

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben

— von der —

Allgemeinen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Wisconsin
und anderen Staaten.

Redigiert von der Fakultät des Ev.-Luth. Seminars
zu Chienerville, 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 43.

1946

Abhandlungen	Seite
Baccalaureate Address. N. A. Madson.....	1
Unionism. M.	9
Pastoral Table of Duties. W. Bodamer.....	26
The Church and Christian Liberty. E. Reim.....	44
Was Luther Needed. W. Dallmann.....	81
Pastoral Table of Duties. W. Bodamer.....	95
"Rebuilding A Lost Faith." H. A. Koch.....	114
The Church and Christian Liberty. E. Reim.....	128
The Natural Knowledge of God and Civic Righteousness. M.	161
Pastoral Table of Duties. W. Bodamer.....	178
The Council of the Antichrist. P. Peters.....	192
A Brief Summary of an Exegetical Study on the Length of the Days of Creation. Otto J. Eckert.....	206
Opening Address. M.	225
Calvinism: Its Essence And Its Menacing Impact Upon American Lutheran Doctrine and Practice. E. Arnold Sitz.....	232
Pastoral Table of Duties. W. Bodamer.....	257
The Blood Sacrifices of the Old Testament. E. Reim.....	272
"A Living Lutheran Theology." Geo. O. Lillegard.....	282

Berichtigungen

A Correction. Joh. P. Meyer.....	143
A Correction. Editors.....	287

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

A Statement	56
Discussion of "A Statement".....	61
"Doctrinal Content"	64
"Selective Fellowship Favored by Committee on Fellowship".....	64
Adult Instruction	65
1546 — Luther's Death — 1946.....	69
Pope's Appeal to Non-Catholics.....	71
The Reformed Church in Hungary.....	75
The Lutheran Church in Russia.....	75
Friedrich von Bodelschwingh †.....	77
Ernst Sellin †.....	77
Fellowships — or Fellowship?.....	144
Dr. Willkomm on Union.....	148
Concerning the College of Cardinals.....	149
Chicago's Mayor Kelly and Cardinal Stritch.....	152
Final Step to World Council.....	153
Uniat Church of the Ukraine.....	154
"Baptist Relief Policy".....	155
Dr. M. Willkomm †.....	210
What Modernism Will Do to a Church.....	211
Doctrinal Discussions of Lutheran Free Churches in Germany.....	212

	Seite
World Relief	213
Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel, 1945.....	215
More About the Unearthed Burial Urns.....	217
Empty Vessels in Palestinian Tombs.....	219
The Doctrinal Affirmation Revised.....	288
The Doctrinal Affirmation Doomed?.....	289
Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary.....	290
God's Word Is Not Bound.....	291
Words of Warning	292
Theological Literature and Theological Faculties in Germany.....	293
Communism's Clear-Cut Confession.....	294

Büchertisch

A. Besprechungen

The Babylonian Genesis, The Story of the Creation.....	78
The Atomic Bomb and the Word of God.....	79
Prayer Fellowship.....	157
Paying the Ransom.....	158
The Problem of Pain.....	160
The History of Christian Doctrine.....	221
Scouting in the Light of Scripture.....	221
Scouting in the Light of the Holy Scripture.....	222
The Spirit of Lent.....	223
Breakfast Table Autocrat.....	224
The New Covenant, Commonly The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.....	295
Plain Talks on Practical Truths.....	299
A Beginning Greek Book Based on the Gospel According to Mark	300
Questions That Trouble Christians.....	302
And Some Believed.....	302
Truth vs. Dogma.....	303
Edifying Discourses	303
The Boy Who Fought With Kings.....	304
Christmas	304

B. Kurze Anzeigen

Amerikanischer Kalender für deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1946	80
The Lutheran Annual 1946.....	80
What Does The Bible Say?.....	80
Instructor's Manual.....	80
Breakfast Table Autocrat.....	224
Communion Tracts	304
„Unser Glaube“.....	304
“More Than Conquerors”	304
“The Incomparable Cross”.....	304

Theologische Quartalschrift.

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

Jahrgang 43

Januar 1946

Nummer 1

Baccalaureate Address, Thiensville, Wisconsin,
December 13, 1945

Prayer

Thou Lord of the Church, who hast not only reconciled us to God by Thy blood, but hast also established a ministry of reconciliation among us, bidding us poor sinners to go out to our fellowmen with the glad tidings of salvation by grace through faith, without the deeds of the law, we thank Thee for this group of young men who now stand ready to do Thy bidding. Grant them grace by Thy Holy Spirit to believe in child-like hearts the message they are sent to proclaim, to be living epistles of its saving truths before the face of all men, and finally to hear that most benignant of all blessings: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord." Hear our prayer for Thine own name's sake, O Christ of God! Amen.

Text: Acts 20, 28

Fellow Redeemed, grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

Your days of study at this "school of the prophets," my dear graduates, are now at an end. It is therefore meet and salutary that the occasion be observed in a fitting manner. As you are about to leave these sacred haunts and go to your various fields of labor in the Lord's vineyard, you will want a word of fraternal admonition addressed to you as you go forth.

But you will want that word to be in conformity with the apostolic admonition: "If any man speak, let him speak

as the oracles of God." 1 Pet. 4, 11. For even as our Smalcald Articles teach that "the Word of God shall establish articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel," so our dear Lutheran Church of the unaltered Augsburg Confession stands committed to the principle that its pulpits are not to be desecrated by human whims or man-made speculations. It shall teach those articles of faith on the basis of God's infallible Word.

But even as that Word "describes all conditions of life, and gives utterance to all desires and emotions of the soul, having a song of triumph for the victor and a wail of defeat for the vanquished, sparkling with the fervor and gladness of youth, celebrating the strength and glory of manhood, and bewailing the sorrows and infirmities of old age, exulting in the mighty deeds of kings and conquerors, sympathizing with the poor and lowly, lifting up the fallen and delivering the oppressed," so it also has a word which in particular is meant for an occasion such as this. For when Paul addresses these words to the Ephesian elders by the seashore at Miletus on his final journey to Jerusalem, he is speaking to such as have been given a most momentous, but at the same time, a most blessed task — the saving of immortal souls. We can do no better then on this occasion than, on the basis of our text and by guidance of the Holy Spirit, to seek answer to the question:

"What is the Meaning of our Ministry?"

1. You are, first of all, to *take heed unto yourselves*, and to *all the flock*, over the which the *Holy Ghost hath made you overseers*.

Yours is not a man-made calling, but one into which the Spirit of God Himself has called you. And if but all who have been entrusted with the ministry of reconciliation were ever mindful of that calling, there would be fewer Elmer Gantrys disgracing the ministry and more fearless Martin Luthers holding forth in the power of God's everlasting Gospel of grace.

Paul's first concern is this, that you are to take heed *unto yourselves*. What does the apostle mean by that admonition?

Does he merely mean to say that you are to lead a morally clean life, and thus win the plaudits of your fellow-men? You might be the rankest of Pharisees, and still qualify under that category. No, the apostle knows that there are more insidious foes to be met in the ministry. He has no doubt in mind what he later on writes to Timothy in that selfsame city: "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. 4, 16.

It is not so difficult so to live before your fellow-men that they shall marvel at your piety. Every nun that walks down the street is proof of that. But it is difficult so to live by humble child like faith in the merits of Christ alone that you, even as a Paul, shall everlastingly be determined not to know anything for yourself or among your fellow-men, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. 1 Cor. 2, 1. It is difficult to live by that profession when you are met on every hand by the alluring voice that there are other things needful unto salvation, so that it would no longer be true: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3, 28. Easy as it is to utter these words with your lips, just as difficult is it to make them living realities in your life. For, as Luther rightly observes, there is nothing which dies harder in us than the old Adam. In fact, it would be impossible to believe the truth of Romans 3, 28, unless it had been given you from above. It is as true today as it was when the Savior pronounced His blessing upon Peter: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 16, 17.

As the high priest of old had to "offer up sacrifice first for his own sins" (Heb. 7, 27), so you, my dear young theologians, must ever be mindful of the fact that you are sinners in daily need of that unmerited grace which you proclaim to others. For unless you live by that grace, and not by works, you are at best but hirelings who shall be put to shame in the day of final judgment.

It is told of one of the most beloved pastors of Norway during the past century, who was by nature of a rather

melancholy disposition, but who always preached in a most comforting and cheerful way, that when he was once asked how it was that he could always preach so cheerfully, he replied: "My good man, do you not realize that I am preaching to myself?" And that, my dear graduates, you must not fail to do. You will have need of it, not only for your own good, but for the good of your hearers as well. And it will not hurt your congregation to note that you are yourself reaching out with a trembling empty hand (the ORGANON LEPTIKON, as our fathers were wont to call it) after the grace which you so freely proclaim to them.

But the apostle tells the elders, even as he is telling you today, that you must take heed unto "*all the flock*". Yes, there will be many a noble Anna und Lois and Eunice in your congregations, many an humble centurion, to whom it will be as easy to minister as it is to pluck the ripened fruit from the low-hanging branches in the apple orchard. But there will also be those to whom it will not be so easy to minister. There may even be spiteful souls, who seem bent upon making life bitter for their pastor. What are you to do then? Are you to get away from it all by simply leaving the flock? Not if you but stop to think on who it is that has placed you there. "*Over whom the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.*" And the Holy Ghost makes no mistakes. He may try you as by fire, to be sure, but do not "despise the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou are rebuked of him: For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." Heb. 12, 5.6. No, with Olearius you must

"Learn to mark God's wondrous dealing
With the people that He loves;
When His chastening hand they're feeling,
Then their faith the strongest proves:
God is nigh, and notes their tears,
Though He answers not, He hears;
Pray with faith, for though He try you,
No good thing can God deny you."

And as for fruits, do not be overmuch concerned about seeing immediate results of your ministry. "Something big

always happens when you minister in sincerity and truth of your Lord and Savior." You are not in the ministry for your own comfort and convenience, but for quite another purpose. And that brings us to the second thought in our text:

2. *"To feed the church of God."* When Peter admonishes us: "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby," 1 Pet. 2, 2, when he, in the very last words we have from his pen, again urges us to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 3, 18), he does so because he realizes that there is need of spiritual food, and especially of God's grace. This does not mean that you are not to preach the law. No, that must be preached in all its damning enormity, as Peter himself preached it on the day of Pentecost, so that men may see their lost condition, and feel the pressing load of sin. But you must never preach the law because you find your delight in wounding sore. When you preach the law make certain that you apply its exacting demands upon yourself first of all. Ask yourself: "Where would I be if God had revealed Himself in no other way than through the law?" You would be in the same condition Israel of old was when it cried unto Moses: "Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die." Ex. 20, 19. For the law offers no surcease from sin, it never gives life, it never heals. No, "the law worketh wrath." Rom. 4, 15. "The letter killeth." 2 Cor. 3, 6.

