche Weissagung, bei den Juden in hohem Ansehen, um ihr Wort von der Erfüllung fest zu machen. Dasselbe tat Christus. Als Johannes der Täufer im Gefängnis zu Christo schickt mit der Frage: „Bist du, der da kommen soll, oder sollen wir eines anderen warten“, antwortet der Herr: „Die Blinden sehen, die Lahmen gehen, die Aussätzigen werden rein und den Armen wird das Evangelium gepredigt“. Du weißt, Johannes, daß so Jesaias geweissagt hat von dem, der da kommen soll. Siehe, durch mich wird das alles jetzt erfüllt. Folglich bin ich der, der da kommen soll. Also benutzt der Herr hier die Weissagung, die dem Johannes fest steht, um diesem die geschehene Erfüllung fest zu machen. Demnach, auf die Benutzung des Alten Testaments seitens der Apostel,

Evangelisten und besonders Christi achtend, kann diese Übersetzung nicht stehen bleiben: Wir haben auch das prophetische Wort als ein festeres.

2. Aber fordert nicht die Grammatik gerade diese Übersetzung: als ein festeres? Man unterscheidet bekanntlich die Stellung des Adjektivums in der griechischen Sprache als attributive und prädikative. In **bebaioteron ton prophehtikon logon** ist allerdings **bebaioteron** in prädikativer Stellung. Stände da **ton bebaiotoron prophehtikon logon**, das wäre die attributive Stellung. Folglich, da die Stellung prädikativ ist, muß man sie so übersetzen: Das prophetische Wort haben wir als festeres. Aber man darf **bebaioteron** nicht mit „wir“, dem Subjekt, verbinden; das verbietet die Form **bebaioteron**. Dieses Wort gehört zu **prophehtikon logon**, dem Objekt. Durch die prädikative Stellung macht Petrus, was er hier sagen will, emphatischer, als wenn **bebaioteron** hinter **logon** stände; er will die Art des *prophehtikon logon* kräftig hervorheben. Wir haben auch das festere, das prophetische Wort (das fester ist). Der Komparativ **bebaiotoron** zeigt, daß Petrus das prophetische Wort mit einem anderen vergleicht. Welches ist dies? Es kann nur das sein, von dem er in diesem Zusammenhang redet, das Wort des Augenzeugen. Zieht man nun alle Gründe in Betracht, die hier vorgelegt wurden, muß man den Gedanken in V. 19 so wiedergeben: Wir haben nicht nur das Wort von Augenzeugen, sondern auch das festere, das prophetische Wort; so ist auch unser Wort. Auch Wm. Douglas Chamberlain in seiner Grammatik für das griechische Neue Testament, Louisville, Kentucky, urteilt so über die prädikative und attributive Stellung des Adjektivs, wie ausgeführt wurde.

Aus Vers 19B und Vers 20.

1. Zuerst ermahnt Petrus seine Leser, daß sie wohl tun, wenn sie darauf achten. Worauf? Auf das Wort, das er zu ihrer Erinnerung hinterlassen will. So fordert es der Zusammenhang. Wo sollen sie darauf achten? In ihren Herzen, indem sie es zu Herzen nehmen und sich erinnern lassen. **En tais kardiais** gehört doch zu **prosechontes**. Wie sollen sie in ihrem Herzen darauf achten? Wie man auf ein Licht achtet in einem dunklen Ort, bis der Tag anbricht und der Morgenstern (als Bote des kommenden Tages) aufgeht. Da läßt man sich ganz von dem Licht leiten, zeigen, führen und lenken, so lange, bis ein besseres Licht, das Tageslicht, es überflüssig macht. So sollen auch sie sich lenken und führen lassen durch das ihnen hinterlassene Wort, so lange, bis sie ein besseres haben, das in der Ewigkeit.

2. Um hierzu seine Leser recht zu ermuntern, bringt Petrus seinen Lesern auch ein kräftiges Argument, das sie recht davon überzeugen soll, daß er und seine Mitapostel auch das festere prophetische Wort, das inspirierte, haben, Vers 20: „Erkennt dies vor allem, daß alle Weissagung der Schrift aus **eigener Deutung** (**epilueseohs** = Deutung einer dunklen Sache) nicht geschieht. Sinn: Kein Mensch kann diese Weissagungen aus sich deuten. Warum nicht? Die Weissagung ist nicht aus menschlichem Willen hervorgebracht, sondern vom Heiligen Geist gegeben. Schluß: Was der Heilige Geist weissagt, muß der Heilige Geist auch deuten. Wie die Weissagung vom Heiligen Geist, so die Deutung. Diesen Schluß wendet hier Petrus auf sein und seiner Mitapostel Wort an: Wir haben die Weissagungen gedeutet, ihren Sinn und Erfüllung gezeigt, daß sie in Christo erfüllt sind. Das ist nicht aus uns, sondern vom Heiligen Geist. Unser Wort ist wie das der Propheten vom Heiligen Geist inspiriert. Daß Petrus diesen Schluß allerdings auf sich und seine Mitapostel anwendet, zeigt klar das Präsens **ginetai** in: **idias epilueseohs ou ginetai**. Das Präsens bezeugt eine Handlung, die in der Gegenwart beginnt, fortgesetzt, aber nicht beendet wird. Es war aber niemand außer den Aposteln, die Zeugen gewesen waren dessen, das geschehen war, die davon zu zeugen vom Herrn selbst berufen waren, und die dazu das Alte Testament herbeizogen, um das Geschehene zu deuten. Darum wendet Petrus nur auf sich und seine Mitapostel dies an: Wie die Weissagung vom Heiligen Geist, so die Deutung durch uns, und macht fest dadurch sein: Wir haben auch das festere prophetische Wort.

Eine wichtige Frage.

Es erhebt sich nun die wichtige Frage: Beschränkt sich diese einzigartige Art der Schrift nur auf die ursprünglichen Schriften, von denen längst keine mehr vorhanden ist, oder behält die Schrift ihre einzigartige Art auch in den vielen Abschriften mit ihren zahlreichen Varianten und in den Übersetzungen? Allerdings eine wichtige Frage. Manche Theologen haben den Inspirationsakt nur für die Originale wollen gelten lassen, aber nicht für die Abschriften, noch weniger für die Übersetzungen. Wenn die recht haben, dann hätten wir heute nicht mehr das inspirierte Wort Gottes, da wir nur Abschriften und Übersetzungen haben. Daß diese dann ihres hohen Ansehens und ihrer Verbindlichkeit beraubt werden, ist offenbar. Sie würden dann zu von Menschen verfaßten Geschichtsbüchern herab-

sinken, die mehr oder weniger genau den Inhalt einst vorhandener inspirierter Schriften wiedergeben. Allerdings liegt vor uns eine wichtige Frage.

Praktisch handeln wir so ohne Bedenken, daß wir in Lehrverhandlungen, Predigten und Vorträgen, wobei uns doch nur Abschriften und Übersetzungen vorliegen, diese so behandeln, als hätten wir die Originale vor uns. Wir achten und bauen auf das einzelne Wort, dessen Sinn, Geschlecht, Kasus, Tempus usw. Wir lassen dies den Ausschlag geben und fühlen uns in unseren Ausführungen so wohlgegründet, daß nichts uns von unserer Stellung bewegen kann. Wir behandeln also die Übersetzung und Abschrift außer da, wo sie sich nach genauer Prüfung als ungenau erweisen sollten, genau mit derselben Ehrfurcht, mit der wir die Urschriften behandeln würden, nämlich als das vom Heiligen Geist inspirierte Wort.

Wir haben dafür das beste Vorbild in den Aposteln in ihrer Benutzung der LXX. Ein feines Beispiel finden wir Gal. 3, 16, wo Paulus sich auf die Übersetzung von Genesis 22, 18 in der LXX beruft, im besonderen auf ein Wort „**deinen Samen**“.

Die Berechtigung dazu soll in dem Folgenden ausgeführt werden. Alle Dinge in der Welt, alle Gegenstände, Zustände, Verhältnisse, Handlungen usw. haben **nur ein Wesen**, das sie von allem anderen unterscheidet und zu dem macht, das sie sind.

Durch sein Erkenntnisvermögen erkennt der Mensch mehr oder weniger das, was in und um ihn sich befindet und ereignet. Da nun alle Dinge nur ein Wesen haben, muß auch das Verständnis des Menschen allgemein dasselbe sein, so daß jeder die Dinge, soweit er mit ihnen in Berührung kommt, in derselben Weise erkennt. Alle haben dieselbe Auffassung, dieselbe Erkenntnis, dasselbe Verständnis von den sie umgebenden Dingen, soweit sie mit denselben in Berührung gekommen sind.

Es besteht nun unter den Menschen das eingepflanzte Bedürfnis, dem Erkannten einen passenden Namen zu geben, einen zutreffenden Ausdruck zu finden. Das ist das Wort, dessen Inhalt das vom Menschen Erkannte ist. Das ist auch das Wesen des Wortes, sein Inhalt, daß es das Wesen des erkannten Dinges zum Ausdruck bringt. Dieses Wesen des Wortes, sein Sinn, Bedeutung, ist und muß in allen Sprachen der Welt, so sehr diese auch in der Zusammenstellung der Buchstaben und Laute sich voneinander unterscheiden, dieselbe sein. Wie hätte sonst König Ahasveros, Esther 8, seine Botschaft an die 127 verschiedenen Völker seines Reiches in ihren 127

verschiedenen Sprachen bekannt machen können, wenn ihre 127 verschiedenen lautenden Ausdrücke nicht denselben Inhalt, dieselbe Bedeutung gehabt hätten? Bei dem einen Wesen der Dinge und dem gleichen Erkennen der Menschen muß auch Sinn und Inhalt der Worte gleichartig sein. Sie alle erkennen gleich, was z. B. Tod ist und meinen darum in ihrer anders lautenden Sprache dasselbe. **Mawet, thanatos, mors, death, Tod** sind Namen für dasselbe Objekt und sind darum in bezug auf das Wesentliche an ihnen einander völlig gleich.

So finden wir, daß alle Sprachen der Welt, wiewohl sie an Umfang sich voneinander unterscheiden, die einen arm, die andern reich, Bezeichnungen haben für all das Verschiedene, das vorhanden ist, daß diese Ausdrücke dasselbe bedeuten, denselben Sinn und Inhalt haben, sofern sie sich auf dasselbe Objekt beziehen. In dem Wesentlichen unterscheiden sich darum die einzelnen Sprachen der Welt nicht voneinander, indem sie, auf gleicher Erkenntnis ruhend, für die Einzelheiten Namen schaffen, die trotz verschiedenen Lautes denselben Sinn und Inhalt, dieselbe Bedeutung haben.

Nur darin unterscheiden sich die Sprachen voneinander, daß sie dem Sinn einen anders lautenden **Behälter** schaffen, der dieselben Buchstaben und Laute hat wie jede andere Sprache, nur in anderer Zusammensetzung. Die Völker zur Zeit des Turmbaus zu Babel hatten nur **eine** Sprache mit **einem** Sinn. Als Gott die Sprachenverwirrung schaffte, änderte er nicht den einen Sinn, aber die Gefäße, in denen dieser Sinn lag, die Worte, durch andere Zusammenstellung der Buchstaben und Laute.

In seinen großen Missionsbefehl: „Predigt das Evangelium aller Kreatur“, will der Herr das Evangelium in **allen Sprachen** der Welt gepredigt haben. Das Evangelium besteht aus den Gedanken Gottes zu unserer Erlösung. Mit seinem Befehl zeigt der Herr an, daß das Evangelium **kann** in allen Sprachen der Welt gepredigt werden. Er, der alles weiß, erkennt damit dies an, daß alle Sprachen der Welt das in gleicher Weise enthalten, das nötig ist, die Gedanken des Evangeliums klar auszudrücken, nämlich den Sinn, die Bedeutung, die in den Worten liegt, daß sie in dieser Beziehung **eine** Sprache sind, daß demnach der ganze Unterschied nur in den verschiedenen Lauten liegt, die den einen Sinn enthalten. Und wo, welche Sprache es auch sein mag, der Sinn, Inhalt, die Bedeutung des Evangeliums richtig getroffen wird, ist es das Evangelium.

Wenden wir dies nun auf die Ursprachen der Schrift, die hebräische und griechische, an, so finden wir, daß alle anderen Sprachen der Welt, allgemein geredet, ihnen völlig gleich sind, indem sie den vielartigen Objekten einen Namen geben, der, auf dasselbe Objekt sich beziehend, denselben Inhalt, Sinn, dieselbe Bedeutung hat; nur das Gefäß, das Wort, ist anders. **Thanatos** und **Tod** klingen verschieden, haben jedoch denselben Inhalt.

Wenden wir dies nun auf die Schrift an. In jeder Übersetzung der Ursprachen in eine andere, natürlich vorausgesetzt, daß die Übersetzung genau ist, setzt die Übersetzung an Stelle des in der Urschrift gebrauchten Namens den in der betreffenden Sprache vorhandenen Namen mit gleicher Bedeutung.

Da nun hier dieselbe Bedeutung, sowohl in der Ursprache, als auch in der Sprache der Übersetzung, vorliegt, gilt von der Übersetzung, was den Inhalt des Wortes betrifft, das, was von demselben Wort in der Urschrift gilt: es ist so voll inspiriert wie in der Ursprache. Nur darin selbstverständlich, sofern das Gefäß, in das der Sinn gelegt ist, in der Übersetzung, was Buchstabenzusammenstellung und Aussprache betrifft, von den der Ursprachen abweicht, darf man die Inspiration nicht behaupten wollen.

Somit ist der Unterschied zwischen Urtext und Übersetzung nicht allzu groß; er besteht nur in einer anderen Zusammenstellung derselben Buchstaben und Laute. Wir dürfen darum auch mit einem vollen Recht von einer Wortinspiration der Übersetzung reden, solange wir diese auf das Wesen der Worte, ihren Sinn, beschränken. In bezug auf das Gefäß, in dem dieser Sinn ruht, darf das freilich nicht behauptet werden.

Darum: Jede genaue Übersetzung ist inspiriert, so inspiriert wie der Urtext. Jede genaue Übersetzung ist Gottes selbsteigenes Wort, was den Inhalt, den Sinn betrifft, nur die Gefäße, in denen dieser Sinn liegt, hat der Heilige Geist **nicht** gebraucht.

Für das eben Ausgeführte haben wir einen trefflichen Schriftbeweis in Apostelgesch. 2, 1-14. Die Apostel, vom Heiligen Geist inspiriert, reden von den großen Taten Gottes, von **einer**, der Erlösung durch Jesum Christum. Sie reden zu der versammelten Menge aus allerlei Volk in etwa 16 verschiedenen Sprachen von **dieser einen** großen Tat Gottes. Sie werden **von jedem verstanden**. Denn ihre Zuhörer bekennen: Sie reden zu uns in der Sprache, darinnen wir geboren sind, von den großen Taten Gottes. Eine Sache reden sie in vielen Sprachen und werden verstanden. Das

beweist, daß alle Sprachen **einen und denselben Sinn**, Auffassung, Anschauung und Verständnis der gesagten Dinge hatten, daß sie nur im Wort, das diesen Sinn enthielt, in dem durch die Buchstaben und Laute bestehenden Behälter, sich voneinander unterscheiden. Gäßen diese 16 Sprachen nicht nur in bezug auf das Gefäß, sondern auch Inhalt voneinander differiert, dann wäre ein Predigen und Verstehen in 16 verschiedenen Sprachen **unmöglich** gewesen. Gerade darauf beruht die Predigt an alle Völker, daß ihre Sprachen **einen Sinn** haben, aber in einem anderen Gefäß.

In dieser Anschauung, die genaue Übersetzung betreffend, bestärkt uns die Behandlungsweise, die Christus, seine Apostel, der Heilige Geist den Abschriften mit ihren Varianten und der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments, der LXX, haben zuteil werden lassen.

Zuerst ein Wort über die Behandlungsweise, die der Herr **den Abschriften des Alten Testaments mit seinen Varianten** angedeihen läßt.

Ob Christus in seinen Erdentagen je die LXX benutzte, ja überhaupt gekannt hat, wird sich kaum nachweisen lassen. Wir wissen ja nicht einmal zur Evidenz, ob der Herr sich der hebräischen oder der diese verdrängenden aramäischen Sprache in seinen Reden bedient hat. Da schon damals die Kenntnis der hebräischen Sprache im Niedergang sich befand und durch das Aramäische ersetzt worden war, hat Christus sich wahrscheinlich auch dieser Sprache bedient. Darauf könnte dies weisen, daß in den von den Evangelisten uns überlieferten Reden Jesu sich manche aramäische Ausdrücke befinden. So ist das talitha Mark. 5, 41 aramäisch, während koum hebräisch ist. In den Worten Jesu: „Mein Gott, mein Gott, warum hast du mich verlassen?“ ist helei hebräisch, aber lema und sabachthanei nach Thayer aramäisch. Auch ephphatha soll nach einigen aramäisch sein. Den besten Schluß, den wir hier wohl machen können, ist: Woimmer ein Sprachenwechsel sich vollzieht, entsteht als Übergang eine Mischsprache, die viel Altes beibehält, aber auch Neues aufnimmt. So mag es bei vielen Juden, auch bei unserm Herrn gewesen sein.

Da zur Zeit Christi in den jüdischen Synagogen immer ein Abschnitt aus dem hebräischen Alten Testament verlesen und sogleich, da das Volk das Hebräische nicht mehr verstand, von einem neben dem Vorleser stehenden Dolmetscher in die aramäische Sprache übersetzt wurde, ist gewiß, daß Jesus bei seinen vielen Besuchen der

Synagogen in allen ein Exemplar des hebräischen Alten Testaments vorfand und dieses in seinen Reden benutzte. Es ist aber auch dies gewiß, daß Christus das Alte Testament nur kannte und benutzte in Abschrift und daß diese Abschrift bei der Vergänglichkeit des damals benutzten Materials eine oftmals gemachte war. Fügen wir diesem hinzu, daß damals das Alte Testament in einer Schreibweise vorlag, die an Stelle der hebräischen Buchstabencharaktere die aramäische gesetzt hatte. Man führt als Beweis dafür Matth. 5, 18 an, wo der Herr das Jota den kleinsten Buchstaben nennt; das sei dieser Buchstabe nicht in der althebräischen Schrift. Dazu kommt aber dies, daß damals das Alte Testament in einer Schreibweise vorlag, die keine Zwischenräume zwischen den einzelnen Wörtern, keine Interpunktion, Akzente noch Vokalzeichen kannte. Das alles kam erst viel später nach Christo. Wird hierzu die schwindende Kenntnis der hebräischen Sprache in Betracht gezogen, dann ist gewiß, daß schon zur Zeit Christi nicht wenige Varianten im hebräischen Text existierten.

Es ist freilich wahr, daß allgemein das Urteil der Gelehrten dahin geht, daß diese Varianten unbedeutend sind und also an dem Sinn der betreffenden Stelle nichts ändern. Ähnlich spricht sich Tischendorf, der Entdecker des Codex Sinaiticus, über die Varianten im Neuen Testament aus. Indem Tischendorf nicht nur die Codices des Neuen Testaments vom 4. Jahrhundert an in Betracht zieht, sondern auch die Schriftzitate bei den Kirchenvätern vom 2. Jahrhundert an, zählt er 30,000 Varianten, von denen allerdings die Mehrzahl sich in den Schriften der genannten Väter befindet. Sein Urteil geht aber dahin, daß diese Varianten zum großen Teil nur sprachlicher Natur sind, auch nicht von historischem oder dogmatischem Belang.

Man könnte die Varianten der Übersetzung in eine andere Sprache gleichstellen und als eine Übersetzung in dieselbe Sprache bezeichnen, die freilich den Sinn nicht ändern darf. Immerhin, da der Heilige Geist nur ein Wort, wo eine Variante besteht, gebraucht hat, hat er eines der beiden nicht gebraucht.

Wie hat sich der Herr dazu gestellt? Wir hören aus seinem Munde nicht ein Wort, das etwaige Leser zur Vorsicht mahnet. Im Gegenteil, er ermahnet seine Leser, in der Schrift zu suchen. Er straft die Sadduzäer: „Ihr irret, denn ihr wisset die Schrift nicht“. Seine Worte, die er in seiner Niedrigkeit aus dem Alten Testament geschöpft hat, von diesen sagt er: „Sie sind nicht mein, sondern

meines Vaters, der mich gesandt hat". „Die Schrift kann nicht gebrochen werden.“ „Es muß alles erfüllet werden, das geschrieben ist durch die Propheten von des Menschen Sohn.“ Auf dem Wege nach Emmaus legt er jenen zwei Jüngern die Schrift von Moses an durch die Propheten aus.

Sehr wichtig ist hier Joh. 10, 35: „Die Schrift kann nicht gebrochen werden: **kai ou duenatai luethennai heh grapheh.** Vers 34 fragt Christus die Juden: „Steht nicht in eurem Gesetz geschrieben: Ich habe gesagt, ihr seid Götter? Wenn er jene Götter nennt, zu welchen das Wort Gottes geschah, und die Schrift kann nicht gebrochen werden, welchen der Vater geheiligt und in die Welt gesandt hat, von dem sagt ihr: Du lästerst Gott, weil er sagt: Ich bin Gottes Sohn“. Dies ist der Sinn: Die, zu denen Gott **sein Wort** gesandt hat, nennt er Götter, und **der**, den der Vater von sich in die Welt gesandt hat, soll lästern, weil er sich Gottes Sohn nennt. „Die Schrift kann nicht gebrochen werden.“ Das **ou duenatai** hat nicht die Bedeutung von „darf nicht“, sondern: Es ist unmöglich, daß. Das **luethennai** bedeutet „brechen, auflösen, zerstören“. So redet der Herr von der Schrift: sie kann unmöglich zerstört werden. Folglich ist sie das ewig Bleibende, Gültige, Unvergängliche, Unveränderliche. Warum? Weil sie von Gott ist, sein Wort, und er will, daß sie bleibt. Er will das, weil seine Gerechtigkeit und Gnade ewig sind. Was aber Gott will, daß es bleibt, kann keine Macht in, über und unter der Erde zerstören. Das ist die Schrift als Ganzes und in jedem ihrer Teile, selbst in zwei Wörtern. So redet der Herr von der Schrift seiner Zeit, oft abgeschrieben und mit nicht wenigen Varianten.

Also ungeachtet dessen, daß zur Zeit Christi die Urschriften längst nicht mehr vorhanden waren, nur oft wiederholte Abschriften, ungeachtet dessen, daß nicht wenige Varianten entstanden waren, sagt Christus von der Schrift: „Sie kann nicht gebrochen werden“. Er macht keinen Unterschied, keine Ausnahme, sondern stellt der Schrift ein jeden Teil derselben einschließendes Zeugnis aus, selbst in bezug auf zwei Wörter. Etwaige Varianten ändern des Herrn Gewißheit in bezug auf die Schrift in keiner Weise; sie sind ihm genau das, das Gott ursprünglich geredet hat, in anderer Fassung. Die Abschrift mit ihren Varianten behandelt der Herr, wie er die Urschrift würde behandelt haben. Das kommt aus seinem Glauben an die Schrift, daß sie Gottes Wort ist. Darum sagt er: „Sie kann nicht gebrochen werden“.

Die Behandlungsweise der LXX, der griechischen Überetzung des Alten Testaments, im Neuen Testament seitens der Apostel und durch sie des Heiligen Geistes.

Es ist ja bereits gezeigt worden, wie viel die LXX von den Schreibern des Neuen Testaments benutzt wird und wie die meisten Zitate, besonders die langen, ganz wörtlich sind. Wo immer sie nicht wörtlich sind, das erklärt der früher genannte Garder auch so, hätten sich die heiligen Schreiber auf ihr Gedächtnis verlassen, vielleicht dann, wenn ihnen keine LXX zur Verfügung stand.

Es ist ungemein auffallend und für uns sehr wichtig, wie die LXX von den heiligen Schreibern und durch sie von dem Heiligen Geist behandelt wird. Man merkt immer wieder, daß es für sie von keiner Bedeutung ist, daß das Alte Testament ihnen nicht in der hebräischen Sprache vorliegt, sondern in griechischer Überetzung. Was und wie der Heilige Geist im Alten Testament durch den Mund der Propheten geredet hat, bleibt im vollen Sinn auch sein Wort in dieser Überetzung.

Wir erkennen dies einmal an der **ausgiebigen Weise**, in der die LXX im Neuen Testament zitiert wird. Wir haben früher eine Liste aller Zitate gebracht, 251 im ganzen, freilich nicht alle wörtlich. Es zeigt dies doch gewiß, daß sie ein großes Vertrauen in die LXX setzten.

Wir erkennen dies ferner an der **wörtlichen Weise**, in der sie die LXX benutzen. Von den 251 sind 161 wörtlich. Sie machen keine Korrekturen am Text der LXX, sondern zitieren sie wörtlich. Wieder zeigt uns dies, wie sehr sie sich auf diese Überetzung verlassen. *Ho de dikaios ek pisteohs zehsetai*, von Paulus Röm. 1, 17 und Gal. 3, 11 zitiert, ebenfalls in Hebr. 10, 38, ist die wörtliche Überetzung der LXX von Habak. 2, 4.

Man erkennt dieses Vertrauen zur LXX auch an der **nicht wählerischen Weise**, wie sie im Neuen Testament zitiert wird. Nirgends erhält man den Eindruck, als hätten die heiligen Schreiber mit Vorsicht gewählt, diese oder jene Überetzung mit Mißtrauen betrachtet und darum von ihr abgesehen. Überall tritt dies zutage, daß das **Bedürfnis** sie leitete. Wenn sie meinten, ihr Wort, wiewohl inspiriert, werde von den Juden williger angenommen, wenn es erhärtet würde durch ein alttestamentliches Zitat, dann fügten sie ein solches ein. Das zeigt besonders Petri Rede am Pfingsttage. Als die erstaunte Menge das vor ihren Augen geschehene Wunder nicht fassen kann, erklärt Petrus es ihnen nicht mit eigenen Worten, son-

dem greift, der Juden Sinn kennend, zur Weissagung des Propheten Joel, damit sie glauben möchten.

Endlich darf nicht übersehen werden die **Weise der Einführung** der LXX-Zitate seitens der Apostel. Es würde zu lange dauern, sollte das von jedem Zitat angegeben werden. Es sei nur kurz bemerkt, daß sie ohne Ausnahme so eingeführt werden, wie sie wären eingeführt worden, wenn die inspirierten Schreiber sie direkt dem hebräischen Alten Testament entnommen hätten. Einige Beispiele:

Aus der Versuchung Jesu in der Wüste, Matth. 4, Vers 4 spricht Jesus: „Es stehet geschrieben: Der Mensch lebt nicht von Brot allein“; aus 5 Mose, 8, 3. So auch Vers 6: „Er wird seinen Engeln befehlen über dir“. Wieder **gegraptai**; aus Ps. 91, 11. Matth. 21, 42. 43: „Jesus spricht zu ihnen: **Habt ihr niemals** in der Schrift gelesen, Der Stein, den die Bauleute verworfen“; Ps. 118, 22. Christus hat freilich nicht aus der LXX zitiert, aber die Evangelisten haben. Diese lassen das „es stehet geschrieben“ stehen. Luk. 20, 42: „David spricht im Psalmbuch: ‚Der Herr hat gesagt zu meinem Herrn: Setze dich zu meiner Rechten‘“; Ps. 110, 1. Petrus zitiert Apostelg. 2, 17 aus Joel 2, 28f. und leitet so ein: „Aber dies ist das Geredete **durch** den Propheten Joel.“ Lukas zitiert nach der LXX, ändert aber nichts an dieser Einführung „**durch** den Propheten Joel“. Er läßt das gleicherweise auch in bezug auf die LXX stehen. Apostelgesch. 28, 26–28, drei Verse aus Jes. 6, 9f.: „Gehe zu diesem Volk und sprich“. Paulus leitet dieses Zitat, von Lukas aus der LXX genommen, mit den Worten ein: „Schön hat der Heilige Geist geredet durch den Propheten Jesaias zu den Vätern“. Lukas, der dies berichtet, läßt diese Einleitung stehen, wiewohl er nach der LXX zitiert: Das hat der Heilige Geist geredet durch den Propheten Jesaias zu den Vätern. Der Hebräerbrief ist in seinen Einleitungen kurz, doch bezeichnend: **Er** jagt, wiewohl er aus der LXX zitiert.

Und nun darf nicht vergessen werden, daß dies alles vom Heiligen Geist geschieht. Die neutestamentlichen Schreiber sind ebenfalls **pheromenoi**, vom Heiligen Geist getragen, inspiriert. Was die Apostel zitieren und wie sie diese Zitate einführen, ist ihnen vom Heiligen Geist eingegeben. Hiermit gibt der Heilige Geist selbst der LXX das Zeugnis, daß sie sein Wort ist, wenn auch in einer Sprache, in der er durch die Propheten nicht geredet hat.