It is so easy for us, especially in the early years of our ministry, to imagine that we are going to reach our objective by thundering away with the fulminations of the law. We are going to scare men into being good. But is not that because we forget for the time being: "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh"? Rom. 8, 3. Paul imagined that he had kept the law while he was still a Pharisee. He tells us: "I was alive without the law once." But what does he add? "But when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." Rom. 7, 8. 9. When it dawned upon his famished soul that he had not even begun to understand the law, his mouth was stopped, and he stood guilty before God. For it will be true while the earth remaineth, in the words of Speratus:

“What God doth in His law demand,
 No man to Him doth render;
 Before His bar all guilty stand,
 His law speaks curse in thunder;
 The law demands a perfect heart,
 We were defiled in every part,
 And lost was our condition.”

Or, to make it a bit more personal with Martin Luther:

“My good works so imperfect were,
 They had no power to aid me;
 My will God’s judgments could not bear,
 Yea, prone to evil made me;
 Grief drove me to despair, and I
 Had nothing left me but to die;
 To hell I fast was sinking.”

And it will not be until you sense the dread horror of the law that you will become true preachers of it. Moses sensed it, and Scripture tells us that “Moses was very meek, above all men that were upon the face of the earth.” Num. 12, 3. Now we can understand the meaning of his prayer for Israel dancing around the golden calf: “If thou wilt forgive their sin —, and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of the book which thou hast written.” Ex. 32, 32. Moses had been trained in the school of affliction. And that meekness, that humility, which ever characterized that leader of God’s chosen people, is a humility you must seek to emulate with all your heart, if you are to grace the profession into which you are now about to enter. You know what Luther says about humility. He calls it *the mother of all virtues*. If you have not learned to be humble, you do not know what it means to be a Christian. Not the humility which is ever telling the world how humble it is, for true humility never speaks of its virtue. No, it must be the humility described by Tyron Edwards in his inimitable words:

“Humility, the fairest, loveiest flower
 That grew in Paradise, and the first to die,
 Has seldom flourished since on mortal soil.
 It is so frail, so delicate a thing.
 And they who venture to believe it theirs,
 Prove by that single thought they have it not.”

But as ambassadors for Christ, you can well afford to be humble. For what does Scripture itself have to say about this heaven-born virtue? "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. 2, 5-8.

And that brings us to the final thought of our text:

3. "*Which he hath purchased with his own blood.*" It is the preaching of the cross which must ever remain paramount in your ministry. For without that cross, there would be no story worth telling. Paul realized that. So when he came to the very sophisticated city of Corinth, he did not care to enter upon a discussion of the merits or demerits of the conflicting philosophies then prevalent there. He knew, as every true minister of Christ today knows, that no soul will ever be saved through mere philosophy. The real problems in life are not solved in the realm of the *intellect*, but in the realm of the *spirit*. And it is therefore that the erstwhile Pharisee from Tarsus now frankly tells the Corinthians: "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." 1 Cor. 2, 2. He had, through that crucified, but resurrected and ascended Christ, experienced the grace of God, a grace which was not made perfect through Paul's strength, but through his weakness. And he can tell the world: "Most gladly will I therefore rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." 2 Cor. 12, 9.

Let the unbelieving world scoff at the simplicity and apparent weakness of this word of the cross. But when God Himself has told us that "it is the power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1, 16), that should be sufficient. For it is still true that "the foolishness of God is wiser than man; and the weakness of God is stronger than man." 1 Cor. 1, 25. Be neither ashamed or afraid to tell whomsoever it may be: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him

should not perish, but have eternal life." Joh. 3, 14. 15. And remember, there is nothing which this sin-sick, confused, and disillusioned world so much needs as that comfort which the God of all comfort expects each and every one of you to proclaim — and that unconditionally. Let there be no ifs or buts about the Gospel you preach. Tell every repentant sinner today, as Paul told the Philippian jailor: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Acts 16, 31.

The righteousness of God has now been revealed through the Gospel. It was this statement of Paul in Romans 1, 17, which for so long troubled Luther, but which finally became his most treasured Scripture truth: "The just shall live by faith." For the righteousness of which Paul here speaks is not the righteousness which God demands of us, but the righteousness which His Son has won for us, and now offers us as a free gift. Gift — there's the word! It is that which the apostle calls it in his epistle to the very congregation whose elders he is addressing in our text: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the *gift* of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast." Eph. 2, 8. 9.

And since the redeemed before the throne shall sing that new song: "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation" (Rev. 5, 9), let every soul which is permitted to hear your proclamation of the word of the cross be constrained to confess with Schröder:

"Jesus, in Thy cross are centered
 All the marvels of Thy grace;
 Thou, my Savior, once has entered
 Through Thy blood the holy place:
 Thy sacrifice holy there wrought my redemption,
 From Satan's dominion I now have exemption;
 The way is now free to the Father's high throne,
 Where I may approach Him in Thy name alone."

Amen.

N. A. MADSON.

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

(Conclusion)

IV. Modern Posterns to Unionism

It is hardly to be feared that unionism in the coarse form in which the Old Testament Jews practiced it with idolaters will be admitted into the Lutheran Church of our land, specifically into the Synodical Conference; although, as the controversy over the Chinese Term Question shows, the danger is not altogether absent.

It is furthermore not likely that, after the pattern of the Prussian Union, joint services might be held, or joint church work be undertaken, with churches of the Reformed Confession. Yet that we dare not relent in prayerful watching, that the danger may be more imminent than we realize, is forcefully brought to our attention by a paragraph of the Pittsburgh Agreement (between the A. L. C. and the U. L. C. A.), which reads: "That Pastors and Congregations shall not practice *indiscriminate* pulpit and altar fellowship with Pastors and churches of other denominations, whereby doctrinal differences are ignored or virtually made matters of indifference. Especially shall no religious fellowship whatsoever be practiced with such individuals and groups as are not *basically* evangelical." Note the wide latitude given members of the U. L. C. A. and of the A. L. C. for practicing church fellowship with "Pastors and churches of other denominations", that is, with individuals and groups who by their membership in heterodox churches publicly sponsor a false confession and thereby a denial of the truth, provided only that the basic truths of the Gospel are not surrendered. Pulpit and altar fellowship practiced under such conditions, whether discriminately or indiscriminately, could hardly be called anything but unionistic.

The danger of unionism in the forms just indicated may not be very acute at present. Yet we must ever be on our guard against more subtle forms of this evil. We must now, however, content ourselves with briefly listing a few danger points.

Due to the war many foreign mission fields were separated from their sponsoring mother church. Who should provide for these "orphaned" missions? They are not in fellowship with the Lutheran churches of America, and, in addition, the Lutheran church bodies of America, for valid reasons, are not in fellowship with one another. It was generally recognized that full cooperation among the Lutheran bodies in America for coming to the assistance of the orphaned missions was out of question. Then it was suggested that the different fields might be allocated to different synods for support. This was called co-ordination. The idea of co-ordination, as distinguished from co-operation, was then extended to other fields, particularly to the operating of service centers. The purpose was: "in order to avoid duplication." This "first working agreement" was hailed in many quarters as marking "a notable milestone" in Lutheran church history, and the question was asked, why not come to some similar agreement with reference to home mission work in order to avoid "shameful duplication of effort" and "waste of funds"?

Here one may well ask, What is shameful duplication? When the difference in the doctrinal (confessional) position of two Lutheran church bodies is sufficient to warrant separate organizations, and to keep them separate, can one really speak of *duplication* of effort? Are the efforts really the same in essence? They may be the same as far as the outward form is concerned, but must not the one party consider the efforts of the other as an adulteration of the Gospel? Where is the duplication if one considers the work of the other as more or less harmful? If a church body is convinced from the bottom of the heart that it possesses the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; if it rejoices in and lives by the truth which it possesses; if it is grateful to God for having graciously endowed it with the truth: will it not be urged to confess the cherished truth and to guard it scrupulously

against any pollution with error? If it regards the efforts of a church body with which for conscience' sake it cannot maintain fraternal relations as a duplication of its own, would that not evince an unpardonable indifference toward the God-given truth?

What is the difference between co-ordination and co-operation? We may be able to formulate satisfactory definitions, definitions that will stand up under the most rigid tests of logic. But is church work, co-operation in church work, co-ordination of church work merely a matter of logical definition? Is it not the expression of a life, a new life, a life created by a special act of the Holy Ghost on the basis of Christ's bitter suffering and death? Here is not the place to discuss at any length the proper function of logic in connection with our faith. Suffice it to say that our logical thinking plays merely the role of a receiving organ, it provides the channel through which the divine truths flow into our hearts. When any other function is assigned to the laws of logic, they will simply have the effect of law, which, as Paul expresses it, is to kill. Church life in every form must be controlled by the law of faith, which is obedience to the truth by which it lives. Fine drawn distinctions according to the laws of logic may dull the spiritual sensibilities to such an extent that a person will confuse doctrinal indifference with evangelical methods and condemn as legalistic a holy awe before the truth.

That is the spirit of unionism.

We need not spend much time on co-operation in externals. We readily admit that there is such a thing, something which may be perfectly legitimate and harmless. A few actual cases may serve to illustrate.

When legislation threatening the welfare of the parochial school system was pending in a certain state, a Lutheran Pastor and a Catholic Father jointly pleaded the case with the legislators. They based their arguments, not on the religious question involved, but on the constitutional principles pertaining to the case. In other words, they were joined together, not as Lutheran and Catholic, but as plain American citizens,

where there is neither Christian nor infidel, Lutheran or Catholic.

There was a small group of Lutherans in a town and a similar group of Reformed people. Neither group was strong enough to build a house of worship of its own. They built one jointly, discussing the plans, prorating the cost, and apportioning the time during which each group might use the building — purely external things, all matters pertaining to the divine service themselves being left strictly to each group. Similar things happen when in mission fields Lutherans rent the buildings of non-Lutheran congregations, or theater buildings, lodge halls, and the like.

Is there a "community of interest and purpose" in such undertakings? Superficially it might seem so. But if this term is stretched to include the spiritual interest and purpose of the undertaking an emphatic no must be the answer. The Catholic Father certainly was not interested in safeguarding Lutheran education as such, nor the Lutheran Pastor in upholding that of the Catholic Church. Both were united in their adherence to the American principle of separation of church and state, from which each one expected the benefit of freedom of action for his own church, which his church could not enjoy without granting and protecting similar benefits to the other as a joint beneficiary of the American system. When in the Bennett-Law fight of some fifty-odd years ago Dr. Ernst was approached by Catholics in the interest of a joint campaign, he declined because of the false impression it would create among the people. So he explained to his Sophomore Class, of which your essayist was a member. With the necessary changes the foregoing applies also to the building of a common church edifice by two congregations of different confessions.

But the thing assumes an altogether different aspect when Lutheran bodies which cannot agree confessionally cooperate in providing for the spiritual welfare of our people in the armed forces, in providing for orphaned missions — if even only to the extent of allocating the fields — in eleemosynary endeavors, in the dedication of service centers, and the like.

When in a dedicatory service a member of one church body offers the prayer, one of another body reads a Scripture lesson, a third delivers the address, a fourth pronounces the benediction — all of this according to a prearranged program — one must close both his eyes to the facts if he still will consider this as legitimate and harmless cooperation in externals. Or is this cooperation in mere externals when soldiers from different Lutheran bodies which are not confessionally united attend, by a general invitation, a common Communion service, announcing themselves by the signing of a Communion card countersigned by a pastor of the synod to which the communicant belongs, irrespective of whether he himself was the administrant, or a pastor of the other synod? Is there any difference, except one of degree, between such a Communion and one in a church of the Prussian Union?