Aus dem Vorhergehenden geht offenbar dies hervor, daß weder die Apostel des Herrn noch der Heilige Geist einen Unterschied machen

zwischen Original, Abschrift und Übersetzung, vorausgesetzt, daß der Sinn des Originals genau wiedergegeben ist. Niemand wird behaupten wollen, daß die Sprache, in der eine Übersetzung vorliegt, vom Heiligen Geist benutzt wurde, aber die Gedanken, die in der Übersetzung vorgelegt werden, falls sie eine genaue Wiedergabe der Gedanken des Originals sind, sind und bleiben des Heiligen Geistes selbsteigene Gedanken. Das Wesentliche in jedem Wort, der Sinn, ist dann des Heiligen Geistes, nur die Hülle nicht. Das macht freilich den Unterschied zwischen Original und Übersetzung gering.

Da wir ein solches Vorbild in bezug auf Varianten und Übersetzungen haben, ein göttliches Vorbild, sollten wir dem nicht folgen? Wir haben in unserm Gebrauch zwei Übersetzungen, Luthers deutsche und die King James Version. Tischendorf sagt von Luthers Übersetzung, sie stimme fast genau mit dem Codex Sinaiticus, wiewohl Luther des Erasmus Griechische Ausgabe benutzte, die dieser in England herstellte, wo ihm nicht die besten Codices zur Verfügung standen. Folgen wir dem Heiligen Geist, dann sagen wir ohne Einschränkung von diesen Übersetzungen: Sie sind das inspirierte Wort Gottes, wovimmer sie genau übersetzen.

Im Anschluß hieran darf 2 Tim. 3, 15 nicht übersehen werden: „Und weil du von Kind auf die Heilige Schrift weisst“. Timotheus wußte von Kind auf die Heilige Schrift, natürlich das Alte Testament. Aus dem ganzen Zusammenh. geht hervor, daß Timotheus das Alte Testament nicht etwa durch Hörensagen seitens seiner Mutter und Großmutter kannte, sondern durch persönlichen Umgang mit demselben. Paulus lobt und ermuntert ihn ja: „Dieselbe kann dich **unterweisen** zur Seligkeit durch den Glauben an Jesum Christum“. Kannte und las nun Timotheus das Alte Testament im hebräischen Urtext oder in der griechischen Übersetzung der LXX? Das hängt ganz davon ab, ob Timotheus der hebräischen Sprache oder nur der griechischen mächtig war. Wir haben, um dies zu entscheiden, freilich keine direkten Beweise, aber doch solche starke Umstandsbeweise, daß wir ohne Bedenken diese Frage dahin entscheiden können, daß Timotheus nur der griechischen Sprache mächtig war:

1. Nach Apostelgesch. 16, 1 war Timotheus in Lystra oder Derbe, Lykaonia, zu Hause. Lykaonien liegt in der Provinz Galatien, Kleinasien. Daß das Griechische auch hier die Umgangssprache war, beweist schon Pauli griechischer Brief an die Galater.

2. Der Vater des Timotheus war ein Grieche; Apostelgesch. 16, 1.

3. Seine Mutter Eunike und deren Mutter Lois waren jüdischer Abkunft, beide unverfälschten Glaubens, 2. Tim. 1, 5. Ob beide der hebräischen Sprache noch mächtig waren, ist äußerst fraglich. Daß sie den Timotheus nicht hatten beschneiden lassen, beweist, daß sie mit dem orthodoxen Judentum in keiner Berührung standen und gewiß wegen Nichthaltens des Beschneidungsgebotes waren ausgestoßen worden. Daß wenigstens des Timotheus Mutter einen griechischen Namen trug, zeigt, daß diese, wie es für das Weib eines Griechen am nächsten lag, sich mehr zum Volke ihres Mannes hielt. Schon dies würde nahelegen, daß sich Eunike der griechischen Sprache als Umgangssprache bediente. Fügen wir diesem die Tatsache hinzu, daß schon 250 Jahre vor Christo die Kenntnis der hebräischen Sprache dermaßen abgenommen hatte, daß die griechische LXX ein Bedürfnis war, daß alle neutestamentlichen Schriften in der griechischen Sprache verfaßt wurden, dann erwarten wir nicht, unter den Juden in Sykaonien, viel weniger bei dem Weibe eines Griechen, bei Eunike, noch eine Kenntnis der hebräischen Sprache zu finden. Das unter diesen Umständen Nächstliegende ist, daß im Elternhause des Timotheus das Griechische die Umgangssprache war, und daß Timotheus in dieser Sprache aufwuchs.

4. Bedeutsam ist auch dies, daß Paulus seine beiden Briefe an Timotheus, Pastoralbriefe, in erster Linie Privatbriefe, für Timotheus bestimmt und mit lauter Anweisungen zu gesegneter Amtsführung gefüllt, in der griechischen Sprache schreibt.

Woimmer direkte Beweise fehlen, muß man zu indirekten greifen. An diesen fehlt es nicht. Die angeführten weisen aber gewiß darauf hin, daß Timotheus keine andere als die griechische Sprache kannte. Sie berechtigen zu dieser Annahme und rücken eine etwaige Kenntnis des Hebräischen seitens des Timotheus, auch ein Name griechischer Herkunft, in solche Ferne, daß diese Möglichkeit kaum einer Berücksichtigung bedarf.

Dann ist die Heilige Schrift auch, die Timotheus von Kind auf kannte, die durch die griechische Übersetzung in der LXX vorliegende. Diese zitiert Paulus auch in seinen Briefen an Timotheus wie in allen seinen anderen Briefen, was auf eine allgemeine Verbreitung, einen allgemeinen Gebrauch und eine allgemeine Kenntnis dieser Übersetzung hinweist.

Dann gilt auch gerade von der LXX, was Paulus dem Timotheus schreibt: „Die Heiligen Schriften.“ „Sie sind mächtig, dich zu unterweisen zur Seligkeit durch den Glauben an Jesum Christum.“

Damit schreibt Paulus der LXX göttliche Kraft zu, daß sie die Kraft Gottes ist. Warum? „Alle Schrift, von Gott eingegeben“, **theopneustos**. Paulus schreibt der LXX die göttliche Eingebung zu. Wie und warum? Weil sie den Sinn, Inhalt, des Heiligen Geistes Gedanken so gut enthält wie das hebräische Alte Testament, wiewohl freilich die griechische Sprache, das Gefäß, in dem des Heiligen Geistes Gedanken nun ruhen, **nicht** das vom Heiligen Geist im ursprünglichen Alten Testament gebrauchte ist. Also trotzdem, das ist zu beachten, überträgt Paulus auf die Übersetzung der ursprünglichen Schriften, die **Theopneustia**. Es sind eben des Heiligen Geistes Gedanken. In welchem Gefäß sie auch ruhen mögen, sie sind und bleiben, was sie immer waren, des Heiligen Geistes Gedanken. Luthers Kleiner Katechismus ist in viele Sprachen übersetzt worden, bleibt trotzdem Luthers Katechismus.

Da haben wir ein unwandelbar festes Vorbild, das Vorbild Christi, seiner Apostel und des Heiligen Geistes in ihrer Behandlung von Abschriften mit ihren Varianten und Übersetzungen. Dem wollen wir und können wir getrost folgen: Solange Varianten den Sinn nicht ändern, solange die Übersetzung den Sinn genau wiedergibt, ein Partizipium im Griechischen durch einen Nebensatz etwa, solange des Heiligen Geistes Gedanken in ihrer Ursprünglichkeit da sind, haben wir das vom Heiligen Geist inspirierte Wort, nur im anderen Gefäß. Da schwindet der Abstand zwischen Original und Übersetzung. Die Hauptsache ist dieselbe, der Inhalt, nur das Gefäß ein anderes.

Zum Schluß noch dieses: Der Schreiber dieses Aufsatzes hätte gerne aus Zeugnissen Luthers, der Dogmatiker des 17. Jahrhunderts und späterer Lehrer unserer Kirche, auch aus unseren Bekenntnisschriften solche angeführt, in denen diese sich über das Verhältnis von Übersetzungen und Varianten zum Grundtext aussprechen; er konnte aber keine finden. Es mag sein, daß dieser in unserer Zeit wichtig gewordene Gegenstand in früherer Zeit nur wenig im Vordergrund gestanden hat, daß man es als selbstverständlich annahm, daß die Schrift ihren göttlichen Charakter behält auch in der Übersetzung. Nur bei Kohnert fand sich etwas, mehr bei Dr. F. Pieper in seiner „Christlichen Dogmatik“.

Kohnert sagt in bezug auf Varianten im Neuen Testament: „Wie wir schon erwähnten, ist die Sache mit den Varianten doch nicht so schlimm, wie sie auf den ersten Blick erscheinen möchte. Dank der fleißigen Textforschung aus alter, neuer und neuester Zeit steht es

fest, daß wir den griechischen Urtext des Neuen Testaments in fast völliger Integrität besitzen. Dies ergibt sich schon aus einem Vergleich der ältesten Codices, von denen vor allen vier hervorzuheben sind, nämlich: Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, beide aus dem 4. Jahrhundert, Alexandrinus und Ephrem Syri rescriptus aus dem 5. Jahrhundert“. Der letztgenannte hatte ein eigentümliches Schicksal.

Dr. F. Pieper widmet der vorliegenden Sache in seiner „Christlichen Dogmatik“, B. 1, S. 418, einen besonderen Abschnitt. Dazu bewog ihn neben anderen H. C. Jacobs, Generalkonzil, Professor am Gettysburg College und Seminar und am Philadelphia Seminar. Prof. Jacobs nämlich behauptete, daß nur die ursprünglichen Schriften inspiriert gewesen seien, aber keine Übersetzung. Dagegen richtete sich Dr. Pieper. Aus dem betreffenden Abschnitt wurden folgende Zitate genommen: „Was in griechischer Sprache Gottes Wort ist, das ist auch in englischer oder deutscher Sprache Gottes Wort, insofern der englische oder deutsche Text eine wirkliche Übersetzung des griechischen Textes ist“. Ferner: „Wir sollten daher nicht sagen, daß auch die besten Übersetzungen nur eine menschliche Auffassung oder Ansicht von Gottes Wort seien. Nein, insofern die Übersetzungen wirkliche Übersetzungen sind, insofern sind sie ebenfalls Gottes Wort selbst“. Ferner: „Die Heilige Schrift verliert durch Übersetzungen nicht den Charakter des unfehlbaren Wortes“. Endlich: „Legen wir z. B. an der Stelle Joh. 3, 16 den Grundtext und die deutsche oder englische Übersetzung nebeneinander, so können wir uns der Wahrnehmung nicht entziehen, daß die Übersetzungen den Grundtext wiedergeben und wir von der übersetzten Stelle nicht sagen sollten, sie sei nicht inspiriertes Wort Gottes, sondern nur a human explanation or interpretation (Jacobs) des inspirierten Textes“.

Es muß so und kann nicht anders sein. Gottes Wort, das zu allen Völkern kommen soll, muß darum fortbestehen und fortleben in allen Übersetzungen. In allen Diskussionen über das Verhältnis von Übersetzungen muß uns das die Basis, der Leitstern, bleiben, was Christus gesagt hat: „Gottes Wort kann nicht zerstört werden“; „meine Worte vergehen nicht“. Petrus sagt 1 Petri 1, 25:

Verbum Dei manet in aeternum.

W. Soenecke.

Kirchengehichtliche Notizen

1545 — The Council of Trent — 1945. — The year 1945 marks the fourth centenary of the opening of the Council of Trent. Undoubtedly this anniversary will be commemorated as a most important anniversary throughout the entire Catholic world, insofar as war conditions will permit. *The National Catholic Almanac 1945* informs its readers that "in early 1943, the Papal Secretary of State, Luigi Cardinal Maglioni, pointed out that the memory of the Council of Trent should be revived in the minds of our contemporaries, absorbed in the present." In evaluating this Nineteenth Ecumenical (or General) Council of the Roman Catholic Church the *Almanac* speaks of it as "a landmark in the history of the Church . . . for introducing a much-needed discipline, for defining dogmas more precisely, and for restoring a sense of unity and solidarity to the Catholic body throughout Christendom." The primary purpose of the Council, however, is designated as "the definitive determination of the doctrine of the Church in answer to the heresies of the sixteenth century, and the execution of a thorough reform of the inner life of the Church". According to the Papal Secretary of State this purpose was accomplished: "Numerous fundamental errors were condemned; the truth of faith, which is of prime importance and influence in moral and Christian life as well as in the existence of the Church of Christ itself, was re-vindicated and placed in a new light; and the discipline of clergy and people was wisely and strongly decreed, bringing about the true Reformation." The "fundamental errors" and the "heresies of the sixteenth century" were of course, as the *Almanac* takes pains to show, those of Luther, "who thought out a new doctrine, the fundamental source of all his errors, which asserted the absolute corruption of human nature, and a merely external justification to be obtained by strong faith, that is, trust, in the merits of Christ. This led to erroneous conclusions, *viz.*, the denial of free will, and uselessness, even sinfulness, of good works."

It is characteristic of this article in the *National Catholic Almanac* that much mention is made of the Church and of Church doctrine, but not once of the Word of God, "the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone" (Eph. 2, 20) as the source of all doctrine. Now the "heresy" of Luther and the Lutherans was none other than a close adhering to the "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture" as found in the Old and the New Testament. It is also well to recall that it is just 400 years ago that Luther edited his Bible translation for the last, *i. e.*, the eleventh time in his life time. Had Luther made himself guilty of no other "heresy" than that of translating the Bible into the vernacular and of giving young and old, learned and unlearned the opportunity of searching the Scriptures, men and women throughout the world would nonetheless have every reason, in this year of our Lord, to commemorate this one great work of Luther with praise and thanksgiving to God. But Luther's heresy in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church does not only consist in having translated the Bible, but in having taught the Word of God as it had not been taught in all its truth and purity since

the days of the Apostles. This also includes Luther's teaching on justification, faith, free will, and good works. Not the Council of Trent, but Luther's teaching of Bible truths brought about the true Reformation.

It was also this very year, 1545, on the 14th of January, that Luther and his co-workers, including Bugenhagen and Melanchthon, submitted a memorial to the Elector John Frederick bearing the title: *Vera et salutaris Reformatio seu Gubernatio Ecclesiae Christi, praecipue in his quinque membris consistit etc.* In this writing Melanchthon, who had penned it, lists the following five main points as essential to a true and salutary Reformation: "1.) The true and pure doctrine which God has revealed and committed to His Church and which is to be taught by the Church, 2.) The correct use of the Sacraments, 3.) The Ministry of the Word and true obedience to this Ministry as God, who preserves this Ministry until the present day, wills it, 4.) The Jurisdictio Ecclesiastica, *i. e.*, Church discipline, and 5.) Schools and other means of preserving and furthering theological learning."

Despite this "gelinde Reformation," as set forth in this Memorial, Luther and his co-workers were fully conscious of the far reaching errors and false doctrine against which they had to do combat in order to preserve the purity of doctrine and true faith. In an accompanying writing they state: "They have no hope that the bishops with their unlearned, ungodly, and arrogant Canons, ever would accept a true Christian doctrine and a proper liturgy. Yea, they are convinced, that this would not happen in all eternity." They were right. To this day the Roman Catholic Church has clung to its false doctrine. The Council of Trent did not even regard the Scriptures as the only source of truth. Tradition was placed on a par with the Scriptures. The IV. Session of this Council decreed that "truth and discipline are contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions," that this Council "receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence all the books, both of the Old and New Testament . . . and also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals . . . preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession."

At the Evangelical Convention in Frankfort, which was called into session at the close of the year 1545, these errors were not only exposed in a writing setting forth the reason why the Lutheran princes could not attend the Council of Trent, but a very sincere and stirring confession was made concerning the Scripture truths. This confession was placed under the caption: "We ought to obey God rather than men (Acts 5, 29)." "God," thus we read, "governs His Church by committing to her His Word and Gospel as an eternal and immutable testimony of His divine will. It is His command that we should obey His rule, even if the rulers and the majority of the people cast it aside and despise it." Concerning the fundamental doctrine of Scriptures the Lutherans at Frankfort confessed: "In these fundamental doctrines, which are necessary for our salvation and which are being taught by those of the Evangelical faith, nothing is uncertain and obscure. . . . Since the Word of God is perspicuous, we hold, that we must also obey God and need not wait first of all for the findings

of men, least of all for the findings of such men, who are enemies of the truth."

As Lutheran Christians we have every reason to commemorate the fourth centenary of that *Vera et salutaris Reformatio*, which was proposed and clearly set forth by Lutheran leaders. Since they were not given an opportunity to present it to the Diet of Worms in March of the year 1545 and to make it public, its wording has never become known to the majority of individual Christians. Still it sets forth those Scriptural principles, upon which Luther's whole work of reform was founded and upon which it has firmly rested and has been signally blessed these four hundred years. As Lutherans we can witness with equanimity the celebration of the anniversary of the Council of Trent with its decrees and canons as long as we remain conscious of our Lutheran heritage: The truth revealed to us in the Scriptures as God's own inerrant Word and faithfully taught by Dr. Martin Luther four hundred years ago. P. PETERS.

Roman — All Too Roman. — Under the heading, *Phony Pardon*, the following remarks were found in the Novena Notes of March 9, 1945, by Hugh Calkins. They were evidently not intended for general consumption, but they clearly reveal the innermost attitude of Rome. May it serve as an eye-opener for easy going Protestants. In these days of powerful Catholic Action we shall do well to remember the unswerving false claims of Rome. Rome cannot be overcome by a seemingly powerful union of all Protestant denominations, as some think, but only by clinging to the clear words of Scriptures. True Protestantism is founded on the Bible, Rome solely on the authority of the Pope.

Under the typical heading, *Two Worlds*, we read the following: "Recently a network broadcast infuriated Catholics. It told the story of a phony pardon. The story of a Jewish rabbi hearing the confession of a Catholic soldier. Even the dumbest Catholic knows nobody but a validly ordained priest can really forgive his sins. And 'validly ordained priest' definitely does not include Jewish rabbis nor even non-Catholic ministers. Jewish rabbis have never claimed to have power of forgiving sins. Didn't the ancient Jews question even Christ's right to forgive sins? And as far as non-Catholic ministers being able to hear confessions, the question was forever settled by Pope Leo XIII. He infallibly declared Anglican Orders were invalid. If Anglicans do not possess Holy Orders, certainly other non-Catholics don't."

Rome has repeatedly changed her tenets, but she will always try to impress her followers and the world with her seemingly unswerving and unchanging attitude. She will hide her claims for a time, if opportune and necessary, but at the suitable moment she will always come forth with her blatant and blasphemous claims. Christ gave the power to forgive sins to His Church, to all of His disciples, not to Peter alone. It is a blasphemous assumption on the part of the Pope to claim this right for himself alone as supposed successor to Peter. May our Protestant members, pastors and also the chaplains take note of these words: "Only a validly ordained priest can really forgive his sins." This is also a shrewd mis-

application of Scripture to construe a "phony pardon" out of the fact that the Jews "questioned" the right of Jesus to forgive sins. The Jews did this, because they did not believe that Jesus was God. Sins can only be forgiven in and through Christ. This eliminates the forgiveness through a rabbi who denies the deity of Christ and consequently also the atonement, but where does the claim of Rome place all of the Protestants?

We are informed that Pope Leo XIII settled "forever" the question whether non-Catholic ministers can hear confessions by declaring the Anglican Orders invalid. If the Anglican Orders, who try to imitate Rome so closely in doctrine and practice and who base their apostolic succession on their former connection with the Church of Rome, are invalid, where do all of the other Protestants stand?

These statements ought to open the eyes of so many Protestants again as to the real nature of the Church of Rome as the Church of the Antichrist by claiming its own priests alone can forgive sins validly. He, whose sins are not forgiven, is lost. If Roman priests alone can validly forgive sins, where does this place us? Thanks to God, we are rid of the Roman yoke through the clear words of Christ, again brought to light by the great Reformer Luther. We can approach the mercy seat directly and can be assured of the forgiveness of our sins. Publicly every true and faithful minister of the Gospel of Christ can proclaim forgiveness in the name of Christ and his congregation. There is something very "phony" about Rome's claims.

H. A. KOCH.

The Churches In Russia. — The four largest church-bodies in Russia, according to the statistics of 1917, were the Russian Orthodox Church numbering 43,000 churches, the Roman Catholic Church numbering 2,000 churches, the Russian Baptists numbering far over 3,000,000 souls, and the Lutherans 1½ millions. We'll do well to remember, however, that of the 43,000 Orthodox churches only 200 remained, and of the 2,000 Roman Catholic churches only one remained in 1939, while of the 192 Evangelical pastors all were executed or imprisoned. In July, 1944, the Soviet government announced the establishment of a *Council on Affairs of Religious Cults*, which granted the Roman Catholics, according to *The National Catholic Almanac*, "the same rights as other religious groups in the Soviet Union." The Catholic Church claims to have seen nothing of these "rights." Its *Almanac* lists the following complaints: "Regulations still in force eliminate the Catholic faith, no seminary training or ordination of priests being permitted. Catholic priests remaining imprisoned on Solovetsky Island or in concentration camps, church edifices having been systematically destroyed, with no means available for reconstruction, and religious instruction to minors being forbidden within a church" (p. 96). In addition to this more than 10,000,000 Catholics of Eastern Europe will come under Russia's "religious or anti-religious policy" as a result of the settlement of her western boundary. At the same time Roman Catholic circles are observing the increasing penetration of Russian Orthodox representatives into Eastern Europe. Russian Orthodox leaders, it is stressed, "are making visits to areas surrounding the Soviet

Union but Roman Catholics have been given no opportunity for contacts with the various hierarchies. The Vatican has been unable to have observers or replace the war-torn ranks of the hierarchy in Eastern Europe, it is said" (*Religious News Service*, 4-12-45). Greatly disturbed by this turn of events the Vatican even gained the services of Edward J. Flynn, personal envoy of President Roosevelt, to carry a memorandum from the Vatican on his recent trip to Moscow, which sought to gain "permission for Rome to send priests immediately to East European countries at present under Russian occupation" and "approval for the reopening of church institutions in these areas" (*Religious News Service*, 4-5-45). In other words, the Roman Catholic Church, which does not want to grant Protestant preachers and missionaries the right to carry on their work in South American countries, is experiencing just such a curtailment of rights on itself in Russia.

The Russian Orthodox Church on the other hand seems to be enjoying the favor of Stalin and the Soviet government. The first religious film released since the Revolution, showing the recent election and enthronement of Patriarch Alexei of the Russian Orthodox Church, features "an address by Georgi G. Karpov, chairman of the Soviet Council on Orthodox Church Affairs, expressing on behalf of the government good wishes for the Church's future. He is shown kissing the newly-elected Patriarch on both cheeks and offering his congratulations" (*Religious News Service*, 5-7-45). At present "the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church consists . . . of four metropolitans (including Patriarch Alexei), 12 archbishops, and 24 bishops." It is also reported that "there are now 89 monasteries in Russia, nine of which are in Kiev." The government has also "supplied the Church with a printing shop and six presses" printing and circulating 10,000 copies of the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* and making preparations for the printing of Bibles and prayer books" (*Religious News Service*, 5-16 and 5-28-45).

As to the prospects of the Baptist Church in Russia the chairman of the Baptist and Evangelical Council in Moscow, Jacob Ivanovich, reported that registration of Baptist congregations throughout the Soviet Union is now taking place, and that an extensive plan for centralized leadership is being undertaken among more than 3,000,000 Baptists. "We carry on," Zhidkov said in an interview, "religious education in our families, and we do our best to impart the Word of God to them. At our meetings children and young people join in singing hymns. Before the Revolution Baptists had schools in Russia, but we have none now. We ourselves have not raised the question of organizing religious schools within our own councils nor with the *Soviet Council on Affairs of Religious Cults*." "Russian Baptists," he said, "are fully enabled to proselyte anywhere," and "we talk about religion anywhere we wish." He also reported that the Baptist Council is planning to initiate courses for training of new ministers (*Religious News Service*, 6-14-45).

These "exclusive interviews" released by *Religious News Service* and just quoted, give us one side of the picture. Still even this picture reveals that the churches in Russia must recognize the Russian government

as an authority in church affairs. The other side of the picture is that of a Russia opposed to all religion. "Newspapers in the Soviet Union have opened their columns widely to articles attempting to prove that religious beliefs are opposed to scientific training" (*Religious News Service*, 4-9-45). The dean of the faculty of social science of the University of Kharkov also has given us "a true picture of Russia's intention toward religion" as presented in an editorial of the *Northwestern Lutheran* (June 24, 1945). *The National Catholic Almanac* is not far from the truth: "The Council (Soviet Council on Affairs of Religious Cults) may serve the Soviet policy of religious strategy, but it conveys no hope of religious freedom" (p. 96). This applies above all to the Lutheran Church in Russia. Although no reports seem to have reached the United States concerning the million and more German-Lutherans in the Soviet Union, still we must conclude from the persecution which has swept over the Lutherans of Eastern Europe, including Finland and Poland, since Russia's conquest of these countries, that the Lutheran Church in Russia proper is no more.

P. PETERS.

The Lutheran Church In Europe and We. — It is exceedingly difficult at this time to get a clear picture, a true over-all view of the condition in which the Lutheran Church in Europe is left at the end of the war on that continent.

Some reports have it that people there are hungry for the message the Church is bringing and church attendance is increasing; that many are eager for spiritual nourishment and gratefully accept Bibles and other Christian literature. Others, in direct contradiction of this, deplore the wide-spread indifference to spiritual matters, the many empty pews in the churches, the lack of Christian awareness with respect to conversation and conduct. In view of these conflicting stories it will be well for us to reserve judgment until the time when really dependable information becomes available. To draw summary conclusions from the scant material at hand would certainly be out of place. We should not be too surprised to find conditions much the same as they were known to be before the war — not uniform but varying in different sections of the continent. At any rate, we have no warrant to expect a great religious revival of the masses as a consequence of the war. Nor do the Scriptures give us encouragement to hope for a rejuvenation of the unchurched masses to confessional Christianity and a living faith in Christ before Judgment Day.

Speaking of the Lutheran Church in Europe we must keep several things clearly in mind.

1. The Lutheran Churches there have all been organized as state churches, *i. e.*, the governments of the several countries have had a hand in the affairs of the church. The future pastors have been receiving their theological education in state-owned universities and were taught by professors who were functionaries of the state, placed into their position by government agencies. The congregations and their pastors were supported through taxes levied by the respective states, and the pastors were considered state officials. As long as a citizen had not his withdrawal from the church

properly recorded he was considered a member of the church in which he had been baptized, and was under legal obligation to pay taxes for the maintenance of that church. Church discipline, under the then existing order of things, had ceased to function properly, was, in fact, almost impossible to be practised. This being so, it becomes obvious, nothing else can be expected but that only comparatively few of the many nominal church members were regular in church attendance. Hence it will be well to remember that any statistics referring to the many millions of Lutherans in Europe should be read *cum grano salis*.

2. Since the forepart of the last century a union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches has been consummated in Prussia, the largest German state, and in some smaller ones. While it is true that the majority of the people thus united in the so-called Evangelical Church was Lutheran, it is nevertheless misleading to call all the members of this Evangelical Church Lutherans, as is so frequently done.

3. True, in part at least, to conditions as previously sketched, many of the pastors and members of these churches were liberals of all shades, ranging from the confessionally indifferent pietist to the notorious modernist decrying all supernatural manifestations of the deity.

At the same time we are well aware and gladly admit, there were numbers of men among the clergy and laity who raised their voices in the struggle against the inroads made upon the Church by the above-named elements. However unsuccessful these attempts proved to be through the years, they considered it their duty to remain within the framework of their churches. They looked upon the "Volkskirche" as a sacred heritage handed down to them by their Lutheran forefathers to which they had to cling at all costs, lest they become guilty of perfidious treachery. They were convinced that by separating they would not fulfil their God-given task of acting as a leaven within their nation. They rather hoped that by staying they might eventually be able to christianize their people. The phantasm of the "Volkskirche," wholly unsupported by Scripture, has been holding them in unholy alliance with sectarians and flagrant heretics, deniers of the fundamental truths of the Christian religion. A sadly misplaced sense of duty, since the concept "Volkskirche" is but a figment of human imagination!

4. There were, and still are, groups of Lutherans in Europe which for reasons of conscience have severed their connection with the state churches, and have established independent church organizations, so-called free churches, supported and maintained solely by the contributions of their own members. Among these we only mention the Free Church of Saxony in Germany and those in Alsace, Finland and Estonia, receiving financial aid from the Missouri Synod, and the Free Church of Poland, financed by our own synod. Besides these there were, and doubtless still are, other Lutheran free churches with which our Synodical Conference has not had brotherly relations.

To forestall any possible misconception it should be said here emphatically that in deciding whether to have fellowship with a church body or not the matter of church government or organization does not enter in

at all. The externals of a church are not unimportant indeed, and deserve consideration at the proper time and place. But when the question of fellowship is up we hold with Article VII of the Augsburg Confession: "To the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, that is, rites or ceremonies, instituted by men, should be everywhere alike." We are deeply grateful to God for the complete separation of church and state vouchsafed us in the fundamental law of our land. We are convinced the human mind can not invent a better guarantee for freedom of conscience and religion. Hence we are constantly on guard and zealously oppose any infringement of this law, whether the state intrudes on the domain of the church, or vice versa. We would oppose the establishment of a state church in our country with all the means which the laws of the land put at the disposal of its citizens. At the same time we know, however, that the mere fact of a church body being a free church does not make it an orthodox church. We do not fraternize with a free church just because it is not tied up with the state. A state church might well be a church of the pure Word and Sacrament in our day as well as in the sixteenth or seventeenth century. The sole deciding factor with us in acknowledging a church body as our sister church is, and has always been, its adherence to the Lutheran Confessions in word and practice.

5. While the "Volkskirche" is an idle dream, it is a fact that there are certain regions in Europe where the inhabitants are Lutheran in such an overwhelming majority that we may be permitted, within the restrictions pointed out above, to speak of Lutheran countries or provinces. These are the Scandinavian countries: Denmark, Norway and Sweden; Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania along the Baltic; the eastern states and provinces of Germany: Pommerania, both Mecklenburgs, Schleswig-Holstein, Brandenburg, Saxony (both province and state), Thuringia. This solid Lutheran block, with the exception of Sweden, has been in the active war zone. Its inhabitants, though not in the same degree, have been exposed to all the indescribable suffering and misery that follow in the wake of war. The former Baltic states: Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, have been incorporated into the Soviet Union. All the German provinces and states named above are occupied by the Russians. Finland and Sweden are under the threatening shadow of Russia, the dominant power, if not of the whole continent of Europe, at least of its eastern part. What this may portend for the future of the Lutheran Church, we are not in a position to predict. If the reported flight of Lutheran pastors from the Baltic states into Sweden is an indication of the plight of the people there, optimism is certainly not justified; a view of the future of the Lutheran Church in all these states and provinces must fill us with deepest concern. Besides, what has seeped through the wall with which the Russian occupation zone has been sealed off from the western world is to the effect that the communists, bitter foes of the Christian religion, are in the ascendancy and usurp the power wherever Russia is in control.

There is not the least doubt that the ravages of war have left all

these churches and their members in a most pitiable condition. The question then arises, how can we help and to what degree. We are ready to alleviate the sufferings of the needy, friend and foe alike, whether churched or unchurchd. When it is a matter of feeding the starving, providing clothing and shelter for the destitute we are making no distinction between Christians and non-Christians. But as we would neglect our plain duty if we would let the members of our own families starve while we are feeding strangers, so it is likewise only good sense when we first care for the Lazarus lying at our very gate before we go any farther afield. And who could be closer to us, aside from our own family, than our brethren in faith and confession, the people with whom we have been in church fellowship these many years? The apostle Paul surely approves (Gal. 6, 10): "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." We might also do well in this connection to investigate the advisability of availing ourselves of the services of these our brethren to bring much needed help to others, thus providing supervision and orderly distribution of our gifts in wider circles wherever they will do the most good.

However urgent the bringing of material aid is at this time, we Christians know of an unquestionably much greater need than the mere physical one. It is horrible to think of a man being capable of letting his fellow-man starve to death for lack of food without moving a finger. How much more horrible, then, is it to behold untold thousands of human beings in war-torn Europe and Asia whose souls are perishing for lack of the bread of life! The spiritual uncertainty, which is the harvest of the seed blind leaders of the blind have cast into the hearts of men, is appalling and is driving the masses into the camp of godless communism which knows of no other life than the one this side of the grave. Should we not avail ourselves of every means to combat such crass unbelief, which is threatening Christianity all over the globe? Should we not help all that call themselves Christians, above all the Lutherans among them, to rebuild their churches and schools, to reestablish their institutions for the training of future pastors? Our inclination to do just that is indeed great.

We are told of the necessity to combine all the forces of the Christian Churches to meet the onslaught of the forces of evil, which strike at the very roots of our faith. Should we not yield to this appeal, and forget the differences in doctrine and practice that have divided not only the Lutheran Church and others, but also Lutherans from Lutherans? Should not the present emergency, brought about by the war and its consequences, justify such a step, make us realistic enough to see that a united front is the need of the hour? Only if we are willing to give the lie to the oral and written testimony which we and our fathers have borne against false teachers. Only if we are ready to admit that our brethren, whom we have encouraged and supported, were wrong in making an issue of the abandonment of the confessional standard by these churches, and in withdrawing from them on account of their false doctrines. We simply must not let ourselves be rushed headlong into uniting with others in disregard of the plain warnings of God against making common cause with

those who teach contrary to the doctrine which we have learned from His Word, but must avoid them (Rom. 16, 17). As Christians and Lutheran theologians it behooves us to cling in childlike faith — come what may — to Him who says: "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart, and lean not unto thine own understanding" (Prov. 3, 5), and "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man" (Ps. 118, 8).

We are constrained to refuse our help for the building of churches from whose altars and pulpits the holy name of God is dishonored by false, *i. e.*, soul-destroying doctrine, lest we strengthen the members of such churches, yes also erring Lutherans, in their conviction that errors in doctrine are of negligible import, so long as they are personally sincere and upright in their belief. God forbid, that we become guilty thus to defile the saving truth which our Lutheran fathers have left us as our most precious inheritance! Not only the Christians, Jews, and others overseas are in the crucible of affliction today when they stand before the ruins of their churches, temples and synagogues. No, here our steadfastness of faith, the sincerity of our confession is put to a most severe test. For we know the plaudits of the public will go to those church bodies which are ready to combine their efforts with any one willing to build the devastated churches of whatever creed they may be. We know beforehand that our obedience to the Word of God will be misunderstood and decied as stubborn aloofness, narrow-mindedness and bigotry. We will be branded as a sect isolating itself from the rest of the Christian world and forgetful of the ecumenicity of the Christian Church.

As Christ's witnesses we cannot do otherwise but testify to the truth. It is not ours but God's, revealed to us and all the world in the inerrant Word of the Holy Bible. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Cor. 5, 6). A little poison mixed with the bread of life makes it a meal of death. A false doctrine in one point vitiates the whole doctrine. What we, what the Christians and the whole world need at this and at all times is fearless witnesship. "Thy Word is truth," our Lord said in His high-priestly prayer. This truth, and it alone, for it is the Gospel of Christ and His salvation, can rescue what may be rescued. Pray God that we may be ready and willing at all times to bring it gladly to any one that will listen, whether in Europe, America or anywhere else. M. LEHNINGER.

News from the Free Churches of Poland and Saxony. — Lack of space forbids us to print any news of a general character on the condition of the Lutheran Churches in Europe. In these lines we bring our readers the brief information contained in letters of a U. S. chaplain, a member of the Missouri Synod, on the fate of those Lutherans in Europe with whom we have been in fellowship of faith and confession before this catastrophic war. We speak of the little flock of confessors in the Free Church of Poland and the Free Church of Saxony.

According to a letter addressed to Pastor W. Bodamer, the superintendent of our Poland Mission, Pastor Armin Schlender, one of our missionaries in the former Poland, reported that all our pastors in East Prussia and Poland had to leave their homes and flee. They found refuge

in the houses of the brethren in Germany. All but one are still alive. The churches in Poland were all destroyed and the congregations scattered. All work there will have to begin from scratch again.

Dr. L. Fuerbringer reports in the *Lutheraner* that Chaplain Daniel Fichler, the same man that wrote to Pastor Bodamer, has made contact with one member of the Free Church of Saxony, Pastor H. Eikmeier. He is pastor in Steeden in Hessen-Nassau. His grandfather, the well-known Pastor Friedrich Brunn, author of an exposition of Luther's Small Catechism, has founded this congregation in 1846.

From another source the *Lutheraner* is informed that the buildings of the "Theologische Hochschule," the seminary of the Saxon Free Church, are partially destroyed, also a number of churches and chapels. L.

Religion On The Battlefield. — Sectarian Lines Vanish as Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish Chaplains Hold Services for Men and Women of All Faiths in Midst of War.

Under this head and subtitle an Associated Press Feature Article appeared some time ago in the *Milwaukee Journal*, from which we glean the following, with occasional emphasis added by this editor.

"A new trend in religion is emerging amid the stresses of war-time: a trend toward church unity and eradication of sectarian lines.

"It is evident at home, even more so on the battlefields. Chaplains have found that, without sacrifice of principle, they can work with clergymen not only of other denominations but of other faiths. *The effect of such unity of effort has not been lost upon the men.* . . .

"Perhaps the chief influence for future unity is *the close association of the war chaplains.* . . .

"The young men who now form the bulk of the chaplaincy will be coming to the front in church life 15 to 20 years hence. *They are growing very impatient* of the denominational trammels in which they formerly lived and worked. . . .

"It will be a tragedy for the churches if 11 or 12 million returning men fail to find the equivalent of what they found out here. . . .

"He (the serviceman) *wants a broader religion.*"

We believe that the Associated Press has given a factually correct report on an existing growing trend. We also believe that the forecast of postwar developments is by no means overdrawn. A good many returning chaplains will be inclined to assert themselves in their respective church bodies and make their "impatience" felt. Very many returning servicemen (and women) will press their demand for "a broader religion." Any church which is not ready to bow to this pressure will find itself in a most unpopular position.

We shall do well to recognize the fact that our Wisconsin Synod will find itself in precisely this uncomfortable situation. We are going to be "on the spot." On the chaplaincy issue we stand quite alone. In addition, our general teaching and practice, because of its conservative character, does not comply with the specifications of those who demand a broader

religion. We shall do well to consider now how we may best meet this crisis which will certainly result.

We are convinced that there is only one argument which really goes to the heart of the matter. The issue is not primarily whether a broad religion is better than a conservative. Nor is the content of such a broad religion being defined with sufficient clearness that it might be debated. The basic question is rather whether it rests with man to design the pattern of the religion which he is willing to accept, or whether this does not lie in a Higher Hand. Here let us with all patience, yet clearly and fearlessly, set forth the majesty of God's Word which alone can decide these questions. Let us in all things humbly bow before this Word ourselves, and we shall find many among our returning servicemen upon whom the power of this Word is not lost, in whom it will work and preserve this same Christian humility, who with us will be willing to let God shape the design of His religion and govern the policies and fortunes of His Church in the years to come.

Any other course, any concessions to this arrogant spirit where man would take into his own hands the things that pertain to God alone, any bid for the approval of those who would redesign the policies of the Church according to their wishes instead of consulting the Word of God, would be disastrous indeed. "*O man, who art thou that repliest against God?*" (Ro. 9, 20).
E. R.

Büchertisch

Our Creed. By J. M. Weidenschilling. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Paper-bound. Price, 35 cents.

This is the third in a series of which we have already taken notice (October, 1944). Like its predecessors (*Our Bible — Our Church*) its aim is to provide material for discussion in Bible Classes, Young People's groups, and the like, also for follow-up reading on the part of adult catechumens. This purpose it serves very well. After an introductory chapter on the importance of creeds, including a survey of the Ecumenical Creeds of Christendom as well as the particular creeds of the Lutheran Church, it presents a careful and detailed study of Christian doctrine according to the Apostles' Creed. This is quite comprehensive, clear, and simple — well suited for the intended purpose.

Our pastors will find it well worthwhile to investigate this book.

E. R.

A Right Way for Our Little Ones (Ezra 8:21). A Treatise for the Promotion of Christian Education of Children in Christian Day Schools. By Edgar Hoenecke, pastor.

This booklet is propaganda in the best use of the word, in the best possible cause. It is obviously written as part of a campaign which aims at the establishing of a Christian Day School in a congregation which so far has been getting along without one. In an extremely attractive out-

ward form the author presents the argument for the Christian Day School, following this with a section dealing with the objections which are usually raised against such an undertaking. Here the concrete and practical experience of the author is clearly apparent. Pastors will find this book a valuable help in their efforts to found a Christian Day School in their field.

At the moment the book is out of print, since it was prepared in a very limited edition for use in the Michigan District of our Synod. Single copies may, however, still be available. Evidence of a wider demand for distribution in a larger number of congregations may lead to a reprinting. Write to the author. E. R.

The Loci Communes of Philip Melancthon with a Critical Introduction by the Translator *Charles Leander Hill*, S. T. M., Ph. D., formerly Dean of Turner Theological Seminary, Professor of Philosophy, Morris Brown College, — and a Special Introduction by Dean E. E. Flack, S. T. M., Ph. D., D. D., Hamma Divinity School. 274 pages, 5½×7¼. Dark blue cloth binding with gold title on front cover and backbone. Price, \$3.00. — Meador Publishing Co., Boston.

The above book reached us too late for a thorough review in this number of our quarterly; yet we deemed it too important to withhold an announcement of the publication from our readers. The *Loci Communes* of Melancthon deserve to be studied far more than they are, not only because they are "the first Protestant work on dogmatic theology," but because, above all, they clearly set forth most thoroughly the "evangelical principles" held in common by Luther and Melancthon, "which were recognized as basic." In the *Loci Communes* of 1521 Melancthon still presented the unmodified doctrine of the total depravity of natural man, without any taint of his later leanings in the direction of synergism.

The translation here offered is a scholarly work. For lack of time the present reviewer could read only some sample pages here and there, yet he was impressed throughout with the fluency of the language and the adequacy of the reproduction of Melancthon's thoughts in English.

This does not mean that occasionally a closer approach to the original may not be desirable and attainable. I shall mention a few cases to illustrate. To begin, Dr. Flack's remarks in the "Introduction" that Luther declared the *Loci* "worthy of a place in the *Canon*" is misleading. What Luther meant to say is that the *Loci* should be made a *standard* text book in the church (*meo iudicio non solum immortalitate sed canone quoque ecclesiastico dignum*. — Cf. St. L. XVIII, 1671: *das es in der Kirche als eine Richtschnur gelte*. — Luther could hardly have done Erasmus a greater favor than if he had introduced his *De Servo Arbitrio* with the claim of canonical status for Melancthon's *Loci*.) — The omission of "against me" (*nobis*) on p. 75 may be due to an oversight by the printer and the proofreader, yet it obscures the fact that the discussion here deals with very personal matters. Also the rendering of *profiteamur* with "what we may teach" has the same effect. The point of an attack by Dr. Eck on Melancthon was that the latter's work in theology must be discounted because he is a "professor of languages." Melancthon coun-

tered: "It makes no great difference what *profiteamur*" — *i. e.*, what calling or profession we follow — "but whether those things are true," etc. In the same connection "witches" is not a very happy translation for *lamiae*. The luring and captivating nature of the opponents' arguments is not sufficiently brought out by this word. "Sirens" might serve the purpose better. — Again on p. 165 I noticed a disturbing omission: "to relieve our own satisfactions" should read: "to relieve *our consciences by (conscientiis per) our own satisfactions.*" — Why "Julius" (p. 170) should be changed to "Julia" is not apparent. — On page 69f. Augustine and Bernard are mentioned as men who "wrote on Free Will," and a brief evaluation of both is given: Augustine retracted, and Bernard *non est similis sui*. This does not mean "like him," but as the German translation (Kolde, footnote) has it: *bleibt sich nicht gleich, i. e.*, is not consistent. In the same connection "restrain" is not the meaning of *reprehendere*: "It seemed cruel for the will to be restrained from being able to turn itself from vice to virtue" — *crudele videbatur reprehendi voluntatem, si non posset se a vitio ad virtutem convertere*. The meaning is that it seems cruel to fault the will for not doing something which is not within its power to do; or as Bryan once expressed it: First clip a bird's wings, and then damn it because it can't fly. St. Paul records the same objection in Rom. 9, 19. Still on the same page "animal wisdom of human reason" is not the best rendering of *animalem rationis nostrae sapientiam*, a phrase borrowed from the Vulgate translation of 1 Cor. 2, 14 ("natural" in the King James Version). At the bottom of the same page *sincerae* could better be translated with "pure" (instead of "genuine").

Other cases might be mentioned as they were noticed while paging through the book, but, as said above, the translation is very readable and generally reproduces the meaning correctly. This monument of the Reformation is worthy of a more thorough study by our pastors, and Dr. Dill's labors have made such study much easier. May we hope that many will avail themselves of the opportunity.

M.

Christ and the Believer in the Song of Songs. By Wendell P. Loveless. Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Illinois. Price, \$1.50.

This exposition of a much neglected portion of Scriptures was originally given in connection with the Radio School of the Bible, a regular feature of the radio stations of the Moody Bible Institute. It is now being presented to the "more mature believers," to the "Sunday school teachers, leaders of Young People's and Bible Study groups" in such a form and according to such a plan that the reader can receive much instruction from it. Although we must take issue with the author on his use of Bible passages cited on page 137 and 138 as proof passages for "two main aspects or phases" of Christ's return and for the "restoration of Israel as a nation," still we do not hesitate to recommend his heart-warming, stimulating and practical comments on a "most ignored" book of the Bible to our readers.

P. PETERS.

The Bearing of Archaeology on the Old Testament. By George Livingstone Robinson. Second edition. 1944. American Tract Society, New York. Price, \$1.75.

Here is a book on Archaeology and the Old Testament replete with 35 illustrations, which deserves to be read by pastors and teachers. It gives the reader a practical knowledge of those discoveries made in Egypt, Babylonia, Arabia, Asia Minor including North Syria, and Palestine that have an actual bearing on the Bible and that clearly illustrate Biblical data. It also sets forth the trustworthiness of Biblical tradition and the untrustworthiness of the evolutionary hypothesis of Higher Criticism (comp. Introduction and pp. 133 and 157ff.). Even revelation comes up for discussion. On page 64 the author compares the Hymn of Akhenaton and Psalm 104 with one another and does not fail to add: "Hebrew monotheism was not borrowed but born (!); the prophets of Israel neither received it from man, nor were they taught it; it came rather by revelation (cf. Gal. 1:12)." Yet the critical reader will ask how this agrees with the author's statement on page 110 that "Jehovah was apparently a Midianite, or North Arabian deity (Exod. 3:1, 18)." The reader will have other questions to ask concerning statements or quotations which involve the doctrine of Biblical revelation and inspiration (comp. Introduction and p. 62) and which contain an evolutionary hypothesis of Comparative Religion. Nevertheless we are and remain indebted to Dr. Robinson for this his vivid presentation of the most important archaeological finds bearing on the Bible, and for making us acquainted with them in such a manner that we learn to comprehend and to evaluate their importance as illustrations and supplements of the historical truths of the Bible. P. PETERS.

We received from the *National Lutheran Council*, 231 Madison Ave., New York 16, N. Y., the following.

All-Lutheran Directory of American Lutheran General Bodies. A compilation of listings from the current Year Books and Annuals, 1945. — Paper covers; 319 pages; 5½×8½.

A Statistical Bulletin for the Lutheran Church in North America. — Paper; 64 pages, 6¼×9½.

Lutherans Working Together. A history of the National Lutheran Council, 1918-1943, by Osborne Hauge. Supplementary chapter, 1943-1945, by Dr. Ralph H. Long. — Green cloth; 126 pages, 5½×8.

The titles of these books are self-explanatory. The Directory, being produced by a photo-offset process from the various Year Books and Annuals, naturally lacks uniformity in arrangement. Its value lies in this that it offers all information of the numerous directories under one cover.

The book on *Lutherans Working Together* presents the history of the Council in ten chapters on the background of Lutheranism for "Three Hundred Years in America" (Chapter I). Appended is the new "Constitution of the National Lutheran Council," on the basis of which the Council solicits application for membership from such Lutheran bodies as at present are not affiliated with it.

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben von der Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Synode von
Wisconsin und anderen Staaten.

Jahrgang 42

Oktober 1945

Nummer 4

UNIONISM

An Essay read before the Convention of the
Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and
Other States, held in New Ulm, Minnesota,
August 1-6, 1945, here published by
Resolution of the Synod

“Yours is a different spirit” said Luther to Zwingli at Marburg, and refused the hand of brotherhood.

“We tolerated it then” said Walther when some one at the Chicago Pastoral Conference protested that the *intuitus fidei* could be found on early pages of *Lehre und Wehre*.

Was Walther a Unionist, while Luther was a Separatist?

Neither. — Both were thoroughly evangelical, and their terse remarks, though on the surface mutually exclusive, are in reality both expressions of the same sound Christian faith.

Why did not Walther refuse the hand of fellowship when some of his co-laborers used the phrase *intuitu fidei* in their presentation of the doctrine of election? And why did not Luther tolerate it when Zwingli interpreted the words of institution as expressing merely a *signifying* of the body and blood of Christ by the earthly elements?

I. A Brief Historical Investigation

may help us to gain a proper understanding and to retain a proper poise in the matter of Unionism.

We begin with the *Colloquy of Marburg*.

While Luther was doing his work in Wittenberg a reform movement started quite independently in Switzerland. The leader was Ulrich Zwingli. From the very beginning there was a great

difference between the two movements. They had this in common that both opposed the errors in doctrine and the abuses in practice of the Roman Catholic Church; yet in the motive and in the mode of procedure they differed widely.

The driving interest in Luther's work is well known to us all. A summary statement will suffice for our purpose. Luther strove to gain the assurance of God's favor. He sought peace with God. He had led an honorable life, but his conscience told him that that was not enough to avert the wrath of the righteous Judge in heaven. In order to achieve a sufficient righteousness he took upon himself the threefold monastic vow of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Yet, in spite of his almost super-human efforts, his conscience could find no rest — till he discovered that justification is by the free and unconditioned grace of God on the basis of Christ's redemptive work. This enlightenment made a new man out of Luther. His fears were allayed. Heavenly peace entered his heart. And the irresistible urge of joy and gratitude from henceforth colored the work which he performed in the position into which God had placed him.

Preaching free justification, however, from the pulpit, in the lecture halls of the university, and through the press raised new troubles for Luther. By preaching free grace he collided head-on with all the doctrines and institutions of the Catholic Church, whose whole system is built up around the idea of a man's own ability to merit the favor of God. Luther was attacked, denounced, excommunicated. He needed a firm foundation on which to rest his faith if his happiness and his vigor were to endure. It was God's Word that had announced the free forgiveness of his sins to him. It was God's Word that had kindled in his heart the confident hope in his Savior. It was the Word of God that proved itself on his heart as the power of God unto salvation. The words of the most eminent teachers of the church and the pronouncements of the most illustrious church councils had not been able to bring him peace, but the Bible did so thoroughly. Henceforth he would trust implicitly in the Word of God. It did not deceive him in the great matter of justification, it would not deceive him in other matters. The Word of God filled his heart with joy, the Word of God now weighed heavier for him than heaven and earth.

This is in brief the spirit of Luther's Reformation. He was a free man, free through the forgiveness of his sins, made free through the Word of God, which at the same time bound him hand and foot.

The Reformation in Switzerland proceeded along different lines. Zwingli had never been driven to the verge of despair by a troubled conscience. A brilliantly gifted man, he had diligently pursued his studies, and had become proficient in his knowledge of literature and of the New Testament. He observed that the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church were not in agreement with the Bible, and he opposed them. The depth of Luther's conviction, born out of an experience of the grace of God in the Gospel, was lacking in his case. The religious interest was not absent. Yet it was paired with, even overshadowed by, interests of a different nature. It was customary for leaders in Switzerland at the time to hire the young men of their domains out to foreign princes for military service. This practice drained the country of the most valuable man-power; it had a corrupting influence on the young men thus drafted for foreign wars; and the dependence on the revenues thus received did not fail to show a demoralizing influence on the country as a whole. Zwingli took a lively interest in the matter, and from the beginning this patriotic and political motive was interwoven with the religious in his reformatory efforts.

His attitude over against the Scriptures also was different from that of Luther. He assumed that God would never propose anything to our faith which went counter to our reason. If any word on the face of it appeared to contradict our reason, or to present anything that seems impossible or unreasonable, then we must find a different meaning to correct and replace the apparent but impossible sense.

The difference between these two movements came to a head in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

To Luther the Sacrament was a precious means instituted by Christ to assure his faith of the certainty of the forgiveness of his sins. Every word of the institution was sacred to him. He did not ask, How can an oral eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ convey any spiritual blessings to me? Nor, What reason is there for such oral eating, seeing we have the full benefit

through a spiritual eating? Nor, How can the body and blood of Christ be present in, with, and under the earthly elements? To him it was sufficient that Christ said, This is My body, this is My blood. To tamper with these words of institution would destroy a means which God in His mercy has granted us for an assurance of our faith in His free justification.

Zwingli took an altogether different stand. Not being troubled by a terror-stricken conscience he was not so keenly interested in every prop that God provides for our faith, nor had he learned to realize his absolute impotence in spiritual matters. He wanted to know how oral eating can help a person spiritually, why oral eating should be added to the spiritual, how a real presence of the body and blood of Christ is possible. Finding no reasonable answer to these questions he did not hesitate to deviate from the words of institution. He made out of the Sacrament a memorial meal with symbolical significance. Participation became an act of obedience. The real presence of the Lord's body and blood was denied. The plain words, This is My body, were twisted to say, This signifies My body.

It was inevitable that these two movements, the Lutheran Reformation at Wittenberg and the Swiss Reformation led by Zwingli, would clash sooner or later. We may for the present ignore the literary feud. We hurry on to the epochal meeting in Marburg.

Threatening clouds had been gathering against the Reformation. The powers that aimed to suppress it had been prevented from doing so only by the rivalries among themselves. But a time came when they composed their differences and prepared to launch an attack with combined forces against the states that favored the Reformation. On the side of the Lutherans there was particularly the Landgrave Philip of Hessa who counseled that all Protestants join in a political confederacy and meet the threatening suppression with force of arms. He envisioned a powerful Protestant league which the enemies would fear and hesitate to attack.

There was one thing that stood in his way. Since this was to be a league for the defence of the faith, should not then all members confess a common faith? Lutheran princes feared that they would make themselves guilty of a denial of the truth if they joined hands with the Zwinglians; they would help to protect and

uphold what they in their conscience considered false doctrine. Luther, moreover could not reconcile himself to the idea that the Gospel should be defended with the implements of war.

The Landgrave was untiring in his efforts to bring about the league, and since the difference between Wittenberg men and the Swiss reformers threatened to thwart his scheme, he was determined that these differences must be removed. He thought a colloquy could achieve this aim. When he approached Zwingli and laid his plans before him he found a ready response. Luther wavered. The whole matter was distasteful to him; yet if he declined he might become guilty of evading an opportunity to confess the truth before such men as had so far only partially embraced it and had adulterated it by various foreign admixtures.

The colloquy was held during the first days of October, 1529, in Marburg. The discussion was limited to one point, namely, concerning the real presence of the body and blood of our Lord in, with, and under the earthly elements in the Eucharist. Neither side yielded. Luther had written the words, *This Is My Body*, with chalk on the table before him as a constant reminder that he would not deviate from the truth as God Himself had proclaimed it; while Zwingli by specious arguments tried to explain away the obvious meaning of the words of institution.

In the course of the debate Zwingli advanced the argument that the body of Christ, being a real body, according to the laws of physics could not be present on earth since Christ had ascended into heaven and was seated at the right hand of the Father. This opened the gates for a discussion of Christological questions pertaining to the union of the two natures in Christ and the communication of idioms, particularly the so called *genus majesticum*. The two Reformers were as far apart on this question as they were on the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper.

In spite of all this Zwingli was ready to recognize the Wittenberg men as brethren in the faith, while Luther declined with the words, "Yours is a different spirit." The difference that separated the two reform movements was not merely a different conception of the Lord's Supper, important though this would have been in itself, much less was it one of phraseology and mode of presentation, it was one of approach and of basic attitude. A

difference in the mode of expression might have served to develop the doctrine itself more fully, a difference of conception concerning some detail might have been eliminated by further discussion, but a difference in the basic attitude, a different spirit, left the colloquists without a common ground on which to meet and from which to make attempts at agreement with any prospect of success.

Before leaving the colloquy of Marburg we take notice of the fact that Zwingli was ready to overlook the difference of spirit and to recognize Luther and his co-workers as brethren in spite of this difference. It was characteristic of his "spirit" to minimize the importance of the truth, to compromise the Gospel truth in favor of some outward union. Outward union to him seemed to hold forth the hope of greater security for the Gospel than a faithful adherence to the truth itself. Luther trusted in God to uphold His truth against the world and against the gates of hell, be it by means of many confessors or by few. In fact, he was ready, and had on many occasions demonstrated his readiness, to stand alone by the truth, yes, to go down in defeat together with the truth, in the firm conviction of final triumph. Luther was branded as stubborn for his firm stand at Marburg, and so are all they to this very day who scrupulously refrain from granting any recognition to error and from compromising the truth.