What are Lutheran charities, orphanages, old people's homes, hospitals and the like? Are they merely secular agencies for the physical relief of suffering? Evidently the apostles at Jerusalem, under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit, did not look upon their endeavors of caring for the widows and other needy persons in the church as secular work. When deacons were to be chosen for this work they mentioned as one of the required qualifications of the candidates that they be "full of the Holy Ghost." Organized eleemosynary work is a form in which Christians practice their love as a fruit of the spirit. It definitely is a phase of their sanctification. The motivation is "faith which worketh by love", in a manner which is compatible with and flows from love. We have so far left entirely out of consideration the special mission work which is ordinarily carried on in connection with such institutions, the devotional services, the educational work, the care of souls, and the like. Collaboration with secular institutions and organizations of other church bodies can hardly be regarded as cooperation in externals, it is cooperation in spiritual matters by such as are not united in their confession.

Another form in which unionism threatens the Lutheran Church today became prominent when the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, about a year ago, adopted so-called

"Selective Fellowship" as its policy. Selective fellowship means the practice of pulpit and altar fellowship by individual pastors and congregations of one synod with individual pastors and congregations of another synod with which their own synod is unable to establish doctrinal agreement, provided the individuals in question do find themselves in such agreement as concerns both doctrine and practice. In other words, fellowship is practiced by individuals across synodical boundary lines, where the respective synods themselves cannot do it nor sanction it.

The resolution adopted by the Norwegian Lutheran Church reads as follows: "Because of the confidence born of association, conference and cooperation through many years, we extend our hand of fellowship to all American Lutherans who adhere to the historical standards and confessions of the Lutheran Church. We find their doctrinal declarations to be in essential accord with our own. We believe no additional theses, statements, or agreements are necessary for fellowship among American Lutherans. Wherever our congregations and pastors find those ties that bind Lutheran Christians, and that teaching and practice conform to official declarations, they may in good conscience practice selective fellowship both in worship and work."

One may get a clear picture of the import of this policy from the resolutions adopted by the A. L. C. at Sandusky. We take the liberty to present them here.

"The convention decided that the time was not ripe either to adopt or to reject any proposal concerning selective fellowship and agreed to submit the following resolution to the Conferences and Districts of the Church for study.

"*Whereas* it is evident that complete fellowship with either the U. L. C. A. or the Missouri Synod cannot be attained in the immediate future; and — *Whereas* many of our pastors and congregations desire a fellowship with those pastors and congregations of the U. L. C. A. and the Missouri Synod whose doctrine and practice are in full accord with our own; and — *Whereas* the practice of such a selective fellowship is in line with Scripture and may promote Lutheran unity; therefore be it — *Resolved*: That our pastors and con-

gregations may have pulpit and altar fellowship with those pastors and congregations of the U. L. C. A. and the Missouri Synod whose doctrine and practice are in accord with the Pittsburgh Agreement and the Brief Statement and Declaration respectively, but that there shall be no pulpit and altar fellowship with those pastors and congregations of the U. L. C. A. and the Missouri Synod whose doctrine and practice are not in accord with the documents named above."

This proposed resolution carries the remark that selective fellowship "is in line with Scripture." A church paper (*Lutheran Herald* for March 20, 1945) copied a fivefold challenge from another paper, of which we reproduce the first and second: "Please quote a Bible passage in which Selective Fellowship is forbidden. —Please quote a Bible passage which gives to any man-made organization such as a synod the power to prevent any pastor or congregation from complete and wholehearted spiritual association so long as they are united in doctrine and practice on the basis of the Scripture."

If the premise expressed in the words "*any man-made organization such as a synod*" were correct, if a synod were nothing but a man-made organization with a purely human basis and human ties and human objectives, one might say to any member: Practice selective fellowship, and God bless you. But since synods are associations of Christians, joined together in a common confession, for the purpose of doing the work of Christ's kingdom with the means which He Himself provided, under the guidance and with the power which the Holy Ghost supplies, the above challenge does not seem quite so formidable any more.

Synods are churches, orthodox or heterodox, confessing the truth in its purity or interspersed with error. The members have not only financial obligations toward one another, but confessional obligations. As long as a person is affiliated with a synod with an impure confession he shares the responsibility for the error. He can meet that responsibility only by testifying in word and, if need be, in deed by withdrawing from his synod. But maintaining his membership and at the same time fellowshiping with members of a church that has a different confession is an inconsistency, an inner lack of

truthfulness, which as such cannot but lead to a compromising of the Gospel in one way or another. It would seem that persons who are in earnest about a synod's confession, be it their own or another, would for that reason shrink back from selective fellowship, while on the other hand, a readiness for it would indicate an indifference toward synodical confessions.

We cannot leave this matter of selective fellowship without calling attention to another point in the challenge: "Quote a Bible passage." That sounds as though it breathed deep reverence for the Bible, yet if taken at face value it would do the greatest dishonor to God's Book by the atomistic treatment it suggests, reducing the Bible to a collection of proof texts. The word "selective fellowship" does not occur in the Bible, it might be difficult to find even the term; but the elements that make up this sort of procedure are clearly condemned by the Scripture. What, to cite an analogous case, if some one should challenge us, Quote a Bible passage in which Freemasonry is forbidden! The Scriptures provide us with the bread of life and warn us against the poison of the world; and then admonish us: "Prove all things", and, "Try the spirits."

We look at another danger that is threatening to poison the minds of our Christians today, that of Scoutism. We are not concerned with the movement in general but only with its influence as to unionism. We readily grant that the leaders officially refrain from forcing the attendance at union services on any member of the organization. We also admit that they emphatically declare that the instruction of a boy concerning his relation to God must be left strictly to the churches. Yet, if we bear in mind that unionism is not chiefly a matter of attending mixed services, but rather an attitude of the heart, it may not be denied that unionism has the effect of fostering a spirit of unionism. Scoutism demands that every Scout do his duty toward God. Which God? Scoutism does not say. It may be the Supreme Being of the Masons or the Triune God of the Christians. Scoutism is not interested, so long as the boy acknowledges some god and pledges to do his duty toward him. What that duty may imply, Scoutism leaves to the various religious organizations to define. Scoutism itself

merely strives to develop the boy's character, his "immortal self", in which development belief in a god plays an important part. Scoutism proclaims that the work of the different religious bodies, any religious body, serves the carrying out of the Scout program, and at the same time promises that its own program will materially aid all religious organizations in carrying on their educational work. Scoutism assumes that such an integration can be effected with benefit to both parties, because it maintains that Scoutism as such represents what is basic to all religions, while the various bodies differ merely in some details which they may think necessary to add. This is the spirit which Scoutism naturally engenders with its insisting on belief in a god, but allowing all forms of worshipping God to be of equal value. That is the spirit of unionism. Add to this that Scoutism, because in its concept of God it cannot, at best, rise above a natural theism, will in its concept of man hold a Pelagian, at least a Semipelagian, view. Scout leaders proceed in their educational work on the assumption that the boy is inherently good and can develop his own character by his native ability.

How can Scoutism with its practical declaration that all religions are of equal value and that similarly every education, whether based on man's innate goodness or on the grace of God alone, is equally effective for true character building, produce anything but a unionistic view of life, even though all unionistic practices are studiously avoided?

Not long ago a privately published church paper deplored the fact that when the National Lutheran Council announced a special prayer of American Lutheranism for God's blessing on the San Francisco Conference it excluded one-third of the Lutherans in America, while it is certain that the omitted third also "remembered the San Francisco Conference in their prayers." The paper then continued: "Why can't we say so? What would be wrong if our voice were joined with the National Lutheran Council in such statements? Certainly no unionism involved! . . . The unexplained silence of the missing one-third is serious!" Yes, isn't it too bad? We pray just as loyally as do any of the rest for God's blessing on our government and its efforts, but nobody gets to know

about it except Him "which seeth in secret." Cannot, in spite of a synodical resolution, something be done about it to let also the public know? Of course, minus unionism! But it certainly could not be branded as unionistic if we merely stand together with others on the same street corner to parade our prayers.

Other forms of lurking unionism might be mentioned, but these should be sufficient to put us on our guard.

V. How to Fortify Ourselves

Although this really ought to be the most important part of our study we need not devote much space and time to it. Our investigation of pertinent facts and the historical background and setting of some unionistic movements was not primarily to serve the purpose of gathering interesting data, but to secure information and insight that would at once fortify our hearts against the allurements of this phenomenon. A very brief summary will now be sufficient.

The key is furnished by Paul in his instruction for the proper treatment of weak brethren and in the manner in which he dealt with the weak and with their seducers in Galatia. To the Romans he wrote: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations" (ch. 14, 1). And to the Galatians: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself lest thou also be tempted. Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ" (ch. 6, 1. 2).

Unionism, which likes to boast of tolerance and of the Gospel spirit of love, really is born out of a law spirit. It is an element inseparable from true love that it is zealous of the truth and intolerant of error. Genuine love cannot permit the suppression or concealment of truth, nor can it enter on any compromise with error. In fighting strenuously for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, love is really fighting for its own existence. Love is born of the truth of God and is nourished by the truth. Withhold the truth from love, and it must die; compromise the truth with error, and love will languish. Just as natural as it therefore

is for true love to be intolerant of error, just so natural it is for unionism to be intolerant toward any one who dares to question its propriety. Being a "love" not nourished by the pure and wholesome food of God's truth, its vaunted tolerance cannot help but turn intolerant.

Love which is living by the truth must fight for the truth — but according to the law of love — not with "doubtful disputations", as Paul warns us. Among the people who accept the Bible as the truth of God given to us by inspiration there are chiefly two ways of using the Bible. There are some who, consciously or unconsciously, look upon the Bible as a book of definitions. There God has defined the various doctrines which He wants us to hold, and there He has defined the rules of conduct He wants us to observe. In that way the Scribes and Pharisees regarded the Word of God. They accepted every syllable and letter of it as binding, filled with divine authority. In lawyer fashion they studied it. They thoroughly analysed every concept they found in it. They carefully counted all the commandments which they could distinguish — 613 in all — and then argued the question about the "great" commandment of the Law. To what extremes they went in analysing the law may be seen from their classification of work which they considered as forbidden on the Sabbath Day. They divided all work into 39 classes — forty less one — which we might think was carrying the thing pretty far. But they were not satisfied, this was still much too general; they called these 39 classes of work "fathers", and went out to discover 39 "sons" for each one of them — a total of 1,521 different kinds of work forbidden on the Sabbath.

But while thus in a hair-splitting way they analysed the concepts of the Law, they in a similar lawyer-like fashion looked also for possible loopholes, for ways to circumvent the law while in appearance obeying its letter to the nth degree. To illustrate we shall briefly look at a few points concerning work on the Sabbath. We are all familiar with the expression which occurs in Acts 1, 12: "a sabbath day's journey", the distance a Jew was permitted to travel on a Sabbath, about 2,000 paces. (Our English word "mile", from the Latin "mille", means 1,000 paces). It was considered as within the

law to walk 2,000 paces from one's home town in any direction and back. Now if a Jew at sunset on Friday found himself 4,000 paces from his home, he might select a very definite spot half-way between where he was at the time and his home, and declare that spot to be his home for the Sabbath. Then he might walk to that spot, a Sabbath Day's journey, and from there continue to his regular home. And every Scribe and Pharisee would ask, "What's wrong with that?" — Another case. Jesus once charged His enemies that they, while condemning Him for healing a sick man on the Sabbath, would themselves not hesitate to lift a sheep out of a pit into which it had fallen — on the Sabbath (Matth. 12, 11). They had a way of doing it without breaking the Sabbath. To tie an ordinary knot was unlawful, that was a forbidden kind of work; but to tie one's girdle was not work, that was a legitimate act of dressing one's self. So they took a girdle and "dressed" the sheep, and then took the girdle to themselves with the sheep attached to it. Again: "What's wrong with that?"

When we consider these methods of the Scribes and Pharisees, do we wonder why Jesus charged them that they "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel" (Matth. 23, 24)? They were very careful to "pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin", while they — lightheartedly — "omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith" (v. 22). When such methods are employed, how can consciences be guided properly? When the blind attempt to lead the blind, both will fall into the pit. Paul very properly warns against doubtful disputations when dealing with the weak. They will never set the consciences free, rather, they will entangle them all the more in the meshes of legalism. The result we may observe in the Pharisees themselves, who, while on the one hand they were fanatic traditionalists, on the other, without any compunctions, sought out ways and means of circumventing the Law.

Here are pitfalls which we must most carefully avoid if we wish to take a sound stand against unionism. If we permit ourselves to be guided by such doubtful disputations, we may on the one hand be led to fellowship people of a different

spirit — or is it a different spirit? — while on the other we hesitate, perhaps refuse the hand of fellowship to some who are truly brethren in confession, but are still afflicted with some weakness which no one deplors more than they do themselves and against which they desire help from their brethren.

There is another way of approaching the Bible than the one just sketched, one of regarding the Bible as a compendium of God-given definitions of faith and rules of conduct. The other way is that we receive the Bible as the Book of Life, as the bread from heaven, as the food of our soul.

While the Bible certainly does not mince words when speaking about our sins, it does not excuse our sins nor allow mitigating circumstances, it does not extenuate, but in a straight-forward manner castigates their heinousness: yet it has comforting words for the sinner. It assures him that the Lord laid all of his sins on Jesus, and made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin. It comforts the sinner with the promise that in Christ there is righteousness for us. When God raised Christ from the dead, whom He had condemned to taste the agony of hell because of our sins, He thereby pronounced Him free from all His sins and guilt, which in reality were our sins and guilt. In fact, He pronounced us free from all our guilt. Our justification, the justification of every sinner, was achieved in the death of Jesus and publicly attested by His resurrection from the dead. It is now being announced to us in the Gospel for us to accept and enjoy in faith.

This Gospel of free justification is a power of God which makes entirely new men out of us. It takes away fear and despair, and fills our hearts with peace and hopeful joy. "Being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5, 1). There is a new life pulsating in our veins. What is the source of this life? It is inseparably connected with the word of the Gospel. It was born out of the Gospel and is nourished by the Gospel. As long as we are connected with the Gospel this life thrives; take away the Gospel, and this life begins to fade out.

For that reason we love the Gospel. It proves its glorious power on us by creating us into new beings. We have tasted

its sweetness. We accepted in faith its great promise of God's free justification, and we were not disappointed. We received justification. The Gospel was true in its greatest announcement. It cannot deceive us in other points. It cannot deceive us in what it says about itself, when it claims to be in every part, in every one of its statements, great or small, the very Word of God, given by inspiration. Yes, its creative, its life-giving power proves that it cannot be anything less.

Because this is our attitude, created in us by the Holy Spirit through the Word, we are extremely jealous of this Word. We are eager to hear it, because by it we live, and we earnestly resist any attempt to alter it, to add to it or to diminish from it, or to treat any part of it as indifferent. Remembering our own weakness and God's patience with our infirmities, we ourselves are made meek over against weak brethren, to bear with their weakness; but, on the other hand, realizing the utter dependence of our faith in the Word, we shun every semblance of commerce with such as manifest a different spirit over against the Word, lest we lose our precious possession.

We realize that not all matters presented in the Scriptures are of equal importance for our faith; some things may even be only very remotely connected with our faith. Yet for that, we ourselves do not treat any part of the Scriptures as indifferent, nor do we connive if others attempt to do so. Since it is our God who justified us who is speaking to us in the Scriptures, every word that He said means more to us than heaven and earth.

Here, then, we have the answer to our question of how we may fortify our hearts against the dangers of unionism: not by doubtful disputations, but by holding fast the Gospel which we have been taught, knowing that therein we have eternal life. Only by feeding our faith daily from the Word of God, by drawing from it daily new life and joy as children of God, shall we be enabled to hold the proper position of the church of God, affected neither by traditionalism nor by syncretism.

We may grant that not all portions of the Scriptures, nor every individual statement contained in them, are of equal importance for our faith, nor of equal importance at all times.

The genealogies, for instance, in First Chronicles or in Ezra, may have little to say to the common Christian today, but they were very refreshing food for the faith of God's children in their day and time. The same holds good with reference to other historical remarks. And it would constitute a gross disregard for God's wisdom if because of this apparent insignificance for us we considered them as less divine than others, or if we confessed them in word but denied them in deed by practicing fellowship with such as so hold them. For the sake of our Christian faith we accept every word of the Bible as being of divine origin, whether we understand its importance or not.

A little seeming digression may be permitted, to show of what tremendous, what vital importance some historical remark may be, which we at a superficial glance might be tempted to consider merely as more or less interesting. Abraham had two sons, Isaac from his wife Sarah, and Ishmael from her slave girl Hagar. What nourishment for our faith does this story contain? Paul says, Very much. In fact, he introduces this story as the climax, as clinching his argument against the Judaizers, Gal. 4, 21ff. When he says, "Which things are an allegory", some people feel that they must apologize for him, because an allegory is not a legitimate way of interpreting the Scriptures. But in this way they not only do Paul a great injustice, but they show that they themselves have looked at his words only very superficially. In place of a lengthy description of an allegory in the accepted meaning of the term, let us look at a concrete example. In Dt. 14, 8, the Jews are forbidden to eat the flesh of swine. This is interpreted in the Epistle of Barnabas, ch. X, 3, allegorically to mean the following: "You shall *not consort*, he means, *with men who are like swine*, that is to say, when they have plenty they forget the Lord, but when they are in want they recognize the Lord, just as the swine when it eats does not know its master, but when it is hungry it cries out, and after receiving food is again silent." Thus an allegory is reading an altogether different meaning into a text from the one the words themselves convey. An allegory substitutes for the natural sense of the words, which the inter-

preter does not like, some sense which he has drawn from his own imagination, and on account of which he prides himself with the possession of a deeper than ordinary insight. Paul does not claim any special insight for himself in this case, but rather blames the Galatians for negligence in not reading the story of Abraham's two sons correctly: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" (v. 21).

He then, and that is our present interest in the matter, does not substitute a different meaning for the words of Moses, but leaves the facts of the story as they are, pointing out, however, that these very facts vividly illustrate the truth of a Law-free Gospel, for which he is contending. All that is required to see this sense of the facts and to feel its force is to *hear* the story, that is, mark the natural meaning of the words and carefully note the context. When that is done with an open mind, without adding to the words or subtracting from them, then every little historical remark, be it seemingly ever so insignificant, will strengthen our faith, even in a case where we may be unable to find its original significance, or are perhaps confronted with an insoluble puzzle. It will fill our hearts with holy awe and reverent joy for the precious Word of our loving Father in heaven. It will guard us against indifference as well as against granting license to any one so to treat it.

To sum up, we cannot ward off unionism by passing resolutions and legislating against it, nor by making logical distinctions and in general applying the Scriptures as a code of definitions, but only by approaching the Scriptures as a starved person would approach a well-set table to still his hunger and to regain his strength. Only in this way can we defeat the spirit of unionism which is lurking in our own hearts, and only so can we strengthen the souls of our members that they stand firm and unyielding over against its insidious allurements, and only so can we with due patience care for the weak ones and help them to grow up to a more mature understanding.

But all the while we remember that "with might of ours can naught be done." We may plant, we may water, but it is God alone who can give the increase. While we repentantly

confess that we have often failed on our part and well deserve that God withdraw His Spirit from us and leave us to our doom, yet on the basis of His grace and promise we kneel before His throne and implore His forgiveness and further guidance and protection. To remain uncontaminated by the spirit of unionism must be a matter of constant and humble prayer. A simple child of God pleading with our heavenly Father will achieve more with his prayers for the protection of the church than all its most eminent leaders can with combined efforts, which are valueless without God's blessing. The most important battles are fought, and the most decisive victories are won against unionism in the secrecy of our closets (Matth. 6, 6).

And then, having implored His aid, and trusting in His power alone, let us humbly and with confidence apply the means which He has given us also as a reenforcement against unionism, His mighty Word. Let us apply it in the spirit of Luther, with a quotation or two from whose sermons during the riots at Wittenberg we close our study. "I'll preach," he said, "I'll speak, I'll write, but I'll coerce no one nor compel him by force." And again (in a free translation): "I opposed the indulgences and other Romish abominations, but never by force. I just applied the Word of God. I preached and wrote, not a thing more. Then while I was sleeping, or refreshing myself with a social drink together with my colleagues, the Word achieved the defeat of the Pope, something that no prince or emperor ever succeeded in doing before. *I did nothing, the Word did all.* If I had used force, I might have turned Germany into a shambles, and yet would have achieved nothing. Then the devil would have snickered at our folly. But it hurts him when we apply only the Word and leave the effect to it alone. It is all-powerful, it takes the hearts captive. When once the hearts are won, abuses will fall by themselves."

God grant us the spirit, the courage and faith of Luther.

Pastoral Table of Duties

According to the Pastoral Letters

IV. The Work of the Pastor

This article takes us to the very heart of the Pastoral Table of Duties, namely to the question: What is the work of the pastor? What is *the* task of his office compared with which every other duty of his office is secondary? The answer is simply and clearly stated: "Preach the word." 2 Tim. 4, 2. Three short words, but into them the Holy Spirit puts everything God looks for in a pastor, whom He, God Himself, has called to be the shepherd of the flock which He has entrusted to his care. His Lord will call him a faithful servant, if he proves himself faithful in this.

"Preach the word." That's the Word as we have it in the Scriptures. That means, preach the whole Word, all of the divine doctrine, the Law and the Gospel. It means preach and teach the Word, but it means too, admonish, rebuke and reprove by the Word. Three little words, yet the pastor's response to them reveals whether or not he is doing what his office demands. And that goes for his entire activity everywhere — in the pulpit, the classroom, at the sickbed, in his dealings with the erring or them that are antagonistic. If the Holy Ghost could have His way with us these three little words would be whispered into our hearts at every step we take, and by means of them He would make us feel our responsibility. Here is *the* guide in all of the work of this office.

Now we must get clear on these words.