But — does not the *Example of Walther*, one of the eminent leaders in American Lutheranism, perhaps the most eminent gift of God to our Synodical Conference, point to a different line of action? Was not his a spirit of tolerance, at least temporary tolerance, over against error? "We tolerated it then" he said in Chicago.

We must add something to that remark, and the apparent difference between Walther and Luther will stand out in even bolder lines. When Walther had said, "We tolerated it then," at once another member of the conference added, "But not any more." The next opportunity Dr. Walther had he corrected the impression as though his toleration had been a matter of expedience or weakness at the time. He remarked emphatically: "When I said, We tolerated it then, I did not mean, But not any longer." He thereby indicated that his toleration at the time was not a matter of expedience but of principle, that under similar circumstances he would not hesitate to repeat.

As an explanation it will not suffice to say that the men using the phrase of an election *intuitu fidei* did so minus synergism. We dare not shirk the duty of investigating a little more closely their manner of presenting the doctrine of election and the spirit which they manifested in it. The matter is contained in a series of 19 theses on election and a number of articles on this doctrine and related questions. In the interest of brevity we limit ourselves to a few quotations from the 19 theses. The first defines election in these words: "Election is an act of God in which He before the foundation of the world, *i. e.*, from eternity, decreed according to the purpose of His will to grant eternal salvation for Christ's sake unto the praise of His glorious grace to all those whose final faith in Christ He foresaw."

Here we have the *intuitus* in the very words. In what sense is it employed? The second thesis calls election a "*cause*" of the elects' salvation. The third thesis warns that we must not consider election as an absolute and arbitrary decree, but that it "at the same time includes all causes, means and ways unto eternal salvation," in other words, the election decree embraces, and in turn is embraced in, a very definite order in which it is to be realized. This point is then unfolded in the fourth thesis. The grace of God is the motive, the work of Christ the meritorious cause; the means of grace confer salvation which faith merely appropriates, and a life of consecration to the end is the way in which the election decree is to be carried out.

Theses 10 and 11 are important for our investigation. "The foreseen faith is not a cause of election; for we are chosen, not on account of our faith, but on account of Christ. — Although all men stand redeemed for Christ's sake (or in Christ) according to His work and merit, yet only those are elected that apprehend Him in true faith, appropriate Him, and persevere in this to the end." The next thesis calls faith a "link in the order in which God offeres men the benefit of His election." — The last thesis once more stresses the truth that eternal salvation "rests, not on the strength of a man's faith, or on the riches of his godliness, nor on any degree of sanctification *in* him, but solely *outside* of him on the gracious election of God in Christ before the foundation of the world, according to the good pleasure of His will unto the praise of His glorious grace."

Faith, which God foresees in His children, may not be traced to an act of self-determination on the part of the believer. Synergism, which assumes the ability on the part of natural man either to accept or to decline the grace of God when offered to him, is rejected in express words. Foreseen faith is introduced merely for the sake of guarding against the error of assuming a blind election, an arbitrary decree of God. In other words, foreseen faith is used as a description of the people whom God elected. One may deplore the use of the term, but one must grant that the men who used it in presenting their doctrine of God's election were sound in their theology.

The expression is unfortunate, because easily misleading and subject to serious misunderstanding. Although used only to describe the elect in clear contradistinction from the non-elect, it is suggestive of motivation. Even though used only to answer the question, "*Whom* did God elect?" subconsciously at least also the other question is stirred up, "*Why* did God elect them?" and before one is fully aware of it, foreseen faith is turned into a cause, or at least a plausible explanation of God's act. Yet such was not the intention of the men who used the phrase in Walther's day, and concerning whom he said in Chicago, "We tolerated it then."

We may ask how it came about that they used such an inadequate term. The records show that they were well aware of the inadequacy. Yet we all know how difficult it is for any one to break away from a phraseology to which we have become accustomed, particularly if the process has gone on for several generations. Theologians who were leaders in the Lutheran Church had introduced the concept of a foreseen faith into their presentation of the doctrine of election over against the Calvinistic idea of an absolute decree. The Calvinists taught that God arbitrarily foreordained some people to eternal salvation, and others just as arbitrarily to eternal damnation. Over against this horrible error Lutherans maintained that there is no bifurcate election, both unto life and unto damnation; that election extends only over the children of God, who by faith appropriate the fruits of Christ's redemption. They said, God foresaw from eternity who would be His believing children, and them He elected. They did not combine with this mode of presentation the idea that foreseen

faith had moved God or even influenced and guided Him in His election. They used the term only to show that His was not a blind election in the Calvinistic sense. Foreseen faith was to them a description of God's elect.

In this phraseology Dr. Walther's contemporaries and co-workers had been trained. They acknowledged the full truth of the Gospel and struggled to express it properly. If they did not succeed at once, who will dare to accuse Walther of unionistic leanings if he "tolerated" it? Tolerated it, not only momentarily, but by implication indicated that he considered it as his Christian duty to do so.

In this respect, moreover, Walther was in perfect agreement with Luther who refused the hand of brotherhood to Zwingli. Luther was dealing with a man of a different spirit, while Walther's co-laborers were of one spirit with him.

In order to understand Dr. Walther's position more fully, to grasp its true Scripturalness, and to be able to apply the underlying truth properly to present-day conditions without using his example as a subterfuge for either separatism or unionism, it will be well to review briefly a few of the 15 theses on *Open Questions* which he used as a guide for his discussions at a pastoral conference, and which he published in *Lehre und Wehre* to serve others for the same purpose. Since our subject is Unionism, not all of Dr. Walther's theses on Open Questions are directly applicable.

We begin with the fifth. "It is the duty of the church militant to strive for complete agreement in all matters of faith and doctrine; yet a higher level than fundamental agreement will never be attained."

We note very carefully that Dr. Walther is here speaking of a "fundamental," a basic agreement — not an agreement in fundamental doctrines. What Dr. Walther understands by "fundamental agreement" we shall see from some of the other theses which he submitted. First we give a little attention to the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles or doctrines.

There are some matters presented in the Scriptures without which Christian faith would simply be impossible. How shall a person trust in the forgiveness of his sins for Christ's sake if he never heard that God sent forth His Son made of a woman, made

under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons? The article of our justification out of grace for Christ's sake through faith is the article on which our faith rests, without which faith would be impossible.

On the other hand, there are some articles presented in the Scriptures, as for instance the one concerning angels, of which a person may be ignorant without any harm to his faith.

There are doctrines of various degrees of importance as far as our faith is concerned. Recognizing this difference, our theologians speak of fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith. The fundamental they sometimes subdivide into primary and secondary. Concerning the primary they ask the further question whether an article serves the purpose of creating faith, or whether it presupposes faith and serves to nourish and preserve it.

Dr. Walther's fifth thesis, quoted above, states that the church on earth, while striving for complete agreement, will never achieve more than a fundamental agreement. Did Dr. Walther mean to say, an agreement in the fundamental articles of faith? The implication then would be that according to him a difference of opinion in some non-fundamental articles dare not be made divisive of church fellowship: it must be tolerated.

What Dr. Walther understood by fundamental agreement, becomes evident from his theses 8 and 9 in the above mentioned series. We here submit them in translation. "It is the duty of the church to take action against any deviation from the doctrine of the Word of God, whether a teacher or a layman, an individual or a church be involved. — Those who persist in deviating from the Word of God in any point whatsoever, are to be excluded from the church."

We observe that Dr. Walther here is not taking into consideration any distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles. He says expressly "in any point whatsoever (*was es auch betreffen moege*)."

A difference in a most secondary non-fundamental article may lead to a severance of church-fellowship; while by implication it might be inferred that under given circumstances a deviation in even some fundamental article might be tolerated for a while. The point is that when Dr. Walther speaks

of fundamental agreement, he does not mean agreement in fundamentals.

What does he mean? This becomes clear from a phrase which occurs in both theses, *viz.*, a "deviation from the Word of God," or "from any doctrine of the Word of God."

Those are in fundamental agreement who without any reservation submit to the Word of God. When the Word of God has spoken in any matter, that matter is settled. There may be things that some men have not yet found in their study of the Bible, there may be matters with reference to which they have accustomed themselves to an inadequate mode of expression: yet no matter what their deficiency may be, they are determined to accept the Bible doctrine. Where such is the case, there is fundamental agreement.

A word which Dr. Walther spoke at the colloquy in Milwaukee (1867) may serve to set forth his position: "Nothing whatsoever that God clearly revealed may be called an *Open Question*. But it is an altogether different question how I must deal with an erring person, lest he sink deeper into error and Satan devour him. I would not jump at the conclusion that a man must be a heretic even though he err in the important article concerning the Trinity, let alone if he erred in a lesser point. Only one who teaches in such a way that he attacks the personal foundation (Christ Himself) or the dogmatic foundation (the sum total of all fundamental articles) or the organic foundation (the Scriptures), and in spite of repeated admonitions insists that he will not give up his error — only such a one I will condemn as a heretic, but not one who does not attack the foundation, in other words, not any one who may err in some other point, but is willing to receive instruction. I am convinced that in this life we cannot attain more than a fundamental unity."

A fundamental agreement is all the church can ever hope to attain here on earth. We are not all equally gifted; one has a much clearer and a much more comprehensive insight into God's doctrines than another. We all strive to grow daily in understanding. Besides, when once we have accustomed ourselves to a faulty or an inadequate expression, it is not only difficult to unlearn the particular phrase and to acquire a proper one, the inadequate term may tend also to warp our views on other points. Yet

in spite of all such differences, where there is an unconditional willingness to hear what God has to say in His Word, there is fundamental agreement.

When the demand is made that there must be agreement in fundamentals, while differences in non-fundamentals need not be considered as divisive of church fellowship, there is danger of a basically wrong attitude over against the Scriptures. This may be even of a twofold form.

It may mean that we regard certain doctrines as matters of indifference. God spoke in the matter, it is true, but since the doctrine to us seems to be of secondary importance, and perhaps in itself is of secondary importance as far as our faith is concerned, we presume to grant license even in the face of what God has clearly spoken. Or it may mean that we declare the Word of God to be unclear, impossible of correct understanding. This implies a terrible indictment against God. It means that God offers us certain doctrines in His Word which He expects us to accept in faith on His authority, but He failed to present them in such a way that we can grasp what He wants us to believe.

There are many questions on which the Scriptures are silent. To mention only two: we do not know on which of the six creation days the angels were created; and although we know that a great number of the angels fell away from God into sin, we do not know precisely how their fall took place. Yet all such things as are not revealed at all, or are not clearly revealed, are not doctrines, and dare not be granted the status of doctrines by any church. That would be the sin of adding something to the Word of God. But whenever God presents anything to us for us to embrace in faith as a doctrine, then it is blasphemy to say that He did not reveal it clearly enough in His Word, or that it is a matter of indifference whether we accept it or not.

There is another sham form of fundamental agreement, which in reality represents anything but such fundamental agreement. It is this. Our fathers thoroughly searched the Scriptures and expressed their findings in certain phrases and propositions. These propositions may, moreover, have received their coloring from certain errors against which our fathers had to battle and which they tried to ward off by their formulations of the truths which they found in the Scriptures. If we, their children, now content our-

selves with simply repeating the terms which our fathers coined, we may appear to be in complete agreement with them, while in reality, because we fail to mine those doctrines ourselves from the Scriptures themselves, we are virtually in basic disagreement. We accept the phrases and propositions as handed down, we accept them on the authority of our fathers, not because we have ourselves become sure of them out of the Scriptures. Traditionalism has then taken the place of unreserved submission to the Word of God. There may seem to be a world of difference between traditionalism and unionism, but under the skin they are twin brothers.

II. Prussian Union

The unionism on which we must strive to be clear, and against which we must guard, may appear to the superficial observer to have little in common with the Prussian Union of 1817 except, perhaps, the name. The Prussian Union aimed to bring together into a church body with a single administration Lutherans and Reformed, two groups with conflicting confessions, while today's efforts are directed, not primarily toward an administrative union, but a mutual recognition as fellow believers with whom pulpit and altar fellowship may be practiced. But this is not a basic difference, it merely makes the dangers of the present tendency more difficult to detect. It will well repay any one's efforts to devote a little attention to the Prussian King's endeavors in the tricentenary of the Reformation.

On September 27, 1817, King Frederic William III issued a proclamation in which he announced that on the 31st of October both the Reformed and the Lutheran Court and Garrison churches at Potsdam would be united into a single Evangelical-Christian Church to observe the anniversary of the Reformation in a joint Communion service, in which he also would participate. He expressed the hope that, although no pressure would be exerted, all Protestant congregations in his domains would profit by his example and would follow in spirit and in truth.

In this way the Union was inaugurated.

Seventeen years later, on February 28, 1834, there followed an order in council from which we briefly quote the following: "The intent and purpose of the Union does not demand that any

one surrender his former confession, nor is the authority which the Confessions of the two Evangelical Churches held so far thereby abrogated. By joining the Union a spirit of charity and tolerance is indicated which no longer regards a difference in some points of doctrine as a sufficient reason to deny external church fellowship to the other church body."

This order clearly indicates a receding from the position taken in 1817. Still more definite is an order of March 6, 1852, in which the then ruling king voiced it as his opinion that the original proclamation had not contemplated an absorbing of one church body by the other, still less the framing of a new Confession, and then decreed that in the administration of the National Evangelical Church both the fellowship of the two Evangelical Churches established in the Union must be preserved and the individuality (*Selbstständigkeit*) of both Confessions must be guaranteed. — In the following year the explanation was added that no one planned to abrogate the Union.

We omit from our investigation a consideration of the controversy about a new ritual (the *Agendenstreit*) which the king had prepared, and which he tried to foist on the churches but which was rejected by many. It was merely a phase of the general struggle about the union, but a detailed tracing of its various steps might prove confusing. The three proclamations mentioned above are sufficient to indicate the trend of the movement.

The thought of establishing a union of the two church bodies did not spring up suddenly. Its roots really go back to the time of the Reformation, although the attempt was finally occasioned by some matters that were closer at hand. There was, first of all, the personal piety of the ruling king, Frederic William III. He belonged to the Reformed Church — since John Sigismund of Brandenburg in 1613 had changed his religion the house of Hohenzollern embraced the Reformed faith — but the queen, Louise, (who died in 1810) had been of the Lutheran confession. It grieved the king deeply that joint Communion in his family had been impossible. From his desire to find ways and means for obviating such difficulty there sprouted the thought of uniting the two Confessions under one administration and of permitting members of the different creeds to commune at the same altar without changing their faith. The Union which he proclaimed, to him at

least, seemed to offer the solution. It was to be accepted voluntarily, it was not to lead to a new Confession but was to allow everybody to retain his former position, while in the government of the two churches, also in the administration of the Lord's Supper, joint action was to be inaugurated. At the same table, consecrated and distributed by the same ministrants, the elements were to be received by the Lutheran communicants as the vehicles for the true body and blood of Christ, united with the bread and wine in sacramental union, while the Reformed communicants received them as mere symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ, seated in His person at some definite spot in heaven on the right hand of God.

We look at another picture. Europe had groaned for years under the arrogance of Napoleon. The Napoleonic wars wrought great havoc. Finally the united armies of the Austrians, the Prussians, and the Russians defeated the common enemy in the battle of Leipzig. When the Prussian King, the Austrian Emperor, and the Russian Czar on their observation point on an elevation near Leipzig were assured of victory, they sank upon their knees, each one in his own style: the Austrian with joined hands, the Russian with elevated hands, the Prussian with folded hands, to express their thanks to God for their deliverance. Their differences of confession were forgotten for the moment, jointly they had experienced the help of God, jointly they offered up prayers of praise and thanksgiving.

The feelings and actions of the three rulers at Leipzig were typical of the attitude taken generally by the people. And although joint prayer by members of the Roman Catholic, the Orthodox, and the Protestant Churches was a momentary and passing thing, yet the feeling remained that at least the two main branches of the Protestant faith should not go on as two separate bodies, but should join hands in a common organization. The experience of a common misery and a common deliverance had tended to draw them closer to their God and to one another.

Thus the immediate cause of the Prussian Union was not a lack of religion, a callousness over against God, an indifference about the Truth, but rather the opposite, a deepening of religious feelings. We must bear this in mind, not only to avoid the pitfall of uncharitable judging of hearts when we see people entrapped in

unionistic tendencies, but also to be on our guard lest we are deceived by the personal piety and devotion of promoters of unionistic endeavors.

Although the vivid arousing of religious feelings may have greatly accelerated the coming of the Prussian Union, this alone would not have been sufficient to produce it. The roots of the Union go back much farther; the hearts had been prepared for it by other factors. We must go back to the time of the Reformation, to the beginning of the two Confessions. It will not be possible in the brief time allotted to doctrinal discussion to trace the development in detail; it must suffice to touch a few of the high spots.

At Marburg we saw Zwingli ready to offer the hand of brotherhood, and we saw Luther refusing it because of the "different spirit." Thus from the very beginning we see that the Reformed Confession is more conducive to a unionistic attitude, while the Lutheran faith makes its adherents more averse to Unionism. If the Union finally came, it was not the Reformed branch of the Protestant Church that had to be prepared for it, it was rather the resistance of Lutheranism that had to be softened. We may, therefore, for the present disregard developments in the Reformed Church; it will suffice for our purposes to limit ourselves to the history of Lutheranism.

The Reformation had brought the great truths of the Gospel to light again: about the justification of a sinner before God out of grace for Christ's sake through faith; of the Word of God in the Scriptures, every letter of which is surer than heaven and earth, and of the Sacraments as seals of the forgiveness of our sins in the power of and according to their divine institution; of Christ, uniting in His divine person a truly human with His divine nature, without fusion, on the one hand, or separation, on the other. Luther and his fellow-laborers had, in sermons, in schools and lecture halls, in writing, proclaimed these truths for the edification of the people, and had defended them against the attacks of Romanists, of Enthusiasts, of the Reformed. They had presented them in the simplicity of the Catechism, and in mighty hymns had sung them into the hearts of the people.

It is particularly important that we take note of the last named factor. For while the upper strata of the Lutheran Church

were often shaken by the vicissitudes of the times, the Catechism and the hymns of the Reformation helped to preserve the spiritual health of the body of believers, so that the swayings from one extreme to another, which fill the pages of history, remained restricted chiefly to the universities and the educated people, while the common Christians were less affected.

After the period of the Reformation, which came to a close with the adoption of the Formula of Concord and the promulgation of the collected Lutheran Confessions in the Book of Concord in 1580, there followed the period in which dogmatics flourished. We need not go into details. The work of the dogmaticians consisted chiefly in this that they arranged the great truths systematically that had been rediscovered by the Reformation, and defined them in detail. While these dogmaticians were personally very devout men and in their theological work by no means neglected the Christian heart, yet the work which they did in maintaining and defending the Lutheran doctrine against error, particularly of the Reformed type, easily creates the impression as though they were, chiefly if not exclusively, concerned with the logic of the doctrine. "Dead orthodoxy" is the opprobrious term often applied to their time.

Intellectual occupation with matters of doctrine will not for long satisfy the cravings of the heart. A reaction is bound to set in. We do not say that during the period of orthodoxy the heart had been neglected. How strong was the Christian will in its manifold efforts at sanctification is sufficiently shown by the fortitude with which the misery of the Thirty Years' War and its aftermath was borne; and how deeprooted were genuine Christian emotions becomes evident if we but take a casual glance at the church hymns produced in this period. We mention only a few names: Johann Heermann (†1647), represented in the new Hymnal with 10 numbers, among them "O God, Thou faithful God" — "Zion mourns in fear and anguish" — "O Christ, our true and only Light" — "O dearest Jesus, what law hast Thou broken?" — Martin Rinkart (†1649), the author of "Now thank we all our God." — Tobias Clausnitzer (†1684), "Blessed Jesus, at Thy word." — Pages could be filled with references like these, but we must refrain. We add only one more name, that of the well-

known staunch confessor, Paul Gerhardt (†1676), represented in our Hymnal with 21 numbers.

Thus though indeed during the time of orthodoxy the heart was by no means neglected, yet names like Johann Gerhard, Quenstedt, Calov, Brochmand, Scherzer, Baier, Koenig will remind us how much time and effort was spent on the systematic development and the logical defense of the pure doctrine; and although the name "dead" orthodoxy is undeserved, yet it was a period the chief characteristic of which was orthodoxy.

The reaction which set in, by far overshot the mark. The leaders overstressed — one-sidedly — the importance of the emotions and the will. The movement is known as Pietism. Two names may be mentioned here.

The first is Philip Jacob Spener, who in 1675 wrote his famous "Pia Desideria," pious longings for a God-pleasing reform of the true Evangelical Church. We may agree with his first wish, that the Word of God dwell more richly in our midst by home reading and explanatory reading in the churches. Secondly he asked for a revival of the spiritual priesthood of Christians. Every layman is to instruct, admonish, convert, supervise the others. In the third place he insisted that Christianity is a practical doing, rather than a knowing — which reminds one of the modern slogan about "Deeds, not creeds."

The second name is that of August Hermann Francke. He is probably most widely known through his "Foundations" — various schools, an orphanage, a dispensary, a book concern, and the Canstein Bible printery — all of this started on a "capital" of 4 Thaler and 16 Groschen. This shows us a man of energetic faith.

About his own conversion he reports the following: "In this great terror I sank to my knees on that Saturday evening and called to God, whom I did not yet know nor in whom I believed, to rescue me from my great misery — if indeed there is a God. The Lord, the living God, heard me from His holy throne while I was still on my knees. So great was His father's love that He answered me suddenly; for as one turns the hand, so all my doubts disappeared. I felt sure in my heart of the grace of God in Christ Jesus, and suddenly was flooded with a torrent of joy so that in full assurance I praised and blessed God."

In Francke's schools the children had 5½ hours of religious instruction a day, during the noon meal sermons were read to them, in addition there were devotional gatherings, divine services three times a week besides the regular forenoon and afternoon services on Sunday. According to Francke's instructions about reading the Bible, one must pause after every verse, say a prayer and heave a sigh of pious exaltation. In other words, the Word of God is buried under an avalanche of self-made pious emotions.

Spener and Francke are the two outstanding men of Pietism. It is not within the scope of our essay to trace the movement in its various branches and their development. Our concern is to investigate how it would, and did, influence true Christianity, such as we find in Luther and his great associates in the work of the Reformation.

It is evident that the emotions and the will dare not be neglected. A one-sided stress on the intellect will ultimately lead to a "dead" orthodoxy. On the other hand, the emotions must have a content, and the will must have an aim and a motive. Else Christianity will become like men who say: "We do not know where we are going, but we want to get there in a hurry." Stressing the emotions and the will without at the same time providing the proper content through the channels of the intellect will have the same deadening effect on true Christianity as has an over-stressing of the intellect. Artificial stimulation of these soul functions will leave faith as a hollow thing that must collapse before long.

What is the connection with the Prussian Union? While orthodoxy did rouse a certain resentment and aversion to purity of doctrine, Pietism undermined the structure of objective doctrine still more and led directly into subjectivism, where everybody is left to the guidance of his own feelings to strive for aims of his own choosing. — The doors were wide open for Unionism.

Another movement set in which broke down the protecting walls still more. That was Rationalism in its various shades. Again we must refrain from going into details. Rationalism ultimately reduced Christianity to the three concepts of God, duty, and immortality. All other doctrines were at best matters of indifference.

We can readily understand how these various movements

sapped the strength of Lutheranism. While the Reformed confession in itself made men willing to establish fraternal relations in spite of doctrinal differences, now by the movements briefly sketched above the powers of resistance within the Lutheran Church had been broken. The Prussian Union became a fact.

The irony of the matter lies in this that the Union was considered as the most appropriate manner of observing the three-hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the Reformation, 1517 — 1817. On August 6, 1817, a gathering of leading theologians held in Nassau opined that the few remaining differences among the divergent ideas of the two Protestant churches did not essentially affect their religion, and hence could not reasonably constitute a legitimate cause for the continued separation of the two bodies. The theologians, representing both churches, voted a union of the two on the basis of the essential agreement of their Confessions. The remaining points of difference were considered as not necessarily divisive of church fellowship. In Prussia the Union was decreed a few months later.

The untenableness of any form of unionism becomes evident particularly at two points in the Prussian Union: they are the oath of ordination for pastors, and the formula of distribution in the Supper. The candidate to be ordained vowed fidelity to the "Confessions of the United Evangelical Church in so far as they are in agreement with each other." But as long as the extent of such agreement was not defined by the church, the obligation assumed by the candidate left everything to the subjective opinion of the candidate himself. In other words, here was a church without a confession, practically a contradiction in terms. — In the formula of distribution a clear confession in the most solemn sacrament is also painfully missing: "Take and eat; Christ says, This is My body." — A church without a clear confession lacks vitality. You can never win victories for any truth by sidestepping the issue, especially not in a struggle against the forces of darkness.

In the Prussian Union we also observe this peculiarity that the demand for tolerance does not prevent any one from becoming most intolerant himself. Joining the United Church was to be voluntary, but before long great pressure was brought to bear on pastors and churches to compel them, and on candidates, who

in connection with their final examination were urged to declare their entrance into the Union. — The late Dr. Denef (of the former Buffalo Synod) wrote shortly before his death, summing up the situation: "Pastors were imprisoned, congregations suffered the loss of property, Lutheran service was prohibited" (*Kirchenblatt*, June 16, 1945). He rightly calls this a "persecution" — in the name of tolerance!

The case of Dr. J. G. Scheibel in Breslau is instructive. In many respects it parallels that of Paul Gerhardt, who for conscience' sake refused to sign the *Revers*, the written declaration not to engage in polemics against the Reformed doctrine. When the Union was promulgated, Dr. Scheibel at first merely petitioned for the privilege of conducting a separate Communion service for Lutherans in a generally unoccupied chapel room. This was denied. Later he was suspended from office. Still later the forming of a separate Lutheran congregation was refused on the ground that "least of all — because it would be extremely un-Christian — may it be permitted that the enemies of the Union in opposition to its friends found a separate religious organization." — Intolerance in the name of the demand for tolerance!

Although we have not nearly covered the history of the Prussian Union, we have probably spent more time than warranted on the matter. Yet it may not be all in vain, because here is a case which shows the principle of unionism in action, its background and its fruit. We may well take the lesson from history to heart.

III. Unionism in the Scriptures

When we turn to the Scripture, throughout its entire course, perhaps nothing will strike us as more peculiar than its absolutely exclusive character, besides its all-inclusive universality.

Scripture is very inclusive. In fact, it includes all men in its message, and excludes not a single soul. No matter how high or low a man may be, Scripture addresses itself to him and offers him the blessings of the Gospel. No one is excluded, except he excludes himself. God would have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth; for God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life. Jesus as the

Lamb of God taketh away the sins of the world. He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. The Gospel is to be preached to all nations, to every creature. For Jesus has been set to be a light of the Gentiles, that He should be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.

But just because of this universality the Scriptures are also most exclusive. There is salvation in Jesus, but there is no salvation in any other and there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. Any attempt to mix other ingredients into the Gospel at once affects the very nature of the Gospel, changing it into another Gospel which is not another.

Isaiah emphasizes over and over the exclusiveness of his message when he ever again stresses the oneness and singularity of God. "I the Lord, the first and with the last, I am he" (ch. 41, 4). "I am he, before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord, and beside me there is no Savior" (ch. 43, 10, 11). "Is there a God beside me? Yea, there is no God (rock of refuge), I know not any" (ch. 44, 8). "Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called: I am he, I am the first, I also am the last" (ch. 48, 12).

This truth was also very powerfully inculcated by Moses: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart" (Dt. 6, 4-6). "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it" (Dt. 4, 2; 12, 32).

Joshua, in the last assembly of Israel that he convened, impressed it upon the people that God demands their hearts undivided. After they had repeatedly declared it to be their firm intention to serve the Lord, Joshua said to them: "Ye are witnesses against yourselves that ye have chosen you the Lord, to serve him. And they said, We are witnesses. Now therefore put away, said he, the strange gods which are among you, and incline your heart unto the Lord God of Israel. And the people said unto Joshua, The Lord our God will we serve, and his voice will be obey. So Joshua made a covenant with the people that day" (ch. 24, 22-25).

True wisdom then consists in this, not that we through our own effort acquire deep understanding or build up our own merit. but that we in all simplicity commit ourselves entirely to the Lord. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" (Ps. 111, 10; Prov. 1, 7; 9, 10).

This is the tenor of the whole Bible that our salvation rests securely in God's hands, that therefore we allow God to handle it, that we pay close attention to all that He tells us, that we scrupulously avoid everything that deviates from His instructions, and shun fellowship with any that tamper with His Word, be it in important or in seemingly the most insignificant matters. How to deal properly according to God's will with such as differ from us is another question; for the moment we must be impressed and overawed by the absolute exclusiveness of the Scriptures, which forbid every form of compromise.