"Preach the word." Jesus is *the Word*. John 1, 1.14; 1 John 5, 7. The Scriptures testify of Him. He is the content, the heart and the core of Scripture. Preach Jesus, then, if you would preach the Word; preach Him as the Savior of sinners, preach what He has wrought for sinners, namely their redemption and atonement; preach Him as the only Savior and as the Savior of all sinners. Make John 3, 16 live before every sinner. Do as Paul did: "I determined to know

nothing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified." 1 Cor. 2, 2.

These three words are quick to put their finger on that which a pastor must *not* preach. Nothing which is not *the Word*.

1. He must not preach empty fables, myths, old wives' tales, the news of the day, etc., as those "of the circumcision" did in Paul's time at every opportunity. The Word says: Avoid, shun and flee such preaching. See Art. III. It is unprofitable all around; no good for souls, nor for salvation of sinners, nor for the edifying of the saints. On the contrary, it is harmful, because it "genders strifes". But such preaching is popular in our day, and constant watchfulness is required on our part that we be not drawn into it. Our people shall not be fed such poison!

2. The pastor must not preach *empty morals* or pious sounding tirades. The servant of the Lord can not be a *Moralprediger* — of which there are all too many everywhere. Such preaching can not help the sinner come to the knowledge of the truth, for it can not work repentance and faith in the hearts of the hearers, nor can it bring sinners to the cross of Jesus. It leaves hearts empty. It can not edify, teach, instruct, nor indoctrinate, for it is empty talk und empty talk can not feed the soul any more than the kettle which is empty can feed the body. But it does create complacency and self-satisfaction and selfrighteousness. Look at the Pharisees and Scribes. Real morals which touch the hearts are preached by preaching Christ.

3. The pastor must not preach the *social gospel*. What a deceitful name! Social gospel has nothing at all to do with the Gospel. It is a perversion of the Gospel and has to end up in natural religion. It is a counterfeit, yet it is the **rage** of our day. It is praised as the cure of all social evils, as the means to make the world a better place in which to live, yes, it even promises to bring paradise back to this earth. It has no interest in the conversion or salvation of the sinner — which is the point of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It turns the Church into an uplift society to improve morals and social conditions. It is a religion for this world, not for heaven. —

The Word is different. It pleads: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." It states: "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." This central theme of the Gospel is entirely foreign to the social gospel, which is, therefore, "speaking lies in hypocrisy". Paul says: Leave it alone. You preach the Word.

4. The minister of Christ and steward of God's mysteries must not preach the "results of *science*," falsely so called. Science is human and subject to error and has often erred, but the Word is divine and therefore infallible and inerrant. But hasn't science, we are asked, clearly proved that in some matters the Bible is fallible? And don't we have to inform our people about that? Do you really think so? Then let me ask you: What do you know about the results of science? Are they built on a system of hypothetical argumentation or on facts? Much that is called a result is built up like this: If this is so, or if we assume that theory to be true, then this result must follow. Take the "if" and the "assume" away and the whole structure crashes. Science, *gnosis*, which is against faith, has, to our day, created the battle of science versus faith. Faith accepts the Word and is happy. What does it care about the results of science? Its trust in the Word goes above all else. And whenever science claims to have disproved a Bible fact (for example, that God made the world out of nothing in six days), then faith says: "Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written." Matth. 4, 10. A more pertinent question: Where are we told by Him in Whose service we are, to preach the results of science to our people? The Lord Jesus Christ says: "Preach the word." We are here to tell the people the *results of God's love* for sinners; the *results of Christ's redemptive and atoning sacrifice*. The results of anything else are of no benefit anyhow. Nor are we ambassadors of science, but of Christ. The message He gave us is the one we must deliver to our people: "We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." See 2 Cor. 5, 18-21. And so the part of wisdom and faithfulness is to let science take care of itself while we take care of the work Christ has given us to do. Souls need the Word, the Word of salvation by grace.

5. A pastor must not preach politics nor clutter up his sermon with politics. It was a sorry spectacle for me when I saw how, in Germany, they who were commissioned to preach the Word changed their pulpits into political rostrums. One preached for, the other against the government. Four times I personally heard such sermons: In Bremen in 1929; in Berlin in 1933; in Nuremberg in 1934, and in Vienna in 1938. It sickened me and I was ashamed. But we have had that same thing in our country as far back as I can remember. The noble experiment, prohibition, for example, caused many a pulpit to be desecrated. Today we are so far that churches have established lobbies in Congress. We have the Federal Council of Churches which specializes in politics. We have the disquieting fact to face that the President of our nation has a personal representative at the Vatican, strengthening in that way the political aspirations of the Catholic Church.

Brethren, preaching politics is a waste of time. It does not fit our office. We have a high calling: "Feed the flock that is among you." 1 Pt. 5, 2. "Feed my lambs," "feed my sheep." John 21, 15, 16. "Preach the gospel." Mark 16, 15. "Preach the word." 2 Tim. 4, 2. Paul's example is right: "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." 1 Cor. 2, 2. That is the heavenly manna, the saving gospel which can make men "wise unto salvation." 2 Tim. 3, 15. Moral speeches, social gospel, politics will not lead one soul to its Savior nor bring it one step nearer heaven. Raging against the terrible evils of the world does not improve congregations nor edify them nor lead one single sinner to Christ. That kind of preaching can have but one result: It makes Pharisees.

Therefore preach the Word.

Kēryxon ton logon. *Kēryttein* means "to be a herald, to officiate as a herald, to proclaim after the manner of a herald, always with the suggestion of formality, gravity and authority which must be listened to and obeyed; to publish, proclaim openly; spec. used of the public proclamation of the Gospel and matters pertaining to it." Thayer. Schierlitz: "Öffentlich verkündigen, öffentlich lehren, d. i. predigen das Evangelium

vom Reiche Gottes." The pastor, then, is a *kēryx*, a herald of his Lord and King, Jesus Christ. Now a herald does not proclaim his own little wisdom; he says what his sovereign orders him to say. Therefore the authority of him who sent him lies in his words. Much lies in the word *kēryttein*. It tells the pastor to proclaim his Lord's message exactly as it was given to him, without addition, subtraction or deviation. It tells him to proclaim it on the authority of Him who sent the pastor. It tells him that, as the herald of Christ, he must preach the Word, the whole Word and nothing but the Word. We are ambassadors of the King of Kings. As such we must deliver His message no matter to whom, no matter when, no matter where. No earthly potentate will stand for it that his ambassador tampers with his message. Woe to the pastor who will not deliver the message of his Lord exactly as his Lord gave it to him.

When Jesus sent out the seventy to proclaim His message He told them: "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." Luke 10, 16. That is so obviously true because the seventy were to speak His words and not their own. John 20, 21 also has a bearing on this thought: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." There we pastors receive our commission, our power and authority, and from His words our proclamation. The "itching ears" (2 Tim. 4, 3) of people do not cut the pattern of our preaching. His Word does that. We are nothing more than His mouthpieces and speak in His place. That's worth remembering, all ye, His messengers!

"Preach the word." That is the Word of God, the Holy Scriptures. This is "the faithful word" Titus 1, 9; "the truth", John 17, 17; "the incorruptible seed", 1 Pet. 1, 23; it "endureth forever", 1 Pet. 1, 28; it "is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of thoughts and intents of the heart", Hebr. 4, 12; it is "the sword of the Spirit", Eph. 6, 17; "it is the power of God unto salvation," Rom. 1, 16; it is able "to make wise unto salvation," 2 Tim. 3, 15; it is "a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path," Ps. 119, 105. "Through thy

precepts I get understanding." Ps. 119, 104. All this because it is the Word of God, for "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Tim. 3, 16. Where is the man who could tire and refrain from using this miraculous Word which can be and do so many things?

There are many personal reasons to make us keep on preaching the Word. It makes us wise unto salvation; it makes us grow in knowledge and sanctification; it fixes divine doctrine in our minds and hearts; it makes it possible for us not to be ashamed when we meet our King. These same reasons apply to our people; preaching the Word gives them the same benefits. Lest we forget: Preach it for Christ's sake, so that His suffering and death may not have been in vain.

Preach the Word in its truth and purity, unadulterated and uncorrupted, for every word is God's Word given by inspiration of God. It is an inexhaustible fountain of life, wisdom and comfort. It is a storehouse of divine love, grace and power which will never be emptied. It is a treasure house always filled to the brim and always open for the sinner; there is nothing to keep him from taking grace for grace, wisdom, strength, comfort, hope, confidence. And it is free.

How can the man who adheres to this Word ever ask: What shall I preach?

This Word, the Bible, is as fresh and new today as when it was first written. It will never grow old. It fits our times and conditions as well as it did those of Moses, David, Paul, or Luther. It has always been under attack, but never destroyed. Where are they all who have made it their life's work to destroy it? Julian Apostata, Paine, Voltaire, Ingersoll, Lenin? The Liberal Critics? But "Verbum Dei manet in aeternum." "The Word they yet shall let remain and not a thank have for it."

Here a word of counsel to our younger pastors is in place. You may at times be led to think that the Old Gospel message is outmoded or stale. To bring your sermons up to date you may be urged to study Sectarian literature, particularly the modern brand. Don't be fooled. Take Bengel's noteworthy

advice: "Te totum applica ad textum et totum textum applica ad te." Then your sermons will be real Gospel sermons and they will be full of life.

We have the sure eternal Word. And our preaching, teaching, comforting and admonishing must be in accord with this "faithful word and sound doctrine;" it must be, as the Word is, "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Tim. 3, 16. For that reason Paul says to Timothy and every pastor: "Hold fast the form (R. V. pattern) of sound words, which thou hast heard of (R. V. from) me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. 1, 13. *Hypotypōsis*, pattern, example, form; "the pattern placed before one to be held and copied; model". Thayer. But it must be the pattern *hygiainontōn logōn*, of sound, healthy words.

Sound and healthy; that is a perfect description of the Word itself. It must be a description of our preaching too. Anything mixed in with, added to, or omitted from the Word makes preaching unsound and unhealthy. Do we need a stronger warning against false doctrine, unionism and carelessness in matters of doctrine? And that means all doctrine, fundamental and nonfundamental. Every doctrine of the Word is divine doctrine and it is no man's privilege to ignore or tamper with one which he might think is nonfundamental. Such arrogance makes for sick and unsound preaching which in turn makes a sick and unsound church. Keep the pure doctrine pure. Keep the sound and healthy Word sound and healthy. Our age demands that we give special attention to that advice, for it teems with bitter enemies of *sound* doctrine and healthy confessionalism. It is shocking to observe the the growth of indifferentism to doctrine and doctrinal discussion both among our clergy and laity. That can spell only one thing: Spiritual decline!

"Preserve Thy Word, O Savior, to us this latter day." That includes the earnest prayer that God give us the spiritual strength to hold fast "the faithful word and sound doctrine" and to fight against any and every compromise with false doctrine.

The Word, Scripture, of course, includes Law and Gospel.