The old patriarchs acted along these lines. There is Abraham, the father of believers. We take a brief look at a few events in his life.

Abraham returned after his victory over the kings from the East. He had saved the country from oppression. Melchizedek went out to greet him. Now Melchizedek is a type of Christ Himself. Yet when he spoke of "the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth", Abraham carefully identified this God as "the Lord", *i. e.*, Jehovah. Jehovah is the God of salvation. He is the God who after the fall of Adam promised to send the "Seed of the woman" to crush the serpent's head. He is the God who promised Abraham that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. So Abraham is very careful on every occasion to confess clearly this Jehovah God as the true and only most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth.

When Sarah, Abraham's wife, had died and the great princes of the land offered him the use of their burying grounds, he insisted that he is a "stranger" among them and that he will buy a field from them for his own burying ground. He had the deal very carefully recorded. Business relations were fine, ordinary courtesy was excellent; but when it came to expressing hope in the Savior from death, Abraham was meticulously careful to keep his confession clear.

We turn to the marriage of Isaac. Abraham took a solemn

oath from his head servant, who was in charge of all his property, that he should not "take a wife unto my son of the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I dwell" — for that would have endangered the purity of the promise which the Lord had given him. The wife of Isaac must give evidence of the same faith which animated Abraham when he left his fathers' house, and which Isaac had evinced when he was willing to be sacrificed on the altar.

In Dt. 7, 1, seven nations are enumerated whom the Lord would cast out of Canaan before the Children of Israel. Then the severe injunction is added: "Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them; neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. For they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods."

Solomon's disregard for this commandment of the Lord with its disastrous consequences is too well known to require a lengthy discussion. — We register the complaint of Nehemiah (ch. 13, 23-25): "In those days also saw I Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab. And the children spake half in the speech of Ashdod and could not speak in the Jews' language but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them and cursed them."

Nehemiah's action against the offending Jews was in line with the previous action of Zerubbabel against the Samaritans when they offered to join the Jews in rebuilding the temple.

The Samaritans themselves are an outstanding example of gross unionism in Old Testament times. The people whom the king of Assyria had settled in Samaria in place of the exiled Israelites "made gods of their own and put them in the houses of the high places which the Samaritans had made, every nation in their cities wherein they dwelt." Then the king sent a priest from the captives who "came and dwelt in Bethel and taught them how they should fear the Lord. . . . So they feared the Lord, and served their own gods" (2 Kgs. 17, 28, 29, 33). They feared the Lord, yet their attempt to fuse the service of the Lord with their serving of their own gods is branded as disobedience to the Lord: "The Lord your God ye shall fear; and he shall deliver you out

of the hands of all your enemies. Howbeit they did not hearken, but they did after their former manner." And the final verdict is: "They fear not the Lord" (2 Kgs. 17, 34. 39. 40).

When these people offered Zerubbabel and Joshua their help in restoring the temple, the leaders of the returning exiles refused. The claim of the Samaritans: "We seek your God as ye do, and we do sacrifice unto him", made no impression on them; nor did the danger, as it actually turned out, that "the people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Judah and troubled them in building." They answered the unionists: "Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God, but we ourselves together will build an house unto the Lord God of Israel" (Ezra 4, 2. 3). — Well may we ask, would not the cause of Zerubbabel have been greatly strengthened in building the temple if he had enlisted the help of the Samaritans instead of refusing them a share in the work and arousing their opposition? Would not the cause of the Lord have been greatly advanced by a united front? Were not the Samaritans sincere in their desire to serve the true God? At least, what right did Zerubbabel have to question their motives, though at the time they still evinced great weakness? Yet in obedience to God's command to avoid every kind of pact with idol worshipers the Jews declined the tempting offer and chose to face the resulting difficulties.

While we must recognize the fact that Israel during the Old Testament period was under "tutors and governors" (Gal. 4, 2) and all arrangements made by God had the appearance of externalism and law, yet the spiritual meaning was well understood by the children of God. Note particularly David's confession in the 51st Psalm concerning the value of sacrifices. So also the spiritual meaning of associating with Gentiles was clearly understood, as the story of Naaman shows. Naaman, after the healing of his leprosy, made it very clear that he believed in Jehovah alone and would serve no other gods. Yet the duties of his office required of him at times to attend the services devoted to the idol Rimmon. He himself was not serving Rimmon, and he let every one know it, but could he as an officer of the king take part? He laid the matter before Elisha, who answered briefly, "Go in peace" (2 Kgs. 5, 19).

Now it is true that in our day the danger of entanglement

with idol-worshippers may seem somewhat remote — at least in our home land. But what in the mission fields? Remember the mission methods recommended by Pope Gregory I to the bishop Augustine, whom he had sent as a missionary to the Anglo-Saxons. He advised against destroying the idol temples and suggested that they consecrate water and sprinkle the idol temples with holy water, that they erect church altars and deposit relics in them, expecting that the heathen would be more willing to serve the Christian God if they could do so in the old accustomed places. He suggested also that they retain the old heathen festivals and merely change them into dedication anniversaries or natal days of the sainted martyrs whose relics the altar held; thus granting the heathen to practice their customs outwardly while the significance of these would be changed gradually. "For there is no doubt that it is impossible to efface everything at once from their obdurate minds." This happened more than 1300 years ago. The letter which we briefly summarized was dated July 10, 601. (The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation, by the Venerable Bede, Bk. I, chap. 30). Compromises of a similar kind may look tempting even today.

However, no matter how remote the danger of such gross unionism may seem to us, in principle it makes very little difference whether the form is coarse or more refined; if anything, the more refined form may prove the more dangerous in the end, because more insidious in character and more difficult to detect.

The New Testament emphasis on the decisive authority of the Scripture is well known to all of us. We need not go into details. We just cite three witnesses. The first is none other than our Lord and Savior Himself. He not only urged that we search the Scripture because they testify of Him, but also assured us that not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled, and warned every one not to break one of the least commandments, lest he be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. — Paul, who encouraged Timothy to remain in what he had learned because the Scriptures, given by inspiration of God, are able to make him wise unto salvation, also testified concerning himself that he was extremely careful not to say any other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come. — Likewise Peter. He compares the Word of God to a light which is shining

in a dark place, and urges his readers to take heed to it in their hearts.

With this stress on the Scriptures as a background we hear the warnings scattered throughout the New Testament to beware of false prophets; to avoid heretics; to mark them that cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which we have learned, and to avoid them; to try the spirits, and not to bid any one God-speed that does not bring the doctrine of Christ.

In the last mentioned case John points out the reason. He adds: "For he that biddeth him God-speed is partaker of his evil deeds." Not only do we, by joining hands with such as deviate from the Scriptures, by our act endorse their false position and thus become guilty of their error, but it is also impossible that our own heart and mind should not become affected by it. We remain alive in the doctrine of Christ, not by having it easily accessible in correctly formulated theses, but by meditating it and pondering it in our hearts. As soon as we cease to search the Scriptures, to read and re-read it for the nourishment of our faith, the doctrine, no matter how correctly formulated, will begin to die to us, and we to it. What then if we unite with some one holding an error? As a result of our fraternal relations, established without clarifying the error, that particular point of doctrine in which he errs will have to be avoided, at least not treated in any but a theoretical way. John calls this "partaking of the evil deeds." Jesus has even a stronger, more drastic expression. He warns against casting our pearls before swine lest they "turn again and rend you." Jesus is speaking figuratively. He does not mean natural pearls nor actual swine. So also the "rending" must be taken metaphorically. They will destroy our spiritual life, our faith. This is the inevitable result of toying with error.

Precisely in this connection a grave danger must be considered. It is very easy, in trying to avoid the Scylla of unionism, to fall into the Charybdis of overbearing haughtiness. There are errorists whom we most avoid, and there are weak brethren whom we must befriend. The glory of Jesus is that He does not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax.

The proper mode of procedure, both against errorists and against weak brethren, may be observed in Paul's manner of handling the situation in Galatia. There were the Judaizers

spreading an error in a seemingly minor point. Their purpose seemed to be a lofty one. Had not Moses given the Law? Was it not God Himself who had spoken through Moses? Should an ordinance of God be set lightly aside? To preach a Gospel of salvation equally free for all without observing the God-ordained rite of circumcision to them seemed nothing short of blasphemy. They were zealous for the glory of their God. — Circumcision in itself did not matter. In the Epistle to the Galatians Paul says directly: "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision," and under given circumstances Paul did not hesitate to have one of his associates circumcised. Yet when the Judaizers insisted on circumcision as necessary to salvation, Paul opposed them vehemently and denounced them unsparingly. They had no excuse for their error. In Antioch the matter had been discussed thoroughly. A delegation had been sent to Jerusalem. There the church, the elders, and the apostles had again studied the question. The correct answer had been formulated unanimously to the satisfaction of all. A letter embodying the resolution had been sent to the churches. There was no longer any excuse for anyone to advocate circumcision as a ceremony necessary to assure salvation, and one that did so thereby branded himself as an errorist.

Were then not also the Galatians to be treated as errorists? Paul had taught them the Law-free Gospel, and the resolutions of the Jerusalem Council had been delivered to them. Yet Paul clearly distinguishes between them and the Judaizers. To be sure, he uses some strong language against them. He not only expresses amazement that they were so easily swayed from the truth, but he calls them "foolish" Galatians who had permitted themselves to be "bewitched". Yet throughout the Epistle he treats them as brethren, as the church of Christ, in spite of the fact that they had already begun to yield and to submit to the ceremonial ordinances of the Law of Moses.

Where was the difference? The Galatian churches were comparatively young and inexperienced. They had accepted the Gospel, but they were not yet sufficiently trained and ready to see it clearly in all its implications. They were studying the truth, they were grappling with the new problems, they seem even to have appealed to Paul for help. That is the reason why Paul

treats them altogether differently from the Judaizers and is ready to continue fraternal relations with them in spite of their serious error.

The same procedure he recommends to the Romans and tells them that it is one dictated by our very faith in Christ. The weaknesses of some Roman Christians seem to have been very similar to those found in Galatia: they observed days and made a distinction in their foods. Yet Paul gives them the testimony that they wholeheartedly trusted in Christ their Savior. They did everything that they did unto the Lord and gave Him thanks. If we wish to express their attitude dogmatically we might say that they were sound regarding the personal foundation of their faith, and Paul implies that they were also sound regarding the dogmatic foundation. Yet they had weaknesses. How were the Romans, particularly the leaders of the Roman church, to treat them? Paul emphatically says: "Receive them." They were not to excommunicate them, nor to withdraw from them. Though they were weak, yet were they brethren. Then Paul adds: "Not to doubtful disputations." To be sure, they must instruct them and testify the truth to them, but not with an air of haughtiness and condescending superiority, but with understanding and considerate love.

Paul himself was a model of such procedure. In 1 Cor. 9, 19-23, where he tells us that in his Gospel work he, in order to show himself a true partaker of the Gospel, made it a habit to put himself into the position of his hearers, becoming unto the Jews as a Jew, etc., he also mentions the weak: "To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak." He placed himself into the position of the weak, he made their troubles his own, he fought their battles in his own heart; and only after he had in faith by the power of the Gospel overcome the difficulties of the weak, did he dare to speak to them. The result was that his words were anything but "doubtful disputations"; they were not overbearing arguments nor condescending advice, they were words coming from the heart, of a man who understands the agony of the weak and the power of the Gospel to effect a cure.

Was Paul guilty of employing unionistic tactics when he wrote: "Unto the Jews became I as a Jew" etc.? Far from it.

Rather, as he himself expresses it in 1 Thess. 2, 7: "We were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherishes her (own) children."

To sum up, while the Scriptures most emphatically denounce unionism with errorists in any form, they just as emphatically insist on the most tender consideration for the weak. Both, impatience towards weak brethren and tolerance towards errorists, would, in the last analysis, constitute a denial of the basic truth of the Gospel. M.

(To be concluded)

Pastoral Table of Duties

According to the Pastoral Letters

III. What the Pastor should avoid and what he should follow after

Article I of this series presented the imperatives Paul used to make clear the qualifications which are "must's" and "must not's" in the man who aspires to the office of a bishop. 1. Tim. 3, 2-7; 2. Tim. 2, 23, 24; Titus 1, 5-9. — Article II presented the imperatives which insist that a pastor be a good example to the believers. 1. Tim. 4, 12; Titus 2, 7. — The present article takes up the imperatives which tell a pastor what he must avoid and what he must follow after.

A. What Timothy, Titus and every faithful pastor must avoid.

1. Tim. 4, 7: "But refuse profane and old wives' fables." 6, 11: "But thou, O man of God, flee these things." 6, 20: "Avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called." 2. Tim. 2, 16: "But shun profane and vain babblings." 2, 23: "But avoid foolish and unlearned questions." Titus 3, 9: "But avoid foolish questions and genealogies and contentions and strivings about the law."

"Refuse," "flee," "avoid," "shun" certain things.

In 1. Tim. 4, 7 the Holy Ghost uses the Greek word "*paraitou*," the imperative present of *paraitomai*, to give us our word "refuse". Also in 2 Tim. 2, 23. The first meaning of this word is: "To ask alongside; to beg to have near." The second:

“To avert by entreaty or seek to avert; to refuse, decline, shun, avoid.” Thayer. In both passages it is used in the second sense. Schierlitz: “Verbitten; sich wegen einer Sache weigern; zurueckweisen.” Luther translates in both cases: “Entschlage dich.” The R. V. has “refuse”. In 1. Tim. 6, 11 we find the word “*pheuge*”, imperative present active of *pheugō*. It means “flee” or run away from something abhorrent. — In 1. Tim. 6, 20 we find “*ektrepomenos*”, passive present participle of *ektrepō* which means to turn out of the way of or twist away from something; to dodge, to shun.— In 2. Tim. 2, 16 and Titus 3, 9 we find “*periistaso*” which means to turn one’s self about for the purpose of avoiding something; avoid, shun. Schierlitz: “Auf die Seite treten, ausweichen um sich vor etwas zu schuetzen; fliehen, etwas vermeiden.” Luther: “Entschlage dich.” R. V.: “Shun.”

The Apostle admonishes his representatives, Timothy and Titus, to avoid “profane and old wives’ fables”, “profane and vain babblings”, “foolish and unlearned questions”, “genealogies”, “contentions”, “strivings about the law”, “oppositions of science falsely so called”.

Paul does not leave us in the dark concerning his reasons for warning so emphatically against these things. “Which some professing have erred concerning the faith.” 1. Tim. 6, 20. “They do gender strifes.” 2. Tim. 2, 23. “They will increase unto more ungodliness.” 2. Tim. 2, 16. “Their word will eat as does a canker.” v. 17. “They are unprofitable and vain.” Titus 3, 9.

Grave indictments indeed! These things create and promote the very opposite of that which must be the aim of every bishop’s work. They will not profit godliness, *i. e.* faith, hope, love, sanctification, edification. They will not help increase knowledge and understanding of “the wholesome word and the sound doctrine”. They will not make people busy about the King’s business and so are a hindrance to the spreading of the Gospel and the real growth of the kingdom of God. — But they will profit ungodliness and endanger faith. They will breed strife and discord. They will interfere with the faithful word and the sound doctrine. They will bring untold harm to the Christian and the Church. Unprofitable and vain describes them perfectly, because there is not one decent thing that can be said for them. He who indulges

in them is wasting valuable time which he should be redeeming because the days are evil. Eph. 5, 16. They wreck the Gospel and salvation. And that is why the devil just loves them. He wants to kill the saving faith and rob men of their eternal salvation.

Paul leaves no doubt about his scathing contempt of all these things and we will bear in mind what he wants to tell us: Don't waste your time with these inventions of the devil.

Paul sensed their danger to the Christian and to the Church. When he calls them fables and myths he is not thinking of harmless fairy-tales, but of powerful forces in perverting Christian doctrine and true faith.

But what is that to us? We don't have such Judaizing errorists in our midst. No? Maybe not in the same form, but there are people like the Seventh Day Adventists who are as zealous in their propaganda for the Mosaic law as the Judaizing zealots ever were. Our country is full of enthusiasts, dreamers, visionaries and fanatics, who all have their pet fables and myths which prevent Christian faith and doctrine. Even in the Lutheran church we have to contend against the chiliastic fables and myths of them who hold that a millennium shall come to this old earth. They are zealous missionaries and propagandists for their vain expectations though they pervert the Scriptures. There are the Christian Scientists, Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormons, House of David; there was a Dowie and also an Aimee McPherson, all enthusiastic promoters of their vain babblings — often "for filthy lucre's sake." Titus 1, 11. And there are the sects, old and new.

That takes care of the question, What is that to us? We have vain babblings, profane and old women's fables, foolish and ignorant questions galore. In our day, too, they are zealously promoted by fanatical missionaries who are all too eagerly "creeping into the houses and leading captive silly women" (and men). 2. Tim. 3, 6. Tirelessly they run from house to house to give away their tracts and pamphlets and books and to invite people to their meetings. — What are we to do as shepherds of Christ's flocks? Warn, warn and warn some more! But remember what Paul says: Don't waste your time by being drawn into disputes about these vain babblings. Shun, avoid, flee and turn your back on them.

After these general remarks about these injunctions we must look at some things in them more particularly. — In 1. Tim. 6, 20 Paul admonishes Timothy: “*Avoiding vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called.*” The R. V. has: “Oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so called.” Luther translates: “Das Gezaenke der falschberuehmten Kunst.” Thayer notes: “The inventions of false knowledge opposed to the true Christian doctrine.” It calls itself *knowledge*, science, Wissenschaft, *gnōsis*, but it has no right to such titles. “*Ektrepomenos . . . antitheseis tēs pseudōnymou gnōseōs.*” It is not knowledge nor science, but vain babblings and fables. Thayer remarks: “The higher knowledge of Christian and divine things, which false teachers boast of.”

Bear in mind that Paul does not tell Timothy to refute these oppositions and fables, but turn his back on them. He had other work to do, namely to keep that which was committed to his trust, (1. Tim. 6, 20) the faithful word and the sound doctrine and to preach it faithfully.

The word science, Wissenschaft, always charmed humanity. It is an idol of our times also. But Paul speaks of *pseudōnymou gnōseōs*, false science, pseudoscience. True science is moderate and modest in its claims. But pseudoscience is a brazen hussy who would wipe the Word of God and Christianity right out of existence on the basis of any unproved theory. Pseudoscience knows no modesty. In fact, the less it knows, the louder it is. For example, natural science works to a great extent with unproved and, in many cases, unprovable hypotheses. But pseudoscience seems to have a magic touch whereby these hypotheses can be turned into facts without proof. The theory of evolution is a case in point. Gen. 1, 1 says: “In the beginning God created heaven and earth.” True scientists let that stand as a possibility. But not pseudoscientists. They know everything. They know there was no creation. It takes your breath away to hear them talk as though they had been there to see the universe develop out of nothing. Who can prove the theory of evolution? Yet this science falsely so called did dominate the scientific and unscientific world for a hundred years. It even claimed that it had overthrown the Bible and Christianity. Today it is

practically dead. But too many people did not read the obituary, as so many textbooks testify.

We are more interested in another pseudoscience, *higher criticism*, which has worked untold havoc in the Church. Its target is the Bible. And the men who are directing it are honored D. D.'s, professors of theology; men who are active in teaching young men to be pastors. Think of it, their aim is to destroy faith in the Bible as the Word of God, as the infallible, errorless and inerrant Truth. What a weak-kneed, helpless church it is which can stand by and see that happen. Individuals lament as though they were utterly helpless and there were no way out for them. But there is: "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing." 2. Cor. 6, 11. When men can not cleanse the church of the sin they see in it, they can wash their hands of it.

In the State Churches of Europe it is a little different, for there the people of the Church have nothing to say about who should be teachers and educators of future pastors. But here, where the Church is not shackled by the State, it is amazing beyond belief that people will stand for conditions as they exist even in the American Lutheran Conference and the United Lutheran Church, where men actually teach the theories of higher criticism as the truth at the expense of the Word of God. See Graebner ("Obstacles to Lutheran Union") and Engelder ("The Scripture Can Not Be Broken") for more than abundant proof.

But listen to a man who is not of our circles, not a Lutheran. In "Fundamentals" vol. 8, p. 103, 104 Howard Crosby says: "What gross absurdities have been promulgated by the learned enemies of revelation. Myths, romance, the fiction of poetry, a patchwork of traditions, contradictory records, pious frauds, these are some of the labels that the strutting pride of man has affixed to the books of the Bible, while not one of his sneers has been sustained in the light of honest criticism. No scientific truth has been found opposed and no historic truth misstated in all the sacred writings from Moses to John. The most microscopic investigations have been made by the most eager and learned enemies of the truth in order to find some inaccuracies, but not one has been discovered, except those necessarily resulting from the process of transcription, and those imaginary ones which are perfectly

resolvable by ordinary common sense. Apply these tests to the Vedas, the Avestas or the Koran and the contrast is overwhelming. These fairly bristle with error and falsehood, but the Bible comes out of the crucible without spot as the pure Word of God. Men just as learned as the inimical critics and just as thorough in their investigations, men known and revered in the world of letters, have accepted the Bible, the whole Bible, as the inerrant truth of God. If the verdict of the inimical critics can thus be set aside in an equally learned court, the result shows that their learning goes for nothing in the matter."

How ridiculous these inimical critics of the Bible can be is shown by F. C. Baur of Tuebingen who was of the opinion that the word *gnōsis* in our text referred to the gnostic heresy of the second century, whereas Paul merely expressed a warning against the false teachers who opposed the true Gospel with something they called a higher knowledge and science.

1. Tim. 6, 11 also requires some particular study. "But thou, O man of God, flee these things." *Tauta pheuge*. Without a doubt *tauta* refers to all that Paul wrote in verses 6-10. I shall quote only verses 9-10: "But they that will (R. V. desire to) be rich, fall into temptation and a snare and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which (R. V. such as) drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the (R. V. a) root of all (R. V. all kind) evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith (R. V. which some reaching after have been led astray) and pierced (R. V. have pierced) themselves through with many sorrows." A dangerous road! A fatal road! No wonder Paul says "Run away from it." No wonder he said, 1. Tim. 3, 3: "A bishop must not be covetous, not greedy of filthy lucre." Why should a bishop seek to be rich? Isn't he a man of God, God's steward? Will God not take care of him? Isn't he God's child by his faith in Christ? Does he need more than the knowledge that his Father in heaven will never forsake him? Hasn't the heavenly Father who entrusted him with this precious work a right to expect him to give everything to faithful work? Dare he let the desire of riches interfere? Why should he desire something which leads to what Paul stresses in verses 9-10? No; flee these things and "follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness." 1. Tim. 6, 11.

Covetousness is a fruit of the flesh, not of the spirit. It is an itch to relax in the comforts others have. That takes money. A most real temptation to all of us. That means that we can not read 1. Tim. 6, 6-10 too often.

We must also give some attention to Titus 3, 9: "But avoid (R. V. shun) foolish questions (R. V. questionings) and *genealogies* and *contentions* and *strivings about the law*" (R. V. strifes and fightings about the law). We find the same injunction in 1. Tim. 1, 3, 4: "That thou mightest charge some (R. V. certain men) that they teach no other doctrine (R. V. not to teach a different doctrine) neither give (R. V. to give) heed to fables and endless *genealogies*, which (R. V. the which) minister questions rather than godly edifying (R. V. a dispensation of God) which is in faith." Genealogies, family traditions, played a big part in the lives of the Jews. They proved two things to the Jews: 1. that he belonged to the chosen nation; 2. that he belonged to one of the twelve tribes. But many Jews were not satisfied with the simple record which established those two facts. They sought to amplify their record. "Names of wives were invented, allegorical and additional tales were woven in." Lenski. Apparently some men who had fallen for these "myths and genealogies" and considered them necessary for salvation had come to the churches in Ephesus and Crete and created unrest among the Christians by demanding that they accept such law-propaganda as a necessary addition to the Gospel. That was another doctrine "rather than the dispensation of God which is by faith." And the fight was on; "strifes and fightings about the law." Paul had to put his foot down hard and tell Timothy: "Charge certain men that they teach no other doctrine." Nor could he be tender in his judgment of these "teachers of the law". They are "desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding (R. V. though they understand) neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm" (R. V. confidently affirm). 1. Tim. 1, 7.

Law vs. Gospel. That was Paul's fight to the end of his days. It is ours too. First in ourselves; then in the Church. The old man in us is a law-man. The new man is the Gospel-man. And that old man is not exactly a weakling. He is strong in his temptations to get us to make a rule, to make our work simple, and to thunder away with the law to bring people into

line. But the law can not and does not change a man. "The law worketh wrath." Rom. 4, 15. Only the Gospel is able to change a man. — Congregations have to fight the same battle. It does seem easier to settle problems with a "law of the Medes and Persians", a constitution, than with the Gospel of Christ. — Church bodies, too, are prone to bring constitutions, rules and regulations to the fore; at times in such abundance that they make a man's head swim.

There you have the "strifes and fightings about the law". Oh, brethren, let us heed this earnest plea: "Preach the Gospel," the living, life-giving and life-sustaining Gospel. Only the Gospel works and creates faith and love and good works and peace and sanctification.

The battle cry of enthusiasts and unionists in our day is different. They say: Not creeds, but deeds. Not so much justification, but "sanctification". But Christ says: "Preach the Gospel." And let the example of the scribes and Pharisees who went the other way make these three words deeply impressive.

B. What the pastor must follow after.

1. Tim. 6, 11: "But thou, O man of God, follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness." — 2. Tim. 2, 22: "Follow after righteousness, faith, charity, peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart." — 1. Tim. 4, 7: "Exercise thyself unto godliness." — 1. Tim. 6, 12: "Fight the good fight of faith." — 6. 11: "Lay hold on eternal life."

1. Tim. 6, 11. "Follow after etc." *Diōke*, imperative present active of *diōkō*, to run after, seek after eagerly, earnestly endeavor to acquire. Schierlitz: "Nach einer Sache trachten; sich einer Sache befeisigen; jemand auf seine Anweisung folgen." Luther: "Jage nach." Luther, as usual, found the right word. The English equivalent of "jage nach" is pursue. Pursue, that also brings out the contrast more sharply. Flee the one, pursue the other. Flee the things mentioned in verses 6-10, but pursue the things mentioned in v. 11. Keep on pursuing those which will benefit you in order to serve those to whom you preach for time and for eternity

Paul calls Timothy a "man of God". As such a man who belongs to God and is His servant and eagerly seeks to do His work, he will, he must pursue the virtues enumerated in this verse.

1. Righteousness. *Dikaiosynē*. The word can mean the righteousness of faith, justification, or the righteousness of life, sanctification. Here Paul means the latter, the sanctification which goes hand in hand with and constantly grows out of justification. That righteousness we must pursue in order that we might grow in it and be ever better examples unto the believers. — 2. Godliness. *Eusebeia*. Piety and reverence toward God. The difference between this and the first is that it describes the inner attitude of the heart while righteousness describes the expression of that attitude. — 3. Faith. *Pistis*. Faith is the hand which takes the righteousness of Christ as its own and is the source of sanctification and godliness. Faith, trusting in God and His Word and promises, actually takes care of every need. For example, there is a foreboding in many pastors' hearts today regarding possible persecution of the Church. I can see it coming through two developments: The State's interference with and abrogation of religious freedom and its attempt to do away with all denominations in the Protestant Church, leaving a Jewish, a Catholic, and a Protestant Church. Those are possibilities. But why should we worry? God's promise is: "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." Hebr. 13, 6. — 4. Love. *Agapē*. Love, the daughter of faith. That is love of God and of man; it is especially love of the brethren. This touches a sore spot in the Church, in congregations and more or less among pastors too. I hear the Lord say: "I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left the first love." Rev. 2, 4. There is too much selflove, too much love of the things of the world, too much envy and jealousy, too much running after the things which do not belong to love. The spirit of Cain is too prevalent. "Am I my brother's keeper?" Gen. 4, 9. So often we sin against the 8th commandment by not putting "the best construction on everything." May we never forget the words of our Lord: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." John 13, 34. And the next verse: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." — 5. Patience. *Hypomonē*. Patience in all situations in life and over against all people, friend or foe, brethren in the faith or scoffers. Not easy! How often we think: Here patience ceases to be a virtue. But part of patience is perseverance in waiting and

steadfastness of purpose. Patience is a most necessary virtue in our work. And it is put to the test time and again by our congregations and by individuals. But the flesh dare never have its way. Pursue after patience. Christ can teach us that virtue! Study His life! — 6. Meekness. *Praypathia*. Mildness of disposition and gentleness of spirit.

Following after these things will keep us too busy to run after the others. This will do away with church politics and meddling in other men's business. — Note, too, that Paul exhorts Timothy to pursue the exact opposite of that which the false teachers pursue. See 1. Tim. 6, 5; Titus 1. 10, 11; 2. Pet. 2, 3.

The injunction in 2. Tim. 2, 22 is practically the same: "Follow after righteousness, faith, charity, peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart." Again *diōke*. One new word is added in this list, peace, *eirēnē*. It means harmony, concord. The pastor should pursue a policy of peace "with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart." Exegetes are not agreed that "with them etc." refers to the virtues here mentioned or to peace alone. Zorn connects it with peace alone: "Dem Frieden, der herzlichen Gemeinschaft und Eintracht mit allen, die den Herrn Jesum anrufen, anbeten aus reinem Herzen, ohne Falschheit und Heuchelei." Lenski takes the view that it connects with all four: "In all this (in pursuing righteousness etc.) Timothy is to join the company of those who call upon the Lord from a clean heart." It makes sense both ways. We will bear this in mind: Timothy and every faithful pastor must seek eagerly to be in communion, unity and harmony with all true believers and children of God. See Rom. 12, 18; Eph. 4, 3.

1. Tim. 4, 7: "Exercise thyself rather unto godliness." Rather than waste his time worrying and arguing about profane and old wives' fables Timothy should do something which would be of profit to him. Yes, those Judaizers "of the circumcision" were peddling their wares under the guise of better Christianity and special godliness; yet Timothy should turn his back on them and keep pursuing true godliness. *Gymnadse seauton pros eusebeian*. Strive earnestly for piety toward God. Luther: "Uebe dich aber selbst an der Gottseligkeit." There is but one way to this end, study the Word, grow in knowledge of the Gospel and be ever more deeply grounded in faith. That will take care

of godliness, which is, to be with and in God, to fear, love, trust in and serve Him, to confess and serve Him in word and deed.

Why this exercise unto godliness? In v. 8 Paul says: "For bodily exercise profiteth little, but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come." There is a little benefit in bodily exercise. But it is for the body only and for earthly life alone. Whereas exercise unto godliness is for body and soul, for time and eternity.

Here we can learn something from the world. It lives for the body and works to take care of that body. It spares neither time, money nor labor to find newer and better ways to benefit the body. Exercise is an important part of the curriculum of every school and it is an important part of the life of the nation. Golf, polo, baseball, football, etc. all serve this end. When we consider the small ultimate profit which grows out of it all and yet see the zeal with which it is pursued we should be shamed because we are less eager to pursue the exercise which gives us so much. How much time do we give to praying, fasting, reading and studying the Word, meditating, singing, serving and working for the Lord and His kingdom?

1. Tim. 6, 12: "Fight the good fight of faith." *Agōnidsou ton kalon agōna tēs pisteōs*. Lenski: "Be (ever) a contender in the noble contest of the faith." That comes closer than either the A. V. or the R. V. to expressing the sense of the Greek. *Agōnidsō*. To enter a contest, to contend in gymnastic games; figuratively, to contend with difficulties and dangers antagonistic to the Gospel. *Agōn*. A contest of athletes; figuratively, "any struggle with dangers, annoyances, obstacles, standing in the way of faith, holiness and a desire to spread the Gospel." Thayer. Compare 1. Tim. 1, 18, 19: "This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, . . . that thou . . . mightest war a good warfare; holding faith and a good conscience." Greek: *Strateuē . . . tēn kalēn strateian*. This is said of soldiers fighting a war. The same words are used in 2. Tim. 2, 4. But in 2. Tim. 4, 7 Paul says of himself: *Ton kalon agōna ēgōnismai*.

In 1. Tim. 6, 11 Paul had exhorted Timothy: "But thou, O man of God, flee these things and follow after righteousness." Paul knew that this was not easy. He understood something of the obstacles, hindrances, struggles, difficulties, and dangers which

stand in the way. Read his lamentation in Rom. 7, 14-25. But having entered the arena Timothy should give a good account of himself. Compare 1. Cor. 9, 24-27; 2. Tim. 4, 8. Pastor or layman, the battle between the flesh and the spirit goes on. The Christian has to contend with the world, its enticements and hate and persecutions, its lures and attractions or its ridicule and scorn. He has to fight against the devil. The pastor also has the many troubles of his office to contend with; he has the false teachers. Yes, his life is a struggle. It is easy to get weary. But Paul, yea God, the Holy Ghost, exhorts: Keep on being (present tense) a contender in the noble contest of the faith. Mark well, it is a noble contest, *kalos agōn*, this contest for the faith, for the faith in the heart, the saving faith, and the faith of the lips, the confessing faith. Compare Jude 3. Bodily strength and agility are of no help here. Only the sure Word of God, faith and prayer supply this strength. "Whom resist steadfast in the faith," Peter says of the devil. 1. Peter 5, 9. "This is the victory which overcometh the world, even our faith," John says of the world. 1. John 5, 4.

When the faithful pastor squirms under the burden of his ceaseless battles it is good for him to hear: Be a contender; don't give up. This encouragement helps too: You are in a noble contest, the contest for the faith "which was once delivered to the saints." Jude 3. It isn't hard for the faithful pastor to think of giving up. He does have much to discourage him. He does have ever so many vexing problems to face in his office. He does have to face the fact that his labors seem to bear so little fruit. He is faced with ingratitude and he knows that, if he worked as hard in another field, he would get much more in the way of earthly things for his work. Then the magnitude of his work scares the faithful pastor. "Who am I to seek to do this work?" "I am not fitted for this precious office." Dejection, despondency and discouragement assail him. But God says: Keep on being a contender; take courage, for the victory is yours; yours is the noble contest for the faith which overcometh the world, the devil and all obstacles. Paul didn't give up. Read Rom. 7 again. Read also his song of triumph at the end of his life in 2. Tim. 4, 7, 8. How glorious to be able to come to the end of our lives

saying: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

Immediately following this last injunction we find the other: "Lay hold on eternal life" (R. V. the life eternal). 1. Tim. 6, 12. *Epilabou tēs aiōniou dsōēs*. *Epilabou*, imperative aorist middle of *epilambanō*, lay hold of, take hold of, seize upon something with the hand. Schierlitz: "Ergreifen, erlangen, erreichen." Luther: "Ergreife das ewige Leben." It is important to know that the aorist imperative denotes a single act, not repeated action. Timothy should grasp eternal life. That is the end of the contest. Zorn: "Dem Seligwerden des Christen stellen sich viele Hindernisse entgegen von Teufel, Welt und Fleisch. Christen muessen kaempfen, zum Kampf sind sie verordnet. 1 Kor. 9, 25; 2. Tim. 2, 5; Hebr. 12, 1. Dieser Kampf ist der Kampf des Glaubens. . . . Dieser Glaube ist es, der den Kampf der Christen zu einem guten, rechten, siegreichen, zu 'dem guten Kampf' macht. . . . Und so soll jeder Christ, wie Timotheus, das ewige Leben, die Seligkeit, welcher sich die Feinde hindernd entgegenstellen, das Kleinod, den vorgestellten Preis 'ergreifen', die Hand darnach ausstrecken und fassen, wirklich erlangen und haben. 1. Kor. 9, 24; Phil. 3, 12." Vom Hirtenamt, 117, 118.

The end of faith is "everlasting life", Rom. 6, 22, "the salvation of your souls," 1. Peter 1, 9. Tired and weary though we grow in ceaseless battle, that prize, that goal, that end of the road should keep us real contenders until God says: It is enough.

C. What the pastor must KEEP, GUARD and HOLD.

In 1. Tim. 6, 20 Paul writes: "O Timothy, keep (R. V. guard) that which is committed to thy trust" (R. V. unto thee). And 2. Tim. 1, 14: "That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by (R. V. guard through) the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." *Phylaxon*, imperative aorist active, guard, watch, guard a person or thing so that it will not be snatched away; preserve safe and unimpaired. Luther: "O Timotheus, bewahre, das dir vertrauet ist."

What is that good thing which was committed to Timothy's trust? *Tēn parathēkēn; tēn kalēn parathēken*. *Parathēkē* is a deposit, a thing consigned to one's faithful keeping. Schierlitz: "Das jemanden Anvertraute, das Pfand, Depositum." Luther: "Dies beigelegte Gut." Thayer notes: "Used of the correct

knowledge and pure doctrine of the Gospel, to be held firmly and faithfully and to be conscientiously delivered to others." This good thing, this sacred trust, committed to him by the Holy Ghost, Timothy should guard. This is truly valuable and worth watching over. It isn't silver or gold or rubies or diamonds, but a heavenly gift, heavenly riches. This is eternal. All else is temporal and must be left behind at death no matter how much it means to us.

This good thing is the Gospel of salvation by grace through faith in Christ, the true doctrine of salvation. Paul says that: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." 2. Tim. 1, 13. And in the next verse: "That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost." In 2. Tim. 3, 14 Paul writes: "But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them." Verses 15-17 show that Paul means the Scriptures. To Titus he writes: "Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught." 1, 9. The faithful word and sound doctrine; there you have the sacred trust which Timothy and we should guard and keep inviolate, uncorrupted and unadulterated. Do we?

Dr. C. Zorn has the following to say concerning this *parathēkē*: "Das merke jeder Diener am Wort! Er ist hochgeachtet bei Gott. Es ist ihm ein hohes Gut anvertraut: die apostolische, die einzig heilsame Lehre. Die soll er bewahren und hueten, auf dass er sich selbst selig mache and die, welche ihn hoeren. Die apostolischen Worte, die Schriftworte, an die hefte er seinen Glauben, die lasse er das Muster, das Vorbild fuer sein Leben sein. Mit dem Schriftwort gehe er bestaendig um, darin lebe er, damit erfuelle er sein Herz, seinen Sinn, seine Gedanken, seine Lehre, seine Predigt. So ist er ein Mensch Gottes und ein Haushalter Gottes (v. 11; Tit. 1, 7). Aber alle dem Schriftwort widersprechende falsche Lehre soll er meiden und abweisen, kaeme sie auch mit dem Schein und mit der Beteuerung noch so hoher Erkenntnis: sie ist doch nur ungeistliches, leeres Geschwaetz und Gezaenke, und sie macht abirren vom Glauben an Jesum Christum. Nein, es ist mit falscher Lehre *nicht* leicht zu nehmen! Sie ist zu meiden und zu strafen; sie ist zu zeigen und aus der Schrift zu beweisen als Seelengift. O Diener am

Wort, bewahre, was dir vertrauet ist!" Vom Hirtenamt, p. 127.

1. Tim. 6, 13. 14 Paul writes: "I give thee charge in the sight of God . . . that thou *keep* this (R. V. the) commandment without spot, unrebukable (R. V. without reproach) until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." *Parangellō*. To transmit from one to another; to charge, order, command. Luther: "Ich gebiete." The charge is, *terōsai*, to keep, guard, preserve. What? *Tēn entolēn*, order, commandment, charge. Timothy should keep this charge without spot, unrebukable. Luther: "Dass du haltest das Gebot ohne Flecken, untadelig." Very evidently it meant much to Paul to have Timothy keep this charge spotless. *Entolē* is the gospel Timothy had received from Paul. "The sense is that Timothy and every faithful pastor is to guard, keep, protect, preserve all the teaching enjoined upon him, so that it will ever remain spotless as when he received it. He is to keep the reine Lehre rein." Lenski. "It is the substance of 'the noble confession', the substance of 'the Faith'." Lenski. Zorn: "Das Gebot ist *die ganze christliche Heilslehre* des Evangeliums, item *das Evangelium selbst*. Das zu halten, zu predigen, zu glauben, darin zu leben und zu wandeln, 'gebietet' Gott mit grossem Ernst, aber mit grossem *Gnadenernst*; wir wollen aus solchem Gebieten den vollen, unzweifelhaften Ernst seiner *Gnade* voll und unzweifelhaft erkennen und voll Zuversicht und froh das Evangelium halten, verkuendigen, glauben, darin wandeln und leben." p. 126.

It is the wonderful Gospel which the Holy Ghost puts into our hands and says: Here is your life and your work. Give this pure Gospel to your people without any if's, and's, but's or must's." That is what the charge, v. 13, and the commandment, v. 14, means to us.

D. What personal work the pastor must do to become better equipped for his office.

1. Tim. 4, 13-16 tells us that. V. 13: "Till I come, give attendance (R. V. heed) to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine" (R. V. teaching). Most exegetes think Paul was here telling Timothy something about conducting divine services. Since there were three distinct parts to a Jewish service, reading of a passage from the Old Testament, an exhortation to the congregation, and teaching, it seems to them selfevident that Christian services were conducted in the same order. Accordingly they take for granted

that Paul wants to tell Timothy to see to it that the right lesson was read, the exhortation properly and scripturally applied, and the teaching performed according to the faithful word and the sound doctrine. So Zorn, Wohlenberg, Lenski, and others. — Others hold that this injunction has to do with Timothy's personal life. He should not neglect reading the Scriptures. He should pay attention to the exhortation and doctrine he finds in them. I incline to the latter interpretation because in the entire context Paul speaks of Timothy's personal life.

Give attendance to reading. *Proseche tē anagnōsei*. Turn your mind to, attend, and give effort, thought to reading—the Scriptures. Here are the tools for his work. Them he must learn to know better and better. Therefore neither Timothy nor any pastor dare neglect the reading and careful study of the Scriptures. Any pastor must do that for his own sake and for the sake of his work. How can he preach and teach the Word if he does not know the Word? How can he know it if he does not read, study, and ponder it? It is the neglect in this respect which makes the empty talk which flows so glibly from many a pulpit. "Through thy precepts I get understanding." Ps. 119, 104. Reading the daily papers, books or magazines or listening to the radio surely can not fit us for the specific work our Savior gave us when He said: "Preach the Gospel." "Search the Scriptures," that is Christ's advice. "Give attendance to reading." That will give us what we need to feed the lambs and sheep of Christ.

Then exhortation will take care of itself, both exhortation as it applies to us personally and as we are to apply it to our hearers.

"Give attendance to doctrine." *Didaskalia*. Teaching, imparting knowledge; also the matter taught, doctrine. Again *proseche*, turn your mind to, attend to teaching and the doctrine. Verse 16 Paul exhorts: "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine." *Epeche*. Have hold upon, observe, attend to. Luther: "Habe acht auf dich selbst und auf die Lehre." Timothy and every pastor should first examine himself. He should first be concerned about his own salvation. Preach to himself. Exhort himself, not only others. Are his, a sinner's, needs less than those of others? Do I not need the constant grace of God, "lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway (R. V. rejected)?" 1. Cor. 9, 27.

Paul speaks of the sound and pure doctrine of Scriptures. Timothy and we must pay close attention to it. It is not ours; it is God's saving doctrine. It needs no tinkering nor improvement. As it is written, so is it entrusted to us. It dare not be corrupted by anyone. That's our job, to know it as it is. It has so many enemies in and outside of the visible church. False teachers will always try to corrupt it — piously and with a godly air. How can we recognize false doctrine, warn against it, fight for the faith and pure doctrine, if we don't know it ourselves?

False teachers seem to grow like weeds. They are everywhere. The Church 400 years ago had to lament: "O God! How sin's dread works abound! Throughout the earth no rest is found, and what has falsehood's spirit spread and error boldly rears its head. Those haughty spirits, Lord, restrain, who o'er Thy Church with might would reign and always set forth something new, devised to change Thy doctrine true." Without much concentrated study we must say: "We need that prayer, Lord, today much more."

Doctrine. The very word makes ever so many see red. Watch over doctrine? There are other, better, more important things to do than watch over doctrine. Why, this world has to be made a better place to live in. Doctrine! The day for that is past. Only cranks like some of those Lutherans are far enough behind the times to still be talking, thinking, and writing about doctrine. Doctrine must be forgotten so that the Church can present a united front; then it can gain power in the world and be an influence in politics. It all makes me think of the song of the old rationalists: "Wir glauben all an einen Gott, Jud, Heide, Christ und Hottentott."

Pastors, church leaders, professors of theology, and D. D.'s, wolves in sheep's clothing, — and there are many — don't care for doctrine, much less do they watch over and fight for pure doctrine. It is no longer a rare sight to see a Jewish rabbi, a Catholic priest, a Protestant clergyman, and a Lutheran pastor conducting a common service. Why wouldn't the devil and the world rejoice? But the children of God who know the Word and watch over pure doctrine hang their heads in shame.

Thou, O man of God, flee from such — false teachers. The Word still stands. It still demands attention to doctrine. That means ridicule, scorn, disgrace in the eyes of the world and much of the church, particularly the unionists. Watch out. Union is

popular even in portions of the Lutheran Church; union at any price. God will not stand for that and we are His servants. He does not want us to be caught in the "falling away", the "grosse Abfall", of the last times. Therefore stand fast in the sound doctrine. Let go of not even a jot or tittle. What of it, if we are hated and scorned? What the Lord wants is more important than what men want. And it is better to be ridiculed and hated by the enemies of pure doctrine than to gain favor by giving in and disobeying God and losing our salvation. Who wants to be condemned by God as an unfaithful servant? Who wants this: "Having our conscience seared with a hot iron." 1. Tim. 4, 2.

Furthermore God exhorts: "Continue in them." Verse 16. *Epimene*. Stay with, continue, remain. In other words, keep on holding fast to the faithful word and sound doctrine, "taking heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine." Shall we sell our wonderful heritage for a mess of pottage? Just to be smiled upon by — we'll say — unionists? Da sei Gott vor!

Listen: "For in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." Verse 16. Considering the consequences of not doing that should scare one into giving heed to the word and the doctrine and continuing in them. To be saved and to save them that hear us is surely our gravest concern. That is the only reason why we are in this office, to preach the saving Word and to teach the divine doctrine. Read Matthew 25, 30 concerning the reward of the "unprofitable servant".

Now let us return to v. 14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of hands of the presbytery." *Mē amelei*. Be not careless, neglect not. What Timothy had was a gift he received when the presbytery laid hands on him. The gift? Zorn writes: "Da der Apostel von der Amtsfuehrung des Timotheus redet, so kann er mit der Gnadengabe, die in Timotheus war, nur die ihm verliehene *Tuechtigkeit, sein Amt recht zu fuehren*, meinen." Lenski says: "Timothy's *charisma* was his ability to understand the true Gospel teaching over against spurious and false teaching. . . . He would properly transmit the true Word of God, could also teach and expound it, and could detect what deviated from it." Barnes, as quoted by Dr. A. Kretzmann, writes: "The gift referred to here was that by which Timothy was qualified for the

work of the ministry. It relates to his office and qualifications — to everything that entered into his fitness for the work.”

The gift, *charisma*, was given to him by prophecy, “by communication of the word to him.” Lenski. The sure word of prophecy, the Scriptures, which he had known from a child, was the means. And then he deepened the knowledge of the Word “under the tutelage of one of the most capable prophets this world ever had, namely Paul himself.” Lenski. “Durch das Wort der Weissagung war ihm die Gnadengabe mitgeteilt worden, die er in seinem Amt noetig hatte. Und als er nun von den Lehrern der Gemeinde, besonders von Paulus, als genuegend vorbereitet und ausgebildet geachtet worden war, da wurde diese Mitteilung der Gnadengabe oeffentlich unter Handauflegung anerkannt. Denn das *meta epitheseōs* bezeichnet nicht, dass die Mitteilung jener Gnadengabe vermittelt des Handauflegens geschah, sondern es geht auf die begleitenden Umstaende.”

There is no magic whereby one through the laying on of hands or of ordination receives the *charisma*, the gift of grace. A man needs more than that to perform a pastor’s work. This *charisma* is a gift which comes from the Word and the Word alone and it is developed by reading, studying and searching the Scriptures and by meditation. This gift dare not be neglected.

V. 15: “Meditate upon these things, give thyself wholly to them that thy profiting (R. V. progress) may appear (R. V. made manifest) unto all.” *Meleta*. Care for, attend carefully; meditate upon *tauta*. There is that word again, for the third time in this chapter. V. 6: “If you put the brethren in remembrance of these things.” *Tauta*. V. L2: “These things, *tauta*, command and teach. The *tauta* in our passage can mean nothing else but the things Paul mentioned from v. 12 on. 1. Timothy should let no one despise his youth. 2. He should be an example for the believers. 3. He should give attendance to reading, exhortation and doctrine. 4. He should not neglect the gift that is in him. Plenty to meditate on and attend to carefully. — For us too.

V. 15: “Give thyself wholly to them.” *En toutois isthi*. Live in these things, be found in them, exist in them. A full-time job which occupies the entire being.

A Pastor’s office demands the whole man, soul, mind, faculties and time. This is not a part time job nor an extra occupation. At

home, sitting at his desk, reading, studying, meditating, working out sermons and catecheses, or visiting the sick, the grieved, the mourning, bringing them the comfort of the Gospel, looking up the erring, the negligent, — these are the things in which he must live and to which he must give himself wholly. *En toutois isthi.* That little sentence should keep us going when we get tired.

But why? Why live in these things? "That thy profiting (progress) may appear (R. V. be manifest) unto all." All shall see that we are growing in knowledge, understanding, righteousness and godliness, in zeal for the Lord's work and in being examples to the believers in all Christian virtues. They shall also know that they themselves are profiting by our profiting.

The lesson for us is plain. We dare not tire of meditating etc. We must examine ourselves as to our lives in respect to these injunctions of Paul. Doing the latter will take care of any smugness or self-complacency which might be left in us.

2. Tim. 2, 15: "Study to show thyself (R. V. give diligence to present thyself) approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (R. V. handling aright the word of truth). The R. V. is much closer to the Greek than the A. V. *Spoudason*. This word does not mean study, but "hasten, exert oneself, endeavor, give diligence." Luther: "Befleissige dich Gott zu erzeigen einen rechtschaffenen und unstraeflichen Arbeiter." Give diligence *parastēsai*, to proffer, to show thyself *dokimos ergatēs*, a proved, accepted workman. But *anepaischyntos*, as one who has no cause to be ashamed. We can take this as one of whom God need not be ashamed, or one who need not be ashamed when he comes before his Master.

The pastor, teacher, or professor is God's workman. He is not the master either of his work or of himself or his time. He is nothing more than a laborer and slave of God and the Savior Jesus Christ. His gifts, strength, faculties, time belong to Him in Whose service he is. His work is assigned to him by His Master. And his work is directed by Him. — In the service of the Master there is no such thing as following your own inclinations, or giving our time and thought to secondary things like hobbies, *Steckenpferde*. Here your work is Gospel-work. In that field please the Master by being and proving yourself a faithful servant.

We should prove ourselves to be such workmen. But do we?

This is a very serious question. Evading the answer won't help. God demands faithfulness. Self-examination in all frankness is the only way to find the answer to the question: Am I a worker who needs not be ashamed?

The work of the "accepted workman" is given in these words: *Orthotomounta ton logon tēs alētheias*. Luther: "Der da recht teile das Wort der Wahrheit." Lenski: "Cutting straight the word of truth." The work of the pastor has to do with the word of truth. It he must teach correctly and directly. *Orthotomeō* means "to cut straight, to make straight and smooth, to handle right." Schierlitz: "Gerade; in gerader Richtung schneiden; im N. T.: Recht behandeln eine Sache." The Greek word does not warrant the translation "dividing" or "recht teilen". Thayer notes: "*Ton logon tēs alētheias*, i. e. to teach the truth correctly and directly."

Zorn writes: "Timotheus selbst aber und jeder Diener am Wort soll ohne Zoegern und Zaudern Fleiss tun und eifrig sein, sich Gott darzustellen als ein bewährter Mann, als ein Arbeiter auf Gottes Ackerfeld, der sich nicht zu schaemen braucht; als einen solchen, der da 'recht teilt' das Wort der Wahrheit, der das Evangelium nicht nur unverfaelscht predigt (2. Kor. 2, 17), sondern es auch recht und erspriesslich an den Mann bringt und als ein guter, treuer und kluger Haushalter jedem sein Gebuehr gibt." Lenski: "Cut the word of truth (and the whole of it is the truth) straight when you present it to others by preaching and teaching. That is what preachers and teachers are to do. When they do not cut the word of truth straight and true, the result is 'nothing useful, but something that upsets those hearing' (v. 14). Such preachers abuse the word and their hearers suffer the terrible effect. O, what maltreatment of the heavenly word and thus of immortal souls!"

This then is the teacher's and preacher's work, to teach and preach true and straight the word of truth (John 17, 19), the word of Christ (John 14, 6), the word of God, "the sure word of prophecy." 2. Pet. 1, 19. That takes more than a title, like Reverend, to be such a workman, approved of God. It takes diligent and careful preparation always.

2. Tim. 3, 14: "But continue (R. V. abide) thou in the things which thou has learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them." *Mene*, stay, abide, continue, remain *en hois*, in the things which thou hast learned and hast

been assured of. *Epistōthēs*, first aorist passive of *pistōō*, to be firmly persuaded. Timothy and every pastor should abide, continue in the word of truth. That is Paul's point. Timothy knew the Holy Scripture from a child. That knowledge he should keep. It is as if Paul said: "Accept nothing else. Shun everything which is not in accord with the word of truth. You know what this word of truth did for you: it made you wise unto salvation. Abide in it for that salvation. Continue to preach it so that others may learn it and be made wise unto their salvation by it."

"Continue, abide in the word of truth." That is a strong and needful admonition. We dare not pass over it as though it were not written for us. The very temptations of our time make it doubly needful for us. This is an age of "science falsely so called" and it is an age in which people put much stock in united fronts. Falling in with these trends of our day necessitates falling away from "these things". That dare not happen, for it is written: "Continue in these things." The word of truth must still rule. This injunction must remain in force.

The either-or involved is made clear by a few questions: Do we want to be true to our calling, our vow, our God and the Lord Jesus and the word of truth? Do we want to have a good conscience and be faithful servants of Christ or throw away our heritage and go with the trend of the times? Do we want the verdict given the "unprofitable servant"? Mt. 25, 30: "Cast the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

2. Tim. 2, 7: "Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." The R. V. improves on this translation: "And the Lord *will give* thee understanding." *Noei*. Perceive with the mind to understand, consider, ponder. And the Lord *will give* (*dōsei*) thee *synesis en pasin*, understanding in all things. No doubt Paul here refers to what he wrote in v. 1-6, especially in 3-6. There Paul speaks of the soldier, v. 3, of the man that warreth, v. 4, of the man striving for mastery, v. 5, of the husbandman that laboreth, v. 6.

Consider what I say. Strive to understand it. But Paul knows that the human mind is not able to understand spiritual things "because they are spiritually discerned" (R. V. judged).

Therefore he adds: "And the Lord shall give (*dōsei*) thee understanding in all things." Lenski contends that *en pasin* can not mean "in all things", but that it means "in every respect." But Thayer says: "*En pasin* means in all things, in all ways, altogether." He says: "*ta panta* means in all respects."

Lenski says of this text: "For all spiritual things our thinking abilities, however keen and sharp, are not sufficient. The Lord must control, guide, enlighten our understanding". He is ever willing to give us "understanding", if only we let him give it, recognize his gift and prize it. The Lord so gives by the means of the very word itself and never apart from the word, which is a lamp and a light, the source of all enlightenment. "Search the Scriptures" and the Lord will give the understanding; it does not come to one through the air . . . The Lord however uses also His gracious providence in manifold ways. Experience helps to make many a passage clear. Teachers and fellow workers are placed in our path to help us. The Lord lets us find the book we need for this or that purpose. He quickeneth our faculties, our memory. Sometimes we must wait, but *dōsei* stands: he will give."

Let us pray and keep on praying for this gift of understanding.

But let us also try to understand what these terms "soldier", "contender", "husbandman" mean for us. "Soldier". He is under orders; he can not do as he pleases. He is not asked if he wants to go where he is sent. He is trained. When he is sent against an enemy God has the right to expect him to give a good account of himself. Remember we are *called* by the Lord to be His soldiers, to war against sin, unbelief, the world and the devil and our own sinful flesh. Where God knows we can best "fight the Lord's battles" (1. Sam. 18, 17), there He places us; certainly not where we think we fit the best. And there is our battle station whether we like it or not. Here much could be said about the call, but we shall defer that. — "Contender". He is in the arena. He thinks and sees nothing but the race he is in. He does not look right or left. The track and the goal are all that interests him. Nothing dare deter him from running his course well. — "Husbandman". He has concern about his land. It must be worked well and at the right time. Seed must be planted. Weeds must be kept down. Fruit must be harvested.

There is much food for thought for every pastor in those figures of speech.

2. Tim. 2, 1: "Thou therefore, my son, be strong (R. V. my child, be strengthened) in the grace that is in Christ Jesus." *Teknon* (see 1. Tim. 1, 2. 18; 2. Tim. 1, 2. 21), an appellation of love. *Endynamou*, receive strength, increase in strength.