But we must understand that Paul, in 2 Tim. 4, 2, is stressing what Christ stressed in Mark 16, 15: "Preach the gospel." Similar injunctions like Titus 3, 8; 2, 15; 2. Tim. 4, 5 bear this out. Zorn says: "Nun, was bezeugt Paulus dem Timotheus so feierlich und eindringlich? (V. 1) Dies: 'Predige das Wort.' Timotheus soll das Wort, das Evangelium, die frohe Botschaft von der Gnade Gottes, dies Wort als ein Herold Gottes ausrufen, verkündigen. Und er soll damit anhalten, immer dabei und daran sein, einerlei ob die Zeit dafür günstig oder ungünstig sein wird." Vom Hirtenamt, S. 177.

Now let us look at Titus 3, 8: "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou confirm constantly." (R. V. much better: confidently). Verses 4-7 show us what "this is a faithful saying" refers to. But what about "these things," *peri toutōn*? Verses 4-7: "But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior, that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." "This is a faithful saying;" and *peri toutōn*, concerning these things I will, *boulomai* (the will prescribing) *se diabebaiousthai*, affirm strongly, assert confidently. Lenski translates: "And concerning these things I intend that thou speak with confidence." Luther: "Das ist gewisslich wahr, solches will ich, dass du fest lehrest." Luther makes it very clear. These things which are a faithful saying I will that thou teach confidently as absolutely true and sure. Then follows "*hina*," expressing the aim of such confident preaching: "That they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works." It is clear that Paul wanted to say to Titus: These things which I wrote of "the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man" I will that thou affirm confidently — the Gospel. This Gospel Timothy, Titus, and every pastor should preach confidently, — the saving and comforting Gospel of God our Savior, of Jesus Christ.

2. Tim. 4, 5: "Do the work of an evangelist." V. 2:

“Preach the word.” Then follows in verses 3-4: “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 (R. V. much better: “but having itching ears will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts”). And they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables (R. V. and will turn aside unto fables).” Then follows v. 5: “But watch thou (R. V. be thou sober) in all things, endure affliction, *do the work of an evangelist*, make full proof of (R. V. fulfill) thy ministry.” Paul is in the eventide of his life and foresees the conditions described in this passage. He wants Timothy to know how to carry on in spite of them. He wants Timothy to realize that conditions which bring even affliction dare never cause him to change his ministry. He must keep on doing the work of an evangelist. That is a preacher of the *euangelion*, the Gospel. “This name (evangelist) is given in the New Testament to those heralds of salvation through Christ, who are not apostles.” Thayer.

How all that fits our age! Sound doctrine? Nothing doing. But teachers after their own lusts, nach dem ihnen die Ohren jucken. And they are easy to find. The world seems to be full of so called “ministers of the Gospel” who never ask: What does the Lord want me to say, but: What do the people want to hear? That does not make it easy for real “ministers of the Gospel”. They are in for hardships and afflictions, — the worst yet to come. Threatening clouds appear on the horizon. They will break over our heads. What then? Here is the answer: Be sober, suffer hardships, do the work of an evangelist. Keep on preaching the Gospel in season or out of season.

We ought to say a few words, too, on the injunction immediately following this one: “Make full proof of (R. V. fulfill) thy ministry.” Luther: “Richte dein Amt redlich aus.” *Tēn diakonian sou plērophōrēson. Plērophoreō*, cause a thing to be shown to the full. Here his ministry. What is that? “Preach the word.” 2. Tim. 4, 2; “Preach the gospel.” Mark 16. 15. See also Acts 1, 8; Matth. 10, 7; 2. Cor. 5, 18-21; 1. Cor. 2, 2; Rom. 1, 16. There is no other way to fulfill one’s

ministry than by preaching the Gospel, by doing the work of an evangelist faithfully.

But should the law not be preached? Yes. Jesus did. John the Baptist did. The law is part of the Word. Everything in its place. At present this is vital: Only the Gospel is "the power of God unto salvation". Only the Gospel is "the living seed" which can create faith in the heart of the sinner. Only the Gospel brings the good news of salvation by grace alone through faith in Christ Jesus. Only the Gospel can tell the sinner: "Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee." Matth. 9, 2. Only it can cheer him and strengthen his faith. That is why Christ said: "Preach the gospel."

Of the Law the Scriptures tell us: "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3, 20. The Law proves to the sinner that he is a *lost and condemned* sinner. But it can not rid him of his sins. "The law worketh wrath." Rom. 4, 15. Of course, by doing this the Law does its part toward our salvation. The Holy Ghost puts it this way: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Gal. 3, 24. On this passage the Formula of Concord says: "That through the preaching of the *Law* and its threats in the ministry of the New Testament the hearts of the impenitent men be terrified, and brought to a knowledge of their sin and to repentance; but not in such a way that they lose heart and despair in this process, but that (since the Law is a schoolmaster unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith, Gal. 3, 24, and thus points and leads us not away from Christ, but to Christ, who is the *end of the Law*, Rom. 10, 4), they be comforted and strengthened again by the preaching of the *holy Gospel*." Trig. p. 961. Yes, the Law in its place and for its purpose. But it can *not regenerate, justify and save* the sinner. Without the Gospel the Law can only kill.

Back to our theme that the "Word" in 2. Tim. 4, 2 refers specifically to the Gospel. We get more information from Titus 2, 15: "These things speak." *Tauta lalei*. *Tauta* refers to verses 11-14. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying

ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." And *tauta* again turns out to be the Gospel of the grace of God, of the blessed hope of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the fruit of this Gospel.

Preach it — first and foremost.

But when? "Be instant (in preaching the Word) in season and out of season." *Epistēthi*, 2. aor. imperative active of *ephistēmi*. In that tense it means to stand by, to be present, to be at hand and ready. Be ready to preach the Word at any time "whether seasonable for men or not." Thayer. "The Word knows no difference as to *kairoi* or seasons, it is proper for all seasons, everlastingly in season; there never is a time in which it is not needed. With it we are to 'buy out' any season. Eph. 5, 16." Lenski. The time is always ripe for the preaching of the Word, no matter what the consequences might be. 2. Tim. 4, 3. 4; 1. Tim. 4, 1-3. The early Christians showed the way when they had to flee their homes and were scattered abroad. "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." Acts 8, 4.

How serious all this was to Paul we learn from v. 1: "I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom: Preach the word." This is no reprimand to Timothy, as though he had not been doing just that, but it is an encouragement to keep on doing it at any cost. Also Paul wants to impress on the Christians who were under the spiritual care of Timothy what they must look for in any bishop or elder.

Brethren, we dare never forget the injunction: Preach the Word. Paul's charge is as solemn and serious for us as it was for Timothy. There is no room for quibbling here. The faithful servant of the Lord must preach the Word and nothing but the Word. Nothing else is good for him or for his flock.

But no man can do it who does not study the Word, does not search the Scriptures over and over again. That means: Give attendance to reading the Word, meditate on it, hold fast this faithful Word and sound doctrine. So shall we be "nourished up in the words of faith and the good doctrine." 1. Tim. 4, 6. Anything short of that will keep the Lord from putting His stamp of approval on our work.

Then our course is laid out for us. We will read the Bible — not newspapers, magazines, books about the Bible — for we want to grow into better preachers of the Gospel in order that "our progress may appear to all." 1. Tim. 4, 15.

In 1. Tim. 4, 11 Paul tells Timothy: "These things command and teach." *Paraggelle tauta kai didaske*. Both imperative present active. *Paraggellō* means to transmit a message along from one to another; to declare, announce; then to command, order, charge. Schierlitz: "Eigentlich daneben oder zu einem andern hinmelden, verkündigen lassen; nachher überhaupt auftragen, befehlen jemandem." Luther: "Solches gebiete und lehre." Lenski: "Order these things and teach them." Being in the present tense this means: Keep on commanding and teaching.

Tauta, that of which he spoke before in verses 7-10: "But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness . . . Godliness is profitable unto all things . . . This is a faithful saying . . . For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe." Understanding *paraggelle* in the sense of transmit to others, announce, Paul here stresses that these things which Paul and Timothy know all Christians must know. But how can they know them if they are not transmitted to them? And how can they follow them if they do not know them? More need not be said to show us our work.

And *teach*. Of course, the same truths. The new element in this word is that of intensive effort to impress and implant these truths on the hearts and minds of the Christians. *Didaske*, teach. That brings another thought. Teaching

requires adaptation to the mental capacity of them who are being taught; also to their spiritual foundation, whether they are well grounded in divine doctrine or are mere babes in this respect; also to their knowledge of language. Paul did not want Timothy's efforts wasted, and, above all, he did not want the import of this precious message lost for the pupils, because Timothy was guilty of "über die Köpfe hinweg reden". By all means, they should not go home empty, these hearers, not ever because a pastor has not done his utmost to adapt himself to their particular needs and abilities.

This very task, to teach the faithful word and sound doctrine, of itself demands that we preach doctrinal sermons. By such sermons our people are enriched and grow in the knowledge of the Truth and are deepened in their trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men. Only so will they be prepared to suffer reproach, hardship and persecution for the sake of the Gospel. And only so will they be inspired to exercise themselves unto godliness and to stand against all false teaching.

In 1. Tim. 4, 6 we read: "If thou put the brethren in remembrance (R. V. in mind) of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith" (R. V. which thou hast followed until now). *Tauta hypothithemenos tois adelphois. Tauta*, there is that word again. Here it refers to verses 1-5. And they are most important and instructive. Verse 1: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter (R. V. later) times some shall depart (R. V. fall away) from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." Note first that this is not Paul's opinion. The Holy Ghost, *the Spirit*, speaks expressly, *rētōs*, in express words. He says that in later times some shall fall away from the faith in Jesus Christ and His redemption and from true and sound doctrine, in short, from the Word. They will no longer be guided by the Word, but by seducing spirits, false teachers. Consequently they will accept doctrines of the devil who is the father of all lies and false doctrines. Verse 2: "And they speak lies in hypocrisy (R. V. through the hypocrisy of men who speak lies)."

Lenski: "In hypocrisy of lie-speakers." Luther: "Durch die so in Gleisnerei Lügenredner sind." They have fallen away from the faith, the Word and Christ, but they still call themselves Christians; they even pose as men who have attained a deeper knowledge of Christianity than others; they still wear "sheep's clothing", but inwardly they are "ravening wolves". Hypocrites. Theirs "is a hypocrisy such as belongs to lie-speakers who must dissemble and be hypocrites to get their lies, their false doctrines across." Lenski.

We know that the Spirit expressly says so. It is before our eyes everywhere. We see how the worst lie-speakers put on the holiest mien. The further they have fallen from the faith and the Word, the more pious is their mask. It must be that way, for "they have their conscience seared with a hot iron." "Their conscience has been cauterized, so that it has lost all sensitiveness and fails to respond." Lenski. Verse 3 gives a picture of what these lie-speakers teach: "Forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meat." *Brōmata*, food, that which is eaten. And these lie-speakers demand that such devil-doctrines be kept to attain salvation, or at least to attain a higher degree of eternal bliss.

In verses 3-5 Paul takes care of these devil-doctrines by stating that God made the *brōmata* to be received with thanksgiving; that every creature of God is good and therefore nothing is to be refused, for it is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer.