No weakling makes a good soldier, husbandman or contender. No weakling can be those things in God's work. We can get along without an abundance of bodily and human strength. But we can not get along if we are not strengthened in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. We need spiritual strength. And that we can get only from above. It is the grace of Christ. He alone can give it. And He gives it and keeps on giving it through His word. So He fills us with and keeps us in the grace which is in Christ Jesus. That means we will never run out of strength to fight, to contend for the faith, to study and ponder the word, to stand against our own flesh, the world and the devil, to fight for the faithful word and the sound doctrine. We will not run out of strength if we continue to use the means of grace. He who is strengthened in this grace is invincible. He can fulfill the duties of his office; he can bring the saving Gospel to sinners; he can perform his work in the vineyard of the Lord; he can teach and preach, admonish, reprove and rebuke; he can fight the good fight of faith and win.

Who would not pray for this strength?

2. Tim. 4, 5: "But watch thou in all things." (R. V. Be thou sober in all things.) *Nēphe*. Be sober. Thayer notes: "In the New Testament everywhere tropical: To be calm and collected in spirit, to be temperate, dispassionate, circumspect." See 1. Thess. 5, 6. 8; 1. Pet. 1, 13; 5, 8. Luther: "Du aber sei nuechtern allenthalben." In all of our work the flesh dare never rule us. Partiality, bias and prejudice are always out. God says: Be collected in spirit; be calm, temperate, dispassionate; be circumspect in judgment; pay attention to all circumstances and consequences; be cautious and prudent; "without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality." 1. Tim. 5, 21.

No question, we need to take that injunction to heart.

God willing, we shall take up the work of the pastor in the next article.

W. BODAMER.

A Catholic on Luther

Milwaukee is the home of the Catholic Bruce Publishing Company, which put out "Luther and His Work," written by Mr. Joseph Clayton. He is introduced as an Oxford man, which should beget respect for his scholarship. He says, "Truth and truth alone, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, is the concern of the writer."

Jesuit Joseph Huesslein of the St. Louis University agrees: a historian "must have but one single bias, and that in the author's own felicitous words must be 'the bias for truth.'" This is "A Science and Culture Book."

All this captures our benevolence and we hope for something different: "Luther was already preaching the . . . discouragement of good works" in 1516; p. 37.

With great regret we read this coming from an Oxford scholar with "a bias for truth." He knows better. For a whole page he praises Luther's catechism, written "to check the flood of paganism that threatens to submerge all Christian belief and the very existence of all moral law.

"When Luther wrote he rarely wrote in vain. The catechisms did achieve very largely the purpose of their author. Thousands lost to the Catholic Church were saved from utter unbelief by these documents," pp. 146, 147.

Electeur Joachim II of Brandenburg "with Agricola for his court chaplain established a Lutheranism that combined much of the old Catholic ritual with the doctrines of Wittenberg. Luther flung contempt on his former disciple, John Agricola, for compromising the Evangel, and separation followed." P. 173.

The Oxford scholar is wholly wrong.

1. Agricola fell into error as to preaching the law as early as 1527. The "separation" with Luther followed in 1537.
2. Joachim II of Brandenburg introduced the Reformation with the "ritual" in 1539 with the help of Melancthon and reported to Luther, who expressed his pleasure.
3. Agricola became court preacher in 1540 and the "separation" had nothing to do with "ritual."

4. The "ritual" worried Provost George Buchholzer of Berlin, who took his troubles to Luther.
5. Luther wisely and wittily advised if the Elector will only let the Gospel be preached then let him indulge in "ritual" to his heart's content. And that was his position at all times.

Toleration of Lutheran worship throughout all Hapsburg dominions and Catholic principalities was guaranteed by this truce of Frankfort, but its counterpart, the toleration of Catholic worship in protestant parts of the empire, was never fulfilled. Pp. 171, 172.

The Catholic majority at the Reichstag of Spires in 1529 declared Lutheranism should not be allowed in Catholic territories, while in the Lutheran states there must be no prohibition of Catholic worship. The sentence of outlawry on Luther must continue. P. 144.

For Charles at war with the pope, for Ferdinand watching the advance of the Turk in Hungary, it was no time for enforcing decrees against Luther, with half the empire apparently on Luther's side. P. 143.

The Lutherans got only as much religious freedom as they could wrest, wrench, wring, force from the intolerant kaiser. The kaiser bided his time from 1521 to 1546 to make war on the Lutherans.

The religious peace of the empire proclaimed at Worms. P. 144.

We rub our eyes and wipe our glasses and try again. Yes, there it is — "religious peace."

This "religious peace" is described thus: The edict declared the heretic an outlaw throughout the empire. It is not only forbidden to provide him with shelter, with food or drink, it was ordered that he is to be seized wherever found and handed over to the imperial authority. Disobedience to the edict brought the penalty of high treason, and all who disobeyed were themselves to be treated as outlaws. All protectors and adherents of the heretic were to be arrested and their property surrendered to those who proceed against them. P. 96.

This ferocious edict the Oxford scholar terms a "religious

peace." Just like the old Romans — "they made a desert and called it peace."

Lutheranism made no serious demand on the intellect. P. 225.

Under the shadow of impending excommunication Luther asserts the sacred right of the individual, of the baptized believer, to acquire all truth and knowledge, without external compulsion. P. 79.

That does make a "serious demand on the intellect."

The Catholic takes his religion from the infallible teacher, the pope, and that makes no demand at all on the intellect.

Luther started the breakup of Christendom. P. XXII.

"The first signs of the coming division of the empire into Catholic and Protestant states may be detected, shortly after the Diet of Nuernberg (1524), in the assembly that Campeggio convoked at Ratisbon (Regensburg), an assembly of Catholic princes." P. 115.

Not till the sacred unity of the Church had been rent beyond mending could the general council on which men set their hopes be assembled. P. 14.

The Council of Trent in 1546, among them Laynez and Salmeron of the Society of Jesus.

None of the decrees favored compromise or reconciliation with the Lutherans, and the emperor found no signs of the necessary reform in church discipline. . . . The decree on justification made reunion impossible.

Relations between Charles and Paul III were strained. P. 248.

Luther's old grievance of the scandal of the sale of indulgences or pardons was also, forty-five years after the challenge of the ninety-five Theses at Wittenberg, met and remedied. Henceforth the pardoner with his scrip of pardons from Rome was to follow his occupation no more. Bishops and bishops alone were authorized to issue and dispense indulgences to the faithful, and so they issue indulgences to this day. P. 250.

The Catholic Clayton seems to be glad the heretic Luther forced the pope to give in to that bit of reform.

Luther is Blamed for Witchcraft

The Catholic Clayton writes: "Pope Innocent VIII at the end of 1484 issued a bull on witchcraft and in 1486 Jacob

Sprenger published the Witch Hammer; both encouraged persecution and did untold harm in Germany . . . reveal the low estate of Catholic faith and Christian morals." P. 22-25.

That was about a year after Luther was born and Mr. Clayton does not blame Luther for that superstition as others do.

Luther is Blamed for Capitalism by Vice-President Henry A. Wallace

The Catholic Clayton writes: "The spirit of adventure that sent men voyaging round the world was active before Luther. The foreign imperialism of Spanish and Portuguese governments preceded the exploits of British seamen." P. 266. Capitalism . . . claims no direct inspiration from Protestant sources; nor can it boast of condemnation by Catholic authority.

Luther . . . fulminated . . . against money lending and the payments exacted by the moneylender. At the Council of the Lateran, 1515, a modest rate of interest on loans was allowed. P. 269.

Catholic ethics detected no violation of Christian principles in capitalism. P. 270.

Luther is Blamed for All the Ills of the Modern World by Kaiser Karl V, King Henry VIII, Sir Thomas More, Pope Adrian VI down to Vice-President Henry A. Wallace

The Catholic Clayton writes: "The years of Martin Luther's youth are the years of the beginning of modern imperialism and strife between nations for world markets. With the rise of the Fugger family at Augsburg, they were the years also of the beginning of international finance. A period of restlessness, of excited lust after gold, of fresh and all-engrossing human interests and obvious preoccupation with material goods. A time of change. The end of the Middle Ages. P. 3.

Mr. Clayton does not blame Luther for all the ills that modern flesh is heir to.

Cardinals saw more closely than Luther saw the ill-doing in Rome, because they lived in Rome. . . . The renaissance brought a return to paganism. . . . These cardinals had the conviction that the pagan literature revealed a way to God, because its

authors were gifted by God to prepare by philosophy and poetry the coming of the Savior of the world.

Some Were Affected in Italy by the Lutheran Teaching

The Catholic doctrine concerning man's justification by faith in Christ was not defined till the Council of Trent.

Luther's insistence on faith *alone* as the true dogma . . . brought conflict, suspicion, and distrust in Italy as elsewhere.

Catholic reformers — were divided on this question.

Cardinals Morone, Pole, and Contarini held profoundly to the preaching of salvation through faith in Christ; nor were they prepared to minimize this belief because Martin Luther held an exaggerated doctrine by faith alone. Salvation through faith in Christ remained true though Luther's doctrine led multitudes out of the Catholic Church.

Caraffa, on the other hand, seeing even in Italy, inroads of Lutheranism, feared any preaching of justification by faith.

Venice particularly was susceptible to Protestant invasion. . . . Lutheran literature was conveyed across the frontiers for sale and circulation in very considerable quantities. Melancthon, in 1539, wrote an earnest appeal to Venice to embrace the new Evangel.

Defections among the clergy in Italy were reported. . . . Caraffa saw no means to stop the flow of heresy into the land save through the holy office of the Inquisition. Some left Italy, clergy of the religious orders chiefly. P. 235.

The Inquisition played its part in averting the northern heresy. (1542) P. 236.

Caraffa and the Inquisition went to work . . .

Catholic reform was the saving of Italy. . . . Caraffa shook his head at the piety of Cardinal Pole, mistrusting profoundly all talk of Justification by faith, holding such talk dangerous to the unlearned, even if the speaker was as sincere a Catholic as Pole believed himself to be. . . . Other groups — in the academy of Modena and that of Ferrara where Renée, daughter of Louis XII of France, held her court — were certainly inclined to dally with Protestant opinions, and justify inquisitorial suspicions. P. 232-238.

With Catholic princes more or less indifferent as to what their subjects believed or where and how they prayed, with the

Catholic episcopate so often attentive to carnal appetites to the neglect of spiritual things, the position in Germany could hardly be otherwise than favorable to Protestantism. Pp. 190, 191.

The lone Luther defeated the mighty kaiser and Karl sneaked away to die among the monks of St. Juste near Valladolid in Spain.

Brother Ferdinand followed as German kaiser and made the Religious Peace of Augsburg in 1555, which gave tolerance to the Lutherans. "Whose region, his religion." The religion of the ruler was the religion of the ruled. If you don't like it, you may leave with honor. Quite an improvement on the inquisition.

"Luther at Marburg with Zwingli in 1529 promised Fraternal Union." P. 145.

This atomic bomb smashed our trust in the author's Oxford scholarship. "Fraternal Union" is precisely the thing Luther did not promise. He promised Christian charity, of course, but refused the hand of brotherhood. Our Reformed neighbors have blamed Luther for four hundred years for just this refusal of "fraternal union" when there was no real union.

Only a few months ago David Saville Muzzey of Columbia in an Ethical Culture lecture praised Luther for ridding the world of much superstition and after the lecture told the writer he didn't like Luther for refusing fraternal union to Zwingli.

Luther would not budge from his doctrine of consubstantiation. P. 145.

When they were deadlocked it was Luther who offered the formula of union: "The Lord's body is present essentially and substantially, but not qualitatively or quantitatively or locally." Just admit the fact and we may differ about the manner.

Andreas Osiander reports: "If they would confess the Lord's body was there, and not only in man's memory, we would not ask about bodily or spiritually, natural or supernatural, local or illocal, and take them for brethren and do everything to please them. But (wonderful to hear) they would not."

James Mackinnon holds this "final concession represents a real stretch of principle for the sake of union," for which Luther was "genuinely desirous."

The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, states: "As the German reformer grew more conciliatory, the Swiss became more uncompromising."

Von Schulte rates Luther's offer "this mildest and broadest form" and it is a fact that it was Zwingli who rejected it.

Leighton Pullan is not friendly to Luther, yet says in the 1924 Bampton Lectures, p. 77: "Protestantism was rent in twain. It was shivered by the rock of Zwingli's antisacramentalism, the principle of which, if logically pursued, would make the Bible dumb and the manhood of our Lord merely an "alien garment."

Walter Koehler, the greatest researcher in this matter, gives this considered judgment: "Uncontested the fact must remain, that by the Lutherans a formula of union was proposed, but by Zwingli and Oecolompad in the end rejected.

"The planned Marburg union was wrecked on Zwingli, and not on the Wittenbergers. . . . Zwingli refused. He could not. Personally he could have agreed, but home politics forbade it. . . . Zwingli would lose everything did he in the Lord's Supper in the least 'lutherize'; the Zurich public opinion in that saw 'popery', the abandonment of the Reformation.

Henry C. Vedder of the Baptist Crozer Theological Seminary is viciously opposed to Luther in this matter and yet admits: "Zwingli was a humanist first and a Christian afterwards . . . all but a rationalist . . . not tolerant of opposition."

Editor Macaulay of "The Leisure Hour" is against Luther, yet here admits: "It was his reverence for the written Word, and no pride or obstinacy, that led him." Luther Anecdotes, p. 99.

Lynn Harold Hough of the Methodist Drew University of Madison, N. J., writes in the Significance of the Protestant Reformation, p. 55: "Zwingli's attitude toward the Eucharist seemed to Luther an aspect of a superficial relation to all the deepest things of Christian experience. . . . We can see that with splendid, dogged loyalty Luther was being faithful to the one great central matter on which he believed everything else depended."

Arthur Cushman McGiffert of Union Seminary in his "Luther" blames him for the split, yet writes: "The belief in the real presence supplied too potent a guarantee of the Gospel of God's forgiving love in Christ to be willingly abandoned by Luther, and his conviction that it was explicitly taught in the New Testament gave him warrant for insisting upon it as a necessary article of faith." Again, in "Protestant Thought before

Kant": "It may seem that the controversy concerned only a minor matter and that the difference between the two reformers was of no such importance as to justify a break; but in reality the two men, as Luther himself clearly recognized, were of an altogether different spirit, and the disagreement touching the Eucharist was only the symptom of a far deeper disagreement concerning the nature of Christianity and the way of salvation. . . . For Luther to tolerate Zwingli would have been to betray the very heart of the Gospel."

Henry Vedder of the Baptist Crozer Theological Seminary in his history of the Reformation makes a vicious attack on Luther and yet writes: "Luther conceived a passionate love for the authority of the Bible . . . was a man of deep spiritual experience and intense moral earnestness. He loved the truth, and sought liberty to believe and teach the truth. . . . To Luther from the beginning, religion was the one all-absorbing interest of life. . . . An earnest-minded, religious man. . . . A great teacher. . . . Again the fulness of the times was come, and again God sent forth a man. . . . In fairness to Luther, it must be added that he had a strong reason, quite convincing to his own mind, against the alliance proposed (against the kaiser) or any alliance. We must grant him sincerity, and consistency in this attitude" — toward Zwingli at Marburg in 1529.

The Catholic Johannes Albani wrote in 1929: "The unoverturnable objectivity of Revelation stood before the spirit of Luther. . . . The 'is' on the Marburg conference table shows Luther's joyful subjection under revealed truth."

Lutherans and Zwinglians made peace in 1536, agreeing to a formula, the concord of Wittenberg, which left their differences unreconciled. P. 171.

"History is the bunk" said the Automobillionaire.

There were no Zwinglians at the Wittenberg Concord in 1536. The Zwinglians declined an invitation.

There were no "differences left unreconciled." The men who signed the Wittenberg Concord accepted the real presence of the Lord's body with the bread.

Really, even an Oxford man should do a little reading before writing and printing.

W. DALLMANN.

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

The Affirmation on Election. — In an earlier issue (January, p. 56) we recognized the fact that in the *Affirmation's* section on Election "the *Brief Statement's* rejection of *intuitu fidei* stands, together with Act. 13, 48 as proof passage." Closer examination reveals that by quoting Article 36 of the *Brief Statement* the *Affirmation* also deals with a number of other issues of the past in a manner most satisfactory from a Synodical Conference point of view, as follows:

"Accordingly, we reject as an anti-Scriptural error the doctrine that not alone the grace of God and the merit of Christ are the cause of the election of grace, but that God has, in addition, found or regarded something good *in us* which prompted or caused Him to elect us, this being variously designated as 'good works', 'right conduct', 'proper self-determination', 'refraining from willful resistance', etc."

We cannot but wonder whether, in the event that the A. L. C. accepts the *Affirmation* at its next convention, this will mean that this church body is thereby consciously and specifically condemning the position which was once upheld by the older Ohio and Iowa teachers. If so, then this is progress indeed.

Some disturbing factors, however, still remain in this otherwise strong paragraph of the *Affirmation*. The foregoing quotation from the *Brief Statement* is followed by a sentence drawn from the A. L. C. *Declaration*:

"For whenever Paul speaks of eternal election, he does so indeed with a feeling of unspeakable gratitude for the grace experienced, and for the purpose of consoling believers in all manner of tribulation, but never and in no case implying that God had considered him and the rest of the believers better than the others and had elected them unto faith on that account or that his election is due to a grace of God that exists exclusively for the elect."

We agree that most of this insertion is pertinent, and all of it true. Yet we can only deplore the break which it causes in the line of thought. For when, after this interruption, the *Brief Statement* is permitted to continue, "Neither does Holy Scripture know of any election 'by foreseen faith', 'in view of faith', as though the faith of the elect were to be placed before their election," etc., the force of the introductory "we reject as an anti-Scriptural error" has been lost, and an unmistakable anticlimax results in the mild observation with which this paragraph closes: "this terminology should be avoided." Further confusion is created by the fact that the last part of this inserted sentence ("or that his election is due to a grace of God that exists exclusively for the elect") has no connection with the point under discussion, which is "that God has found or regarded something good *in us* which prompted or caused Him to elect us." This

rejection of a particular (as opposed to universal) grace properly belongs into Article 39 where these matters are under discussion, even as it was originally taken from a similar context in the *Declaration*.

Paragraph 37 of the *Affirmation* closes with the following, taken bodily from the *Declaration*:

"It is true, if the term 'election in view of persevering faith (*intuitu fidei finalis*)' is interpreted in this manner only, that God has decreed from eternity to give on Judgment Day, for the sake of the merits of Christ imputed to them, the crown of glory to those whom He Himself by His grace has brought to faith and has kept in faith unto the end, then such an interpretation expresses indeed a truth clearly revealed in Scripture. It is also true that the Scripture doctrine of election includes as the final step the glorification of the elect. But Scripture and the Confessions do not say that the eternal election, or predestination unto the adoption of children, took place *in view of faith*. Hence, for the sake of clarity in doctrinal presentation this terminology should be avoided."

It should be recognized that two entirely different doctrines are under discussion here, that of Election, of which this entire section treats, and that of the Final Judgment. This remains true even when we note that "the Scripture doctrine of election includes as a final step the glorification of the elect." Keeping this in mind it will be seen that the warning to avoid this terminology, which is not needed at all when the Final Judgment is being discussed, is entirely too mild when the topic happens to be God's eternal election of grace. To use it then is simply wrong. For while the use of the phrase *intuitu fidei* certainly does not immediately stamp one as a heretic, yet it is wrong in itself when used to explain the election of grace.

In paragraph 39 we read: "To be sure, it is necessary to observe the Scriptural distinction between God's election of grace and His universal will of grace, *and their relation to each other*, for only when both are maintained with equal clarity and emphasis will the full Scripture truth be expressed." The italics are ours. If this reference to the relation of these two doctrines to each other should mean no more than the difference between them, then this clause is superfluous. For this is the "distinction" of which the preceding lines speak. If it is meant to go beyond this, however, then it is dangerous. For it was precisely such attempts to explain the mystery of God's election which resulted in the controversies which the *Affirmation* is now meant to settle.

A final change appears in the same paragraph. In pointing out the distinction between these two doctrines, the *Brief Statement* declares, "the election of grace attains its end with all whom it embraces." The *Affirmation*, however, is clearly speaking of the *universal will of grace* when it says, "it does attain its end in all those embraced in the election of grace." The reason for the change does not immediately appear.

The net effect, however, is not merely again to disarrange the clear arrangement of thought in the *Brief Statement*, but virtually to reverse its intention and meaning.

It would seem that this entire section of the *Affirmation* calls for the closest kind of study by all concerned.

E. R.

Lutheran Unity in Canada. — Under this heading the *Lutheran* (U. L. C. A.) brings the following item which may be of interest to our readers:

"The Lutheran Seminary at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, is to have a professor appointed by the American Lutheran Church. Previously two other Lutheran bodies, Norwegian Church and Augustana Synod, decided to co-operate with the United Lutheran Church in maintaining this seminary.

"Due to the difficulty of sending Canadian students to seminaries in the United States during wartime, A. L. C. students have been going to Saskatoon. Decision has now been made to continue this arrangement, states Dr. Emmanuel Poppen, A. L. C. president.

"With four Lutheran bodies uniting to support Saskatoon Seminary, prospects for Lutheran unity in Canada are encouraging. 'An all-Canadian Lutheran Church' is the goal to be kept in view, says Dr. J. H. Reble, president of the U. L. C. Canada Synod. A Canadian Lutheran Council is already in process of formation. Dr. N. Willison, president of Saskatoon Seminary, is provisional chairman. A proposed constitution was prepared this spring which states that the Council's purpose is 'to further the interests and work of Lutheran churches in Canada, particularly by promising (promoting? — Ed.) free sectional conferences with a view to the achievement of complete Lutheran unity.'

According to another issue of the *Lutheran* the Missouri Synod Districts of Canada were officially represented on the committee which drafted this constitution.

E. R.

Rome's Most Recent Move. In the October issue of the *Converted Catholic Magazine* we find the following significant statement:

"The archdiocese of Louisville has endorsed the orders of Archbishop McNicholas of Cincinnati forbidding Catholics from joining "in any public presentation with members of other faiths under the auspices of religion." According to the *Louisville Courier Journal* of February 18 the following official statement was made public: "Any gathering, meeting or action which leaves the implication that there is more than one true church or that one religion is as good as another cannot be participated

in by Catholics." It is further stated that this ruling is in accord with 'pontifical law'.

The editors of the *Converted Catholic Magazine*, former Roman Catholic priests, printed this statement without comment. They only framed it conspicuously in print. Since they apparently see the greatest menace of Rome not in its subversive doctrines, but in its dangerous, global political aspirations, they certainly do not approve this latest Roman stand toward other religious denominations. They are bringing to light many facts disagreeable to Rome, but they will never wage a successful battle against Rome unless they attack Rome's denial of the fundamental principles brought to light again by Luther: *sola Scriptura, sola fide, sola gratia*. They have not fathomed the depth of Roman depravity and are fighting on the periphery.

What may have induced the Roman officials to publish this statement? Evidently they must have noticed that their own parishioners came to the inescapable conclusion that if Roman clerics can participate with non-Catholic ministers and rabbis in religious services that they thereby annul the Papal claim that they are the only Church. This frank declaration will not deter Rome from appearing together with liberal Protestant ministers and rabbis in future where the greater glory of Rome can be enhanced. The chameleon-like nature of Rome adapts itself very well to all possible situations. Their leaders are now sensing the danger within their own ranks when their own members begin to have their doubts as to the Roman claim of being the only true church and that no one can be saved outside of the Roman fold. With this argument they have indoctrinated their own members, but couch the same in more careful and qualified words in their public utterances. Such dangerous practice, they now think, must be stopped not because of its being un-Scriptural but merely because of its dangerous influence on its own members.

What can and should we Lutherans learn from this recent move of Rome? It has always been conservative Lutheran practice not to participate in any kind of religious service with any denomination which is not of the same household of faith, be they political celebrations or baccalaureate services with their seemingly inevitable invocations and the like. A dent has already been made in this practice within our own ranks. Let us be on guard and resist the beginnings. Rome sensed the importance of parochial schools in countries with a higher standard of culture and civilization and has outflanked us Lutherans in this respect. They are now sensing the intrinsic danger confronting their own church by such promiscuous services. Must we be brought to our senses by the awakening of Rome also in this respect? Rome is guided by expediency. May we adhere to Scriptural practice. May we not offer the world the sad spectacle that we can do otherwise too.

H. A. KOCH.

"It Happened in St. Louis." The *Lutheran Standard* for October 13, 1945, contains a report of the 32nd convention of Lutheran church paper editors and managers, who have been meeting annually, this year for the first time in St. Louis. In former meetings strong emphasis had been laid on the discussion of Lutheran unity. In this meeting "the accent was on a united Lutheran impact on the social order." The editors did not mince words in expressing their opinion. Dr. E. Ryden of the *Lutheran Companion* "struck the social action keynote in his paper on 'The Well Balanced Church Paper'" by emphasizing that "we must rethink our position on the matter of separation of church and state. . . . The church has taught freedom," Dr. Ryden maintained, "in the spiritual realm at the price of allowing freedom to the state to carry on as it saw fit in its sphere without criticism from the church. Eventually this leads to the loss of the church's liberty." Dr. Ryden's paper found full support in a discussion of "Public Relations and the Lutheran Press," in which Dr. Theodore Graebner declared "that the church must serve as the living conscience of the body politic and must proclaim its revealed knowledge of the purpose and function and goal of the secular institutions." According to the *Lutheran Companion* (October 3, 1945) Dr. Graebner quoted Dr. O. A. Piper, a German scholar, as saying: "Luther regarded it an eminent task of the Church to spread the knowledge of the purpose and function of the body politic, no matter whether or not its rulers and citizens were true believers. At least they have to be confronted with the truth concerning themselves for that is one of the reasons why the Church exists in history. This proclamation of the true understanding of the body politic cannot be confined to the abstract doctrines of political ethics. Since the believer has to live his life of faith here in this world, the Church has to speak forth in a concrete way how far actual political life moves toward the goal assigned to it by God. The Church is not so much the teacher as the living conscience of the body politic" (p. 3). One of the banquet speakers, Professor Walter Gast, Missouri Synod layman, put the question: "What does a layman like to read in a church paper?" His answer was, as the *Lutheran Standard* tells us: "What the Bible has to say about our economic-social organization and problems." Professor Gast argued: "There is not now available any reliable, sane writing which appraises our economic problems in terms of first and fundamental principles. No one can face the future with any degree of confidence and with anything but deep fear and personal confusion until the church produces a thoroughly Scriptural analysis of our economic-social organization, its problems and ills."

Not only the Evangelical Church of Germany, but also the Lutheran Church of America seems to be seeking a "new program of social action." It certainly is our duty at all times to "rethink our position on the matter of separation of church and state," to use Dr. Ryden's own words. This has been done, however, by both Lutheran and Reformed theologians in the past decades in Europe and America. George W. Forell in the *Luth-*

eran Church Quarterly (April, 1945, No. 2) gives us a concise review of this discussion followed up by an able presentation of "Luther's Natural Orders". Another outstanding article, although it does not favor Luther's position, is that of Walther M. Horton on Natural Law and International Order in the *Ecumenical Review*, "Christendom" (Vol. IX, No. 1). These articles are being mentioned here because they give their readers an insight into the emphasis that is being laid on this question and on the fundamental difference which separates the Lutheran Church from the Roman Catholic and the Reformed in regard to the separation of church and state.

That the Church has an influence in an indirect way on the body politic, no one can gainsay without denying the truth. The Christians as the salt of the earth and the light of the world influence the world at large; although they cannot transform it. Forell points to the enlightened reason of the Christian as "a beautiful and mighty instrument and tool in the hands of God" (L. Ch. Q. p. 177). Dr. Graebner is right in stating that the church "must proclaim its revealed knowledge of the purpose and function and goal of the secular institutions", if this is to mean that the church is to do it in its preaching of the Law, in particular of the Fourth Commandment (comp. *Quartalschrift*, January, 1945, p. 41). But does the church have a call and the duty to do this to gain a *direct* influence on the State? We cannot think of answering this question, unless we keep well in mind why Luther and the Lutheran Confessions separated so clearly and distinctly between church and state. The latter is to Luther the realm of the Ratio, the former the realm of Revelation. The Church, which must regard the realm of Revelation, *i. e.*, the spiritual order of the Gospel, as its very own, cannot simply march into the realm of the secular order, where the Ratio rules. "For Luther the natural orders are real, they are administered by sinful men, they exist for the sake of sinful men, and they punish sinful men. Within these orders human reason rules. But this reason is itself sinful. Christians, too, stand within this realm of the natural orders. As far as they are members of these orders, they have to obey their rules. Therefore they may be forced by the sinful situation and orders to do things that are not Christian" (*The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, April, 1945, p. 177). These facts concerning the natural order, which is nonetheless a divine order, must be the one premise of all our discussions on the separation of church and state, if we do not want to forsake Lutheran principles. The spiritual order, the realm of Revelation, is the second great premise, on which we must be fully agreed in rethinking our Lutheran position. Again the author of the above quoted article, George W. Forell, has ably shown the great gulf that separates the secular order from the spiritual. "Luther's conception of the natural orders never tries to give man the claim to be a worthy object of revelation. They have nothing whatsoever to do with God's revelation in Jesus Christ. Luther never said that the fact of the natural order gives man in any way an ability to be reached by revelation. On the contrary, it reveals how much more perverted we are by sin than,

e. g., the birds. According to Luther, the fact that we are men and not birds does not bring us one step closer to the revelation of God. . . . As far as man's salvation is concerned, it is one of the most uninteresting things in the world that man is man and not a turtle. Revelation is a miracle, not anything that can be expected on the basis of some imaginary human point of contact. At least the natural orders do not furnish such a point of contact" (*Ibid.*, p. 176f.).