Of these things Timothy should remind the brethren. *Tauta hypotithemenos*, participle present middle, to supply, suggest. Schierlitz: "Unter die Hand geben, anraten." Lenski: "Submitting." Luther: "Wenn du den Brüdern solches vorhältst." In short, Timothy should warn them. The important fact is that the things concerning which he should warn the brethren are not Paul's personal fears, but a revelation of the Holy Ghost, for "the Spirit speaketh expressly" that they shall come in the later days. They began to come even in Paul's day. 2. Thess. 2, 7: "For the mystery of iniquity does already work."

Putting the brethren "in remembrance of these things" is so important to Paul that he says: "If thou put the brethren

in remembrance of these things, then shalt thou be a good minister of Jesus Christ." By reminding the brethren of the fearful dangers ahead, he will prove himself a good minister of Jesus Christ, "in brief, a sound, safe teacher of all the brethren under his supervision." Lenski. In order that no one might think that Timothy had not always been that, Paul adds: "Whereunto thou hast obtained." (R. V. much better: "Which thou hast followed until now").

Thus is our work cut out for us. We must warn the brethren of false doctrine, show them the danger of submitting to human or church laws instead of true doctrine and the law of God. They must learn how these doctrines of the devil eat the very heart out of faith, doctrine and the Church. These "later times", yea, the last times, are here. What a busy horde of lie-speakers in hypocrisy has descended on this world. The air is full of their fanatical cries: Don't eat this; don't touch that; don't drink, smoke, etc.; keep this rule or you can't be saved; don't marry. And all as conditions to salvation.

And there you have salvation by law and works in full bloom. Not God's law, but "the traditions of the elders", constitutions of congregations, church laws, rules, regulations. And Christ's redemption is taken right out of the hearts of men and nothing is left of salvation by grace alone through faith in Christ Jesus. Christian liberty is gone and men find themselves again "under the yoke of bondage."

The Puritans offer an example of life by church law rather than the Gospel. Their entire life from the cradle to the grave was regulated by the law of the church. That included everything, their work, recreation, attending church, keeping the Sabbath, etc., etc. Penalties for breaking these laws were severe, yes, salvation depended on keeping them. What did the Puritans have left of life and liberty? Nothing. In spite of their outward piety and their well meant submission to rules of the church these people had actually fallen away from the faith and divine doctrine and had actually been giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of the devil. Instead of gaining what they were striving for by their works, they lost what Christ had done for them by His. Many modern religious programs are that way. Their preachment rests on

laws they make. And they propose to make better Christians by getting men to obey "the traditions of the elders".

Popery is the highest fulfilment of this prophecy of the Spirit. How far it has fallen from the faith and divine doctrine and the Word! It confesses Christ with the mouth, but denies Him in fact. It teaches salvation by works. It makes a stern judge of the gracious Savior. It has taken the role of mediator away from Him and given it to Mary and the saints. Instead of preaching faith in Christ as the Savior, it teaches fear, dread and awe over against Him. It has taken away salvation by grace alone, for Christ's sake alone, by faith alone and imposed in its stead salvation by works, — not even the works demanded by the law of God, but by the laws, rules, and regulations of the Catholic Church. The Council of Trent pronounced its "*Anathema sit*" on the doctrine of justification by grace alone without the works of the law, as Scripture surely teaches it. The Pope demands honor and reverence as the vicar of Christ on earth. Popery makes the claim that the Catholic Church is the only true church and only they can be saved who belong to it, while all others are damned. Popery forbids priests, monks and nuns the right to marry. It demands abstinence from meats on certain days and in certain seasons.

Paul calls all these doctrines of the devil. Popery is speaking lies in hypocrisy. Luther and the Confession of our Church were right when they took the stand: "The Pope is the very Antichrist." Smalc. Art.; Trigl. p. 475, 10. To sectarians and many Lutherans that sounds like a terrible judgment. And we can readily understand why. They can't recognize the abominable things in Popery, the teachings of the devil, because they harbor similar teachings in their own midst; and the worst of them at that, like salvation by works, making even faith a meritorious work. There isn't much difference between the Catholic Church and the sects, the foster children of the Reformed Church.

It is possible that the greater part of the Lutheran Church is not in harmony with the Confessions of their Church on this point. They let the sentence, "The Pope is the very Antichrist", stand only as a historical judgment. They grant

that the Pope may be the antichrist and that he has many of the characteristics described in Scripture, but that there may be still "a special unfolding of the antichristian power."

This is a common saying: I don't see how you Lutherans can teach such a terrible thing about the Pope. Luther at his time may have had reason to believe it. But times have changed, and popery has changed too. Implying, of course, a change for the better. But that will not go down. The development of popery since Luther's time only verifies how true the statement was: "The Pope is the very antichrist." It was since Luther's time that the Council of Trent met and hurled its infamous "*Anathema sit*" at the very heart of the Gospel, the doctrine of justification by grace alone. Only seventy-five years ago the Vatican Council met in Rome and adopted the blasphemous doctrine of the infallibility of the popes. And don't forget that every papal bull ever issued by any pope is still in force. And they include the infamous "*Unam Sanctam*" of Boniface VIII issued in 1302; and the superarrogant Encyclical Letter "*Immortale Dei*" of Leo XIII issued in 1885. Indeed, our Confession's judgment will stand to the Last Day.

Now, once more: If Timothy put "the brethren in remembrance of these things", then he would "be a good minister of Jesus Christ." For Christ does not want those whom He has freed from "the bondage of the Law" to be put under the bondage of any other law, be it the traditions of the elders or of the sects, or be it church rules. And Timothy would grow in steadfastness and "be nourished in the words of the faith and of the good doctrine". Knowing sound doctrine better and better he would not permit Christian liberty to be curtailed.

On Christian liberty we refer you to article II of this series. *Quartalschrift*, July 1945, p. 157-159.

Paul wrote the injunction, "Put the brethren etc." for the Gospel's sake. He did not want it supplanted in their hearts or in the Church by man made laws, rules, regulations, restrictions, etc. "The Spirit speaketh expressly" the same warning to us. For the same purpose. With the Old Adam forever

hankering for the law our vigilance dare never even falter. Eternal vigilance is also the price of Christian liberty.

2. Tim. 2, 14: "Of these things put them in remembrance." *Tauta hypominnēske*. *Tauta* refers to verses 8-13. Of these things: 1. that Christ was raised up from the dead; 2. that this was Paul's message; 3. that because he preached it he suffered as an evildoer (criminal) even unto bonds (irons, for Paul was a prisoner in Rome); 4. that the Word of God is not bound; 5. that he endured all things for the sake of the elect; 6. that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory. Then he continues: "It is a faithful saying: for if we be dead with him (Christ) we shall also live with him; if we suffer we shall also reign with him; if we deny him, he will also deny us; if we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he can not deny himself." Timothy should put them in remembrance of this wonderfully comforting Gospel and keep on doing so (present imperative indicates continued action). Always we are brought back to this: Preach the Gospel and more Gospel.

For as ministers of the Gospel those words apply to us. We must *preach the Word and keep on preaching it*. We must keep reminding the brethren of all these Gospel truths. No one will deny the need of just that in our day. We must be on the alert lest the leaven of the many who see salvation of the Church in outward activities and institutions and societies find a place in our hearts and in our work. We must know that these can never replace the Gospel and the Scriptural means of grace.

We are living in the last times. The Gospel is denied by many. It is sneered at here and made impossible there. Think of the Martyrs of Riga; of the persecution of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in Communist Russia; of the Lutheran pastors of Esthonia and Latvia who have been denied ration cards by the Russian government. Learn of Paul how he took his sufferings and chains for the Gospel's sake and see how even then his only desire was that the Gospel continue to be preached.

So this is the work of a faithful pastor: Preach the Word; preach it in season and out of season. Preach it in the spirit

of Peter and John who said: "We can not but speak the things which we have seen and heard." Acts 5, 20.

He who does it thus, does well.

W. BODAMER.

(To be continued)

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)

(Continued)

II

The basic truths concerning this liberty constitute a treasure so priceless that the Church must guard them with unflagging zeal.

It has already been said that there is a very definite connection between our spiritual liberty and those doctrines concerning the work of our Savior and His Spirit which we know must be fundamental to our faith: justification, the atonement, the *satisfactio vicaria*, the doctrine of our redemption, or that of the appropriation of this liberty. The need for defining and distinguishing these different teachings clearly in our thinking should never lead to our forgetting that basically they constitute a complex of truth which is so closely knit that no part of it can be assailed without our entire freedom, our salvation, being endangered thereby. Paul's "Be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" does not merely point to the unpleasant consequences resulting from again becoming involved in some inconvenient and uncomfortable ceremonial regulations, but is rather a mighty shout of warning lest they revert to that old condition of slavery which must inevitably lead to their eternal ruin. Nothing less than their soul's salvation was at stake.

We find it quite natural to understand that all these basic doctrines taken together should constitute a priceless treasure. The necessary thing to recognize, however, is the importance

of the individual teachings, even in some seemingly minor point, and their mutual interdependence. When the Judaizing opponents of Paul sought to win the Galatians over to a point, where they would recognize circumcision as a necessary prerequisite to their salvation by faith in the Savior, we find Paul saying, "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole Law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the Law; ye are fallen from grace" (chap. 5:2-4). Stronger words have never been written to show how an apparently little and localized error will affect the whole structure of Gospel teaching. For one might say that this question of circumcision affected only one phase of a single doctrine, of justification. But Paul's answer is that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. If James teaches that he who keeps the whole Law, and yet offends in one point, is guilty of all (chap. 2:10), then Paul's corresponding warning is to the effect that it is impossible to confine error to a single point of doctrine. This can be done in theory only. It is impossible in fact. In our study and use of doctrine we dare not place a sliding scale of values upon the various points of teaching. The whole truth of the Gospel is at stake when a single point is threatened.

A priceless treasure has been given us in these Biblical truths. As we value our soul's salvation, so let us guard them unceasingly. They constitute the heart of the Gospel. But it will not be enough simply to resolve to be on guard. Just as sound military defense strategy consists in surveying and analyzing all possible avenues by which the attack may come, in order to take the proper countermeasure while there is time, so we need to be familiar with the sources and areas of danger in our defense of the truth.

Truth is, of course, endangered by its opposite — error. This may consist in some flat contradiction of God's Word, as when the Tempter opposed God's warning concerning the Tree of Knowledge ("In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die") with the brazen denial "Ye shall not surely die." On the other hand, error may result from a faulty interpretation of some difficult passage of Scripture, an interpre-

tation which, however, is in clear contradiction to some other Word of God and therefore mistaken. It may be some malicious error, conceived with the express purpose of leading men away from the truth, or it may be an error of which the errorist himself is not aware, and which he holds in all good faith. But whatever its source may be, it involves some contradiction to God's Word, wherefore His children cannot but reject and resist it. "He that is of God heareth God's words" (John 8:47).

The errors by which the liberty of the children of God has been assailed are many. They range from Rome's bald assertion that the justification of man is by his works to the rational but unscriptural position that the conversion of man is due to at least some slight degree of cooperation on his part, or that the function of faith in the justification of the believer is anything more than a merely receptive one. To these and other errors the Church dare not remain indifferent, leaving it to chance whether its members become infected by them or not. They are historic departures from the truth, errors which are powerful to this day. Against them the Church must raise her voice, even at the risk (which really amounts to a certainty) of being charged with intolerance. The trumpet must not give an uncertain sound. The witness of truth against error dare not be silenced.

But the truth is not only endangered by attacks from without. It is very often vitiated by an inward process of gradual corruption. All the persecution which the Church of the first centuries had to suffer, plus all the errors from without to which it was exposed, did not hurt it nearly so much as the fact that it gradually lost its hold on the truth which had been committed to it; that in the hearts and minds of its members the truth underwent a change. Not only did they begin to call it a New Law, but they began to think of it and operate with it as Law, to react toward it as Law, to see their Christianity as a kind of outward conforming to some external regulations and requirements. No longer were they glorying in their liberty. They were reverting to the yoke of bondage. This history should serve for all time to make the Church alert to the need of watching itself most closely, to make sure that

the note of Christian liberty does not depart from its teachings.

Yet history records that this has taken place time and again. It happened in the Lutheran Church when, but a few years after Luther's death, the ingratiating arguments of synergism were heard, in a tragic attempt to provide a rational answer to the question which Scripture itself leaves unanswered: why, if faith is the gift of God, some are saved and others not. It had similar results when Lutherans in America, even while rejecting Melancthonian synergism, still sought to find the reason, if not in some positive contribution which man must make toward his conversion, then at least by demonstrating a helpful negative attitude, by his refraining from wilful resistance when God calls him (*das mutwillige Widerstreben unterlassen*). Whenever these attempts were made, and whatever the nature of the fancied solution happened to be, the truth held by the Church was thereby corrupted. A foreign note crept into the pure harmony of the song of rejoicing with which the Church proclaims its liberty — a note of uncertainty, of doubt, of fear. The old bondage beginning to reassert itself!

Let us not think that we who have rejected these errors in the past and up to now are therefore done with them. We are living in a day when the principle of reason in religion is exalted as seldom before. We are placed alongside of churches which are paying undue tribute to this rational principle. Much of the theological literature of our day is infected by it. What would be more natural than that, in view of the unreasonableness of the unconditional Gospel which has been entrusted to us, in the preaching of which our Church has gloried in the past, and in an attempt, perhaps unconscious, to adapt our preaching to the modern mind or to satisfy our own natural conception of how such a Gospel should be preached, the disturbing strains of a conditioned Gospel come to be heard in our midst also? Let us ever keep in mind that the Biblical *sola gratia* can tolerate no restricting, qualifying, circumscribing, or hedging on our part without being gravely corrupted thereby. The Gospel is God's simple, unqualified message of pardon and forgiveness. Let us leave

it at that. — This is, of course, primarily the matter of individual and personal responsibility for every one of us who is concerned with the preaching and teaching of the Word. The Church has a vital interest in it, however, and will be discharging its full duty only when it keeps this issue clearly before its ministry and its members, constantly warning against the danger, and cultivating and deepening their understanding of the liberty which is theirs.

Another dangerous foe of our treasure of truth is neglect. The gravest form this could take would be if the Church were to lose its taste for, and interest in, its spiritual liberty, if it should come to feel that these topics, which will occur ever again if we really go into the heart of this Gospel, have an old-fashioned sound, if it were to forsake them for newer, more arresting, more sensational ones. Such a condition would be serious indeed. For we may be sure that these truths cannot be ignored and neglected for a time and then taken up again when it suits the whim of man. Here God Himself is the decisive factor. These gifts are possessed only where by His grace He has granted them. Where they are then scorned, neglected, where men have wearied of them, the prophetic warning applies: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine for bread nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord; and they shall wander from sea to sea and from the north even to the east; they shall run to and fro to seek the Word of the Lord, and shall not find it" (Amos 8:11f.). From this preserve us, dear Father in Heaven!

But this same condition of neglect can come about in other ways, which are more insidious and therefore more likely to pass unnoticed. The Church is very busy in these modern times. There are so many problems to be solved, surveys to be made, policies to be defined, activities to be directed, causes to be supported, that there is danger that in the press of business the Church lose sight of its great, single, and all-sufficient mission of proclaiming liberty to the captives, that it forget its compelling need to safeguard its own hold on this freedom. These many distracting issues need not be evil in themselves. There may be many a one among them in favor

of which much good can be said. But when, Martha-like, the Church becomes preoccupied, cumbered about much serving, and is careful and troubled about many things, even though it be with the best of intentions, she is becoming guilty of neglecting the one thing that is needful. This danger of losing sight of the main issue because of preoccupation with a host of other causes, often commendable in themselves, is among the several points which are being brought up here perhaps the most difficult to describe. One may sense these dangers and yet be at a loss when it comes to mentioning specific reasons for ones' fears. So many of these undertakings with which the Church is so often overburdened and distracted in these times are somebody's pet project, and often one in favor of which much can be said — and usually is. To raise one's voice in warning seems so much like cranky fault-finding that it is a thankless task, not easily undertaken. Then also the replies to such objections seem so reasonable, and the good intentions of the sponsors are so obviously sincere, that the voice which is raised in warning is often shouted down, and its arguments only too soon dismissed from the mind. Under such conditions one can only pray our Lord to guard us against this danger of neglecting the one thing which sets the Church apart from all other agencies and to preserve among us a lively appreciation of the great singleness of our mission.

A final attack upon the truth against which the Church must ever be vigilant comes by the way of compromise. Here it is particularly important that we do not permit ourselves to be swayed by reason and human experience. For by these standards the method of settling a controversy by compromise and mutual concessions is often, though by no means always, the best. In many cases it is the simple solution of plain common sense. Many a family quarrel, many a clash between management and labor, many a boundary dispute between nations, have been effectively and satisfactorily settled by wise and intelligent compromise. Each side yields a little, each gains a little. Each party can retain a measure of honor and self-respect. Each is spared the humiliation of utter defeat. It is not surprising that one often hears it asked why the

Church cannot employ a little of this same common sense, why the many timeworn controversies cannot be disposed of by meeting one another halfway and making a few concessions for the sake of peace and harmony. Here our answer must be weighed carefully. For there are, also within the Church, conditions which call for just this willingness to make some mutual concessions, in which compromise is not only permissible but God-pleasing, where a refusal to take such steps would involve a grave offense. Of such situations we propose to speak under Thesis III of this essay.

But it is a different matter when the truth is at stake, particularly when it is God's truth. Truth simply does not lend itself to compromise. It isn't something which can be divided, like a piece of land, or adjusted one way or the other, like a wage scale. Truth is a most inflexible thing. It is an absolute. Therefore Paul took that inflexible attitude against the Galatian errorists which we have already noted. Luther was confronted with a similar situation in the year 1529, after the Diet of Speyer had repealed a previous decree of tolerance and had inaugurated a most severe policy of repression against the cause of the Reformation. When a formal protest of the Lutheran representatives went unheeded, a strong demand made itself felt among these "Protestants" for a military alliance in which all those whose faith was endangered could present a united front against the Emperor and his Catholic supporters. In order to make this alliance as strong and impressive as possible, adherents of the Swiss Reformation were to be included in spite of their false doctrine of the Sacrament.

Luther's answer to the proposal was to call the entire plan "unchristian," since it would lead to strengthening and defending a heresy. Evidently the argument was advanced that the difference was of limited scope, being confined to a single point of doctrine, and that for the sake of the other points on which there was agreement one should not make so much of that one issue. Luther replied, "This one is too much . . . because of it the others all are tainted. . . . He who denies one doctrine only is no less unchristian than Arius or his like." In another paragraph we find him declaring, "Since

they do not correct this one point, it is not to be expected that they will remain true and firm in the others." To the proposal that the alliance be established at once and the doctrinal issue taken care of later, since the Sacramentarians had offered to come in "*auf Erkenntnis*" (subject to subsequent negotiation and arbitration), Luther had this to say: This helps us not at all; for we know with conviction (*wissen und halten*) that they are wrong, and we are not able to place this matter into the field of uncertainty and arbitration (*mögen solches mit ihnen nicht in Zweifel oder Erkenntnis setzen*), wherefore we are not able to negotiate with them with a good conscience, since we would have to consent to, and confirm, their offer of arbitration and thus fall from our certain understanding and fall in with their doubt and obsession of uncertainty. This, then, would be more than half, if not a complete denial of our faith." (Luther's "*Bedenken*" of May, 1529, St. L. XVI:519f.). To which Dr. Willkomm adds, "So sure was Luther of his doctrine, and so sensitive was his conscience, that he felt it to be a denial even to arouse and confirm in his opponents the thought that they might possibly be right and the Lutherans wrong." (*Das Augsburger Bekenntnis*, p. 7.)

For this stand Luther was denounced as unreasonable and intolerant by many at that time, charges which have been repeated many times through these more than four centuries, which are widely repeated today, and which, it is to be feared, are echoed even by some who call themselves after his name. But let us not forget that this staunch refusal to compromise with error, to make any concessions when the Word of God was involved, not only safeguarded the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of our Lord in the Sacrament and defended it successfully against the infiltration of Zwinglian error at the Colloquy at Marburg, which was so soon to follow, but in the following year, 1530, contributed more than any other human factor to securing for Lutheranism that clear and staunch declaration of faith, the Augsburg Confession. As we value our Lutheran heritage, as we value the central doctrine of Scripture which is so clearly sets forth, let us guard these truths faithfully against the spirit of com-

promise, lest the Church of today, our Lutheran Church, be despoiled of its treasure.

Thus there are many ways in which these truths may be lost. But one common denominator runs through them all. Whether it be through error from without or corruption from within, whether it be by careless neglect or by deliberate compromise, finally it all comes down to this, that men have become indifferent to the glory of these truths, have held them cheaply, have forgotten what a priceless gift was theirs. In view of this let us take to heart the admonition of the Lord to one of His seven churches in Asia: "Hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy *crown*" (Rev. 3:11). Doctrinal issues, even as the study of doctrine, are often looked upon as tedious tasks. What we need is to *re-view* particularly the central doctrine of our faith until we come to recognize that in them we have a crown indeed.

But the liberty which is undermined when the Word of God is no longer taught in its truth and purity is endangered also when human authority encroaches upon it. Our Lutheran Church has suffered this repeatedly. Two instances are particularly important for our present study. The first occurred when the terms of the truce which followed the military defeat of the Smalcald League (the Interims, Augsburg and Leipzig) not only restricted freedom of worship for Lutherans, but imposed doctrines and re-introduced church customs which were in utter violation of Lutheran consciences. The other instance referred to is that of the Prussian Union, early in the last century, when Lutheran and Reformed elements were united into one State Church, forcibly if it was necessary, which resulted in the same type of violation of conscience as was suffered by Lutherans in the days of the Interim.

We are here not concerned with the role of the State in these affairs. The scope of this paper is limited to the part played by the Church. Here the Church cannot justify itself by pointing out that the force employed was wielded by the State, and that therefore the Church has no responsibility in the matter. It is true, as has been shown before, that the basic spiritual liberty of the Christian is not lost even when he

is deprived of all his civil rights, including that of religious freedom. Both of the examples we are using prove this, for in each case countless Christians held fast to their convictions, specifically rejecting the errors in question, and stoutly