This great gulf, which lies between the two orders, the secular and the spiritual, justifies the question, whether the two can be bridged at all or whether they must remain separated unto the end of days. Can the Church transform the natural orders by transplanting the Revelation of the Gospel or "a higher righteousness of love" into the secular order and thereby replace the Ratio and the Golden Rule? It cannot, nor has it a divine call to do so. Even Dr. O. Piper in his book, "God in History", does "not think that the church will ever be able to transform this whole world into a theocracy; nor does God require this from her", (p. 173). And George W. Forell in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* states: "They (the ethical demands of Christ) do not, in some miraculous manner, change the sinful character of the natural orders" (p. 177). What then is to bring about a change in the body politic, which even Lutheran churches are advocating so strongly? The answer of the Lutheran church paper editors is: "The church must serve as the living conscience of the body politic". Pastor Niemöller based his statement that the church "is to act as the conscience of the state" on the precedents created by the churches in America and England. Dr. O. Piper, whom Dr. Graebner quoted when making the above statement, tells us in another connection what he means when speaking of the church as the conscience of the state. He says: "The Occident will be saved, if there is a small minority, a remnant who feel constrained by the love of Christ to assume full responsibility for all contemporaries, and the world is prepared to accept this service" ("God in History", pp. 173/4). Indeed, if the church is the conscience of the state, she also must assume full responsibility for the state, just as a father assumes full responsibility for his child, even before God, when he directs his child to do that which is right and to flee that which is wrong. Does God in His Word impose this responsibility on His Church over against the State? Is the Evangelical Church of Germany responsible for the German government? Can it declare itself responsible for the betterment of the German government in the future? No, the civil governments are responsible for their rule to God, Who has ordained them. The responsibility of the Christian Church in Germany and of that of every land lies on an altogether different plane. It can be summed up in this: The church is responsible for the preaching of the Gospel in all its truth and purity with the purpose of building the Kingdom of God. Whatever the "impact" of this preaching may be on the social order does not lie within the scope of the church's call and activity as the Church of Jesus Christ. His "kingdom is not of this world" (In.

18, 36) but is a "heavenly kingdom" (2 Tim. 4, 18). Therefore our call as a church is to save sinners, not, however, to reform society in its moral, cultural, and political aspects. The tendency of Christian churches abroad and at home to seek a closer union in a "new program of social action" gives no promise for the future. The only promise for the future rests in a united preaching of the Gospel-message to a sin-laden and war-weary world: "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3, 2).

P. PETERS.

The Treysa Conference. The Treysa Conference, which convened in the ancient city of Treysa in Hessen-Kassel and which was attended by more than 100 pastors including ten from the Russian zone of occupation, has, according to the *Religious News Service* (9/5/45), brought about a new formation and a new policy of the Evangelical Church in Germany. To demonstrate the change of formation the old name "German Evangelical Church" has been changed into "Evangelical Church of Germany". Our readers will notice the definite change which this new name embodies. Emphasis is laid on the name "Evangelical Church", while the national element of the old name is relegated to the background. The change of name is to prove to the world that the "German churchmen want nothing to do with the church constitution of the Nazis, nor a return to the loose pro-Hitler federation". Yet we fail to see how this formation of German churches, as long as it includes Lutheran, Reformed, and United churches can ever be anything else but a loose federation, even if this formation goes beyond "federation" and stops short of "amalgamation".

All hope for a closer union of these churches undoubtedly rests in the "new program of social action". This program is supposed to spell a "revolutionary reversal of policy". "Realization of their social task has broken through suddenly", Dr. Schoenfeld of the World Council of Churches, who attended the Treysa Conference of German churchmen, declared. "While they were primarily occupied with theological questions before", he continues, "they now recognize their responsibility for the social and political structure".

This responsibility has been voiced most definitely by Pastor Niemöller, who "seemed to have swung to the other extreme from his former theological position". He stressed two duties which the Church is supposed to have. On the one hand it is to "act as the conscience of the state", on the other hand it "must recognize a close relationship between genuine Christianity and genuine democracy".

At present at least it will be impossible for the German Church to put these two principles into practice, although they undoubtedly find great favor with American and English theologians. Ewart E. Turner, former pastor of the American church in Berlin and at present Religious News Service Correspondent, has transmitted the following information in his first dispatch dated September 26, 1945: "Russian occupation authorities have announced that courses in religion for children may no longer be

given during the regular school hours. The decision is said to have created a critical problem for Protestant and Roman Catholic leaders seeking to reeducate Nazi indoctrinated youth. The decree, issued by the Russian Central Control for Public Education will go into effect throughout the Soviet-occupied zone. While the mandate bars religious instruction during school hours, it does not expressly forbid such instruction in school buildings after school time, but presumably such teaching must hereafter be confined to parish halls. In cases where these halls were destroyed during the war, use of school buildings after normal school hours is left to the discretion of local authorities, most of whom are German Communists. Church leaders here pointed out that high school and grammar school courses in religion, taught by regular members of the teaching staffs, have been the backbone of Christian education in Germany and were continued in many parts of the country even during the Hitler regime. They might also have pointed out that the German church has had every opportunity in the past centuries to act as the conscience of the state and to seek a close relationship between church and state. They might also have added that the new program of the Treysa Conference, according to which the church "is to enter the school, to rebuild youth organizations, and influence the universities", is not new at all, but has been the aim of the German church for centuries. And what has been the result? In short, the Treysa Conference with its "revolutionary reversal of policy" and its "new program" continues to revolve in a vicious circle from which there is no escape until the Evangelical Church of Germany realizes that its God-given duty is not to be a "kingdom-of-God-on-earth church", is not to be a federation or amalgamation of churches where there is no true inward unity, but is rather, by the grace of God, to grow into its great heritage as the church of the Reformation and to preach the Gospel as revealed in the Scriptures and as taught by the Reformer, Dr. Martin Luther.

P. PETERS.

The Netherlands Reformed Church. The Dutch Reformed Church seems to be setting the best example of all European churches in as far as it clearly declares that "a strong influence for the good of the whole population could only originate from a living organism based on Gospel and Creed". In a few months it will hold its first General Synod since 1618 to reorganize its government on a confessional rather than solely administrative basis. Forty-five delegates, consisting of 30 ministers and 15 elders named by the classes or judicatories, will meet in Amsterdam to consider breaking off ties with the State which have existed since 1816, when King William I imposed a statute on the Reformed Church that substantially defined its government. The King's action made the Synodical Commission a purely administrative body, and the Church, formed at the famous Dordrecht Synod of 1618-19, "lived by its regulations instead of its creed". Since then, plans for reorganization have been brought forward repeatedly and a policy struggle, mainly between latitudinarians and

orthodox, raged for upwards of a century. All proposals were rejected, although by an ever-decreasing majority. World War II, however, brought the various schools of thought together and convinced them that 'a strong influence for the good of the whole population could only originate from a living organism based on Gospel and Creed'. . . . Consequently, it was possible to adopt by almost unanimous vote a resolution in the higher governing assemblies to release the Church from the regulations of 1816, thus enabling it to become a professing church. Under the new church order, to be prepared by the coming General Synod, the governing body of the Church, in addition to its administrative work, will also exercise spiritual authority and restore the validity of the three historic confessions of the Church — the Belgic Confession, the Heidelberg Confession, and the Canons of the Dordrecht Confession. It will also be charged with the integration of various church councils, missions, youth schools, and home missions with the life of the Church. It is expected that preparation of the new church order will take about three years.

The Netherlands Reformed Church will encounter the same difficulties to become a "professing church" which the Evangelical Church of Germany has to face. Its orthodox and latitudinarian wings have caused a rent in this Church since the forepart of the 17th century. We do not want to undervalue the "strong influence for good" which this Church experienced during the War. Yet if this influence does not find a basis in a united Christian confession, "based on Gospel and Creed", it will have little lasting value for the future of the Netherlands Reformed Church.

P. PETERS.

The Pledge of the Austrian Evangelical Pastors. The reaction of the Evangelical Church of Austria, with its 170 pastors and 320,000 members, to past events and experiences gathered in World War II is laid down in a pledge sent to all pastors not to meddle in party politics. The pledge reads: "As a member of the clergy of the Austrian Evangelical Church of the Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions, I swear to abstain from all party politics. The fulfillment of political duties, my rights as an Austrian citizen and my loyalty toward the Austrian Republic will not be affected by this pledge." Pointing out that "a burnt child shuns the fire", Bishop May of the Evangelical Church declared that "in the future our watchword is 'fingers away from party politics'. . . . Only by complete neutrality in politics can the pastor win the confidence of all parish members. Taking politics out of the church is especially important for the pastors in the proper fulfillment of their spiritual duties. This is a sharp restriction of personal freedom, but the life of the clergy demands strict discipline in many respects." In short, and in the words of another interview which a correspondent of the R. N. S. had with Bishop May, the Evangelical Church of Austria "is dropping nationalism and politics from religion". The same can be said of the youth movement in Austria's Evangelical Church. Pastor Traar, head of the Evangelical

Church's Youth program, reports that "many young people, disillusioned by the Nazis, have had their fill of politics and will not be attracted by the propaganda of political parties, which are also organizing youth movements". The activity of this Youth Movement at present consists in gathering Bible groups, forming clubs for the study of church history, church music and related subjects. Plans for church camps are also under way, in which the young people prior and subsequent to their confirmation can undergo a special intensified course. Finally, two Evangelical high-schools in Vienna play an important part in the Evangelical Church's youth work.

The Austrian Evangelical Church can only hope to instruct its confirmed youth in its own church schools, since Austria is a "Catholic state" in the eyes of Rome, and of the Austrian government, in consequence of which "religious instruction will again be compulsory in the grammar schools, high schools, and special trade and occupational schools of Austria under the country's new government" as reported by Father Frederich Mittelstedt, Cardinal Innitzer's secretary for religious instruction. He also said "that Austria is a Catholic state with religious instruction in the schools as one of its fundamental principles, and that religion has been an obligatory subject since 1774 until the Nazis began in 1938 to eliminate it. One important change from the former system, according to Father Mittelstedt, will be that payment of salaries to religious instructors will be made by the Church instead of by the State, thus giving the Church more influence in the choice of teachers and the methods of teaching. Another improvement, he said, will be that participation in religious exercises, such as mass or communion, will not be compelled by the schools. Instead, it will be voluntary and participation will be prepared by the priest within the church community". This intensification and reorganization of religious instruction of children by parish priests is a move which is looked upon by the Roman Catholic Church as "a decided victory".

We do not doubt that the Roman Catholic Church has a stronger hold on Austria's youth and through it on the Austrian people than before World War II. This fact will not simplify the missionary and educational endeavors of the Evangelical Church. While the common lot of both churches in Austria undoubtedly has eased "the traditional bitter rivalry", inducing the Evangelicals to liquidate the anti-Catholic (Los von Rom) movement and moving Cardinal Innitzer to send two Catholic representatives to attend the ceremonies of the ordination of Bishop May in Vienna, thus replacing the "traditional rivalry" by an "unofficial friendship", still Rome will brook no friendship at the expense of its growth and influence. Of this fact the Evangelical Church of Austria, "seeking a new, positive attitude toward the Catholic Church", must always remain conscious, if it is not to be outdone by the ever growing strength of Rome in this Catholic state.

The Free Church in Germany. An official letter dated August 30 and addressed to the Missouri Synod by the *emergency* convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church, which was held in Gross-Oesingen (Hannover), contains "the following excerpts" published by the *Lutheran Witness*, October 23, 1945:

"Whereas, There is widespread and notable increase of church attendance in the whole country, and whereas, the willingness in the Protestant clergy to accept confessional Lutheran leadership may be greater than heretofore; and whereas, true leadership must be in accordance with the principles laid down by Dr. C. F. W. Walther; therefore be it resolved, that the honorable Synod of Missouri, Ohio and other States be urgently requested — 1) to send to the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church all available German theological and devotional literature, gratis, especially the works of Dr. C. F. W. Walther and Dr. F. Pieper and some standard English theological literature, also German Bibles and catechisms; 2) to send to Europe and especially to Germany a commission empowered to act immediately; 3) to lose no time but for Jesus' sake and for the succor of souls to act at once. The commissioners must be prepared for immediate conferences with notable leaders of the Landeskirchen and Freikirchen leaning toward confessional Lutheranism at present. The literature ought to include all dogmatical works available, also A. Graebner and Hoenecke and Walther-Baier, but above all Walther's whole works, Stoeckhardt's works, very many tracts and sermons for missionary purposes, some copies of the Saint Louis edition of Luther for pastors (two thirds of the pastors of all Germany have lost their whole library, and there will be no Luther on the market for a long time), the *Triglotta*, Krauth's *Conservative Reformation*, historical works on liturgical studies, *Concordia Theological Monthly* 1939-1945, etc. To set up *Lutherstuben* where theologians can become acquainted with the Lutheranism of Walther and associates, to publish a theological paper, to reach the public by lectures — these are practical aims of the Free Church. Great has been the tribulation of the past; that of the future will be still greater. But in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us and is with us all days even unto the end of the world. (Rom. 8, 37; Matt. 28:20) Indivisible is the unity of the spirit, Eph. 4.

"With fraternal greetings to the honorable Synod of Missouri, Ohio and Other States, the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church, Heinrich Stallmann, Vice-President."

This cry for help is, thank God, being answered. Two members of a commission of five men, Dr. J. W. Behnken and Lawrence Meyer, are in Europe at present. Other "urgent petitions from the Lutheran churches of Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, and many Lutheran leaders in Germany *outside the Freikirche* to come to help re-establish a Church founded on God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure" have reached our Missouri brethren. God grant that a true Lutheran church, both in doctrine and

practise, a Free Church, glorying in that freedom with which Christ has made it free, may be re-established throughout Germany.

P. PETERS.

Boy Scout Movement in Germany. It is interesting and important to note the reaction of the Roman Catholic Church to the inauguration of the Boy Scout movement in Germany. The Roman Catholic Church does not favor a boy scout movement in Germany. "Of course we are in sympathy", Roman Catholic Bishop Albert Stohr of Mainz stated, according to R. N. S. (10/3/45), "with many of the ideals of the boy scout movement, such as cleanliness, honesty, kindness and helpfulness, but there are traditions going back into the centuries in each country which must be followed. Merely to try to force German youth into the mold of the boy scout movement which has its roots in the Anglo-Saxon tradition would be a great mistake." A still stronger argument is advanced by the Bishop against the Boy Scout movement in expressing "opposition to any mixed youth movement in which Catholics are members with Protestants, Jews, Socialists, Communists and others." In arguing thus Bishop Stohr is speaking from experience: "We had that system in the pre-Hitler free youth groups", he explained. "We found that these principles as applied to Germany lead to a weakening of the spiritual content of the youth movement. Only the lowest common denominator of all groups could be used. It was mixing wine with water. We desire for our youth a firmer religious and ideological foundation." Only if the cooperation with the Boy Scout movement does not involve "a sacrifice of our vital principles" is the Mainzer Bishop willing to cooperate. He is well aware of the danger which threatens the Roman Catholic youth by such a cooperation and therefore criticizes union of Communist, Socialist, and Christian youth movements in the Russian occupation zone in which the Communist elements claim leadership. In other words, the Roman Catholic Bishop finds "anti-Christian tendencies" in the youth movements of the Russian occupation zone and is undoubtedly fearing these same tendencies in the German Scout organization planned and proposed by British and American youth experts for the British and the American zones. Should the vigilance of the Roman Catholic Bishop not be an incentive to us for a still greater watchfulness over against the inroads of the Boy Scout movement into the Lutheran Church of our country!

P. PETERS.

Martin Luther Bible. A first edition of the "Martin Luther Bible" has been unearthed deep in the cellars of the Reformed Evangelical Church in Warsaw, according to a report sent to the *Religious News Service* by the Polish Press Agency. If we keep in mind that Luther edited his Bible translation no less than eleven times in his life time, the last edition being edited in the year 1545, then this find of a first edition of his Bible must be regarded as one of great value.

P. PETERS.

Brzesc Bible. Another find reported by *Religious News Service* is that of "two copies of the first Bible translated into Polish for the Calvinist denomination, under the patronage of the famous Radziwill family, which later became converted to Roman Catholicism. Dated 1563, these are known as the Brzesc Bibles and are especially rare".

P. PETERS.

German Publishing Houses. — Students, who know the value of books published by German publishing houses prior to World War II, will not only regret the fact that these publications are not any more on the market, but will ask themselves with no little concern, whether these plants together with their publications have escaped the ravages of the War. Among the well-known publishing houses of Germany mention must be made of the Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt in Stuttgart, which has printed many important editions of the Bible in German and Greek. Many American Bible students know Menge's translation of the Bible, which has gained as much popularity in Germany as Moffat's in England and America. Not less known are the principal editions of the Bible in Greek, the Septuagint by Rahlfs, and the *Novum Testamentum Graece*. All of these and many other editions — let us not forget the *Stuttgarter Jubiläums-Bibel mit Erklärungen* — have been published by this Bibelanstalt. It is therefore good news which the *Religious News Service* is forwarding in regard to this Publishing House: "Although three large buildings of the German Bible Society at Stuttgart were demolished by Allied bombardments, it has been reported here that the Society's main office escaped damage. It was also revealed that all printing plates for the Society's principal editions of the Bible in German and Greek were stored away in deep cellars and have been recovered intact."

P. PETERS.

Unearthed Burial Urns. "Eleven early Christian burial urns, which archeologists say may provide the oldest record of Christianity, have been discovered in a cave on the Jerusalem-Bethlehem road. Inscriptions on the urns contain an historical confirmation of the trial and crucifixion of Christ. The inscriptions, dating from the First Century, A. D., are in Hebrew and Greek, and are said to be lamentations by Jewish disciples on the passion and death of Christ, set down perhaps by an eye-witness to the crucifixion. They have not yet been fully translated. Other articles found with the urns, including pottery, lamps and bottles, will be studied, Professor Sukenik, director of antiquities at Hebrew university here, announced. 'At present', he said, 'it is only possible to say that the inscriptions on the urns date from the period immediately preceding the destruction of the second temple in 70 A. D. The Hebrew inscriptions contain common names like Miriam, Simeon and Matti. The Greek inscriptions beside them contain references to Christianity, and, it seems probable, also to the crucifixion.'" R. N. S. (10/3/45).

Before drawing far-reaching and premature conclusions from this find, we'll do well to heed the caution urged by Prof. R. W. Hamilton, director of the department of antiquities of the Palestine government, who stated according to the *Milwaukee Journal* of October 16, 1945, "that before publication of final results by Sukenik it would be premature to assume any connection between this tomb and any known event or persons in sacred history".

P. PETERS.

Büchertisch

We Move Into Africa. The story of the planting of the Lutheran Church in southeastern Nigeria, by *Henry Nau*, first Lutheran missionary in Nigeria, West Africa. XIII plus 414 pages, 5×7½. Black cloth, with gold title and outline map of Africa on front cover and backbone. Price, \$2.00. — Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.

This book arrived on our desk just as we were about ready to go to press. A thorough review is out of the question, yet since we feel that our readers will just at present be especially interested in a comprehensive view of our mission work in Africa, we hasten to announce the publication of this volume.* The reader will not be disappointed. The author, Dr. Nau, presents the facts in a fascinating style. According to the "Preface" he is writing on the basis of a daybook which he kept during his 18 months' stay in Africa. — The first missionary from our Wisconsin Synod, Wm. H. Schweppe, wrote the "Introduction."

The book itself is divided into four parts: "I. The Country and the People. — II. The Ibesikpo United Church. — III. The Emergence of the Ibesikpo Lutheran Church. — IV. The Vision of the Future." — The last part is not written from our present standpoint, but from that of the author at the time he was ready to leave Africa. Hence, naturally, the two men from our Synod who were commissioned recently (N. Reim, G. Baer) and those from Missouri circles are not mentioned.

In taking samples here and there throughout the book the undersigned found particularly some chapters of the first part and some of the third part most instructive, acquainting the reader with social, economic, and religious conditions in the country, and with the specific problems which confront the missionary. The author discusses these matters very thoroughly. Also his criticism of the methods of the "Faith Missions" (Part II; chap. 8) should be studied by every one, not only that their mistakes may be avoided, but especially that our faith in the Lord of the Church may be nourished.

* Lack of space prevented this review from appearing in the July number of our Quarterly. — Ed.

The book contains many illustrations, could not a map of Nigeria have been included? — The print is very clear and free from typographical errors, we stumbled on only three in paging through the book.

M.

Understanding the Child. An introduction to child psychology with comments for workers and parents interested in Christian training and education. By Alfred Schieding. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. \$1.50. 186 pages.

As the explanatory title points out this book is not meant to be an exhaustive textbook on child psychology but rather an introduction to this field of scientific study. In keeping with what one would expect of an introduction the book aims to acquaint its readers with scientific child study, with some of the problems that it seeks to solve, with some of the methods that it employs, and with some of the findings that it has brought to light.

Inasmuch as this introduction is written "for workers and parents interested in Christian training and education" it has the specific aim of giving a Christian evaluation of systematic child study. The author succeeds in showing that such study is in a position of discovering facts about children which must remain hidden to the casual observer. Thus it can serve to correct many faulty ideas based on hearsay, bold opinion, or limited observation. Again it can verify or supplement sound conclusions won by experience. In such instances child psychology commends itself to the Christian as "a useful servant" in carrying out his high responsibilities over against children. On the other hand the book does not neglect to point out that the obvious limitations of scientific study are even greater in this field and that un-Scriptural presuppositions often lead to prejudiced interpretations instead of true findings.

It would seem that such an introduction would find a welcome also among readers of this periodical and prove helpful to them in their quest for a better understanding of the child whom they are called to train with God's word

C. L.

"The Word Was Made Flesh!" — A Children's Christmas Eve Service, arranged by Edgar Hoenecke. Sample copy, 25c; 25—50 copies, 15c each; 50 or more, 12c each. Order direct from The Plymouth Mail, Plymouth, Mich.

This service represents an attempt, a happy one in the opinion of this reviewer, to counteract the trend towards the Christmas "Program" with its playing up of the role of the individual child, which so often then degenerates to the level of "cuteness". It provides instead a dignified and worthy service which is completely liturgical in its quality. The old familiar carols are used extensively, and the device of choral speaking is

most effectively employed to repeat in the very words of Scripture, first the foretelling, and then the telling of the Wondrous Birth.

It is a service which may well become traditional in a congregation, since it has the simplicity of Scripture itself, which grows on one by repetition from year to year.

E. R.

The Relevance of the Prophets. By R. B. Y. Scott. New York, Mac-Millan Company, 1944. Pp. VIII, 227, Indices. Price \$2.50.

The relevance of the Bible is a subject on which no less than three books have been written since 1944. Two of these are by H. H. Rowley: "The Relevance of the Bible" and "The Relevance of Apocalyptic," while Dr. Scott, professor of Old Testament Literature, United Theological College, Montreal, has written on the same subject under the above title.

This volume had its origin in a series of lectures given at the Summer School for Clergy at MacDonald College, Quebec, and is to serve pastors in aiding them to gain a knowledge of the Old Testament prophets and their message. Therefore the author, Dr. Scott, aims to show his readers in how far the "prophets themselves", not so much "their particular insights and predictions, and the total substance of their teaching", are relevant to "Christian theology", to the "preacher" and his "messages on social justice", relevant to "the cultural crisis of today", to "our modern social problems", yes "relevant for modern democracy". The author seeks to show this by reinterpreting key words of the prophets, such as revelation, salvation, righteousness, judgment a. o., and by giving them an essentially new meaning. Consequently Revelation has lost its objectivity in view of God, and is defined by Dr. Scott as "both a present experience, and an objective element in the historical tradition" (p. 116). Salvation has become an "eschatological national salvation" (p. 129), righteousness exclusively an ethical concept void of the meaning which Luther found in it, consequently only "one of the necessary strands in the social bond" (p. 167). Even when the author speaks of the final thing in religion, the eschatology of the prophets, he defines it as a "social eschatology", which in the last analysis is nothing else but "truth working itself out in social history" (p. 216). The importance of the prophets, according to Dr. Scott, is "that they introduce ethical standards and religion into the conviction of the social destiny" and affirm by means of their religious eschatology "that the real values of history must finally emerge from history's relativities and ambiguities" (p. 216). This reinterpretation and reconversion of Biblical terms and thoughts into the realm of the social and the *Diesseits* is the groundwork for the social gospel of our days. We are indebted to Dr. Scott for showing us how deeply the social gospel is imbedded in the theology of a modern school of Old Testament scholars, whose investigations have resulted in a reinterpretation of Biblical terms.

The work of our author does not only represent a fruition of these investigations, but above all a challenge to all pastors who disagree with him in his interpretation of the prophetic key words. This challenge we'll not only meet by reading this volume — we gladly grant that it is though-provoking throughout — but by studying and restudying the Old Testament prophets and their Gospel messages, which give promise to a kingdom of heaven, not, however, to a kingdom of this world.

P. PETERS.

An Outline of Missions. By John Aberly. Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1945. Price, \$3.00.

This book has grown out of courses on missions given in the classroom. It "has been prepared for publication in its present form in response to a call for such a book adapted to students in theological schools". We believe the author is not mistaken in the hope that it "will also serve the needs of teachers in church schools as indeed also of the general reader". The statistics are with few exceptions from the *Interpretative Statistical Survey of the World Missions of the Christian Church* of 1938. The author acknowledges especially his indebtedness for much of the contents of the present book to the famous German scholar, the late Dr. Julius Richter, "who in his histories covered all the various areas of the world-wide mission field".

The work is divided into two parts. Preceding a general survey of the history of missions in chapters II—IX, ranging all the way from the post-apostolic days to the modern missionary movement, is chapter I on the Scriptural basis of mission work. Professor Aberly reminds us how on Pentecost the Church was endowed with the power of the Holy Ghost, how God prepared it, through events following the persecution in which Stephen suffered a martyr's death, also through the conversion of Paul and his subsequent activity, for its world-wide mission until all were ready to admit joyfully that "to the Gentiles also God had granted repentance unto life." As the home base served Antioch, lying on the trade route between the East and the West. Starting from Acts and the Epistles of Paul the author speaks of the missionary message, its methods, its motives, and its results with applications to and observation of the work as it is done in our own day.

The second and by far larger part of our book concerns itself with the different mission fields of the world of today. India, China, South-eastern Asia, Oceania, the Japanese Empire, the Near East and North Africa, Africa, Latin America are treated in this order from chapter X—XVII. The concluding chapter XVIII views methods, results and prospects. Appended are an extended bibliography and the index.

In the wake of the two great wars of the last quarter century conditions — partly due to the internment of European missionaries, partly

in consequence of an aroused racial or nationalistic consciousness unwilling to submit to any supervision by members of the white race — have arisen which have precipitated young and immature mission churches into independence. Because of their timeliness we quote the following pertinent remarks of our author: "It has been the experience of missions however that this change can be made too precipitately. While it is true that the church should become responsible for the work as soon as possible, time and instruction are needed so that the church itself may be more firmly rooted and grounded in order that it may effectively perform its great task. There has been danger, on the other hand, for this church to be kept in leading strings too long for fear that it should make some mistake that might otherwise be avoided. However both for the strengthening of the church itself and also because of its greater efficiency to do the work, wise mission methods will make it the center of its evangelistic work as rapidly as possible. With almost no exception this has been the line along which the work has developed."

This book of 306 pages is a fount of valuable information. With most of the judgements and opinions expressed by the author this reviewer finds himself in full agreement. L.

Christ, Set the World Aright! — By Walter A. Maier, Ph. D., D. D.
Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. \$1.75.

"Radio Messages of the Eleventh Lutheran Hour from New Year to the Pentecost Season." E. R.

Living With Luther. By J. M. Weidenschilling, S. T. D. Illustrations by Gustav Koenig. For the Use of Christian Schools. Published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 47 pages. Price 25 cents.

An appropriate Christmas gift for our youth. Adults will gladly pick it up and read in it. P. PETERS.

* * * *

Alle hier angegebenen Sachen können durch unser Northwestern Publishing House, 935-937 North Fourth Street, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin, bezogen werden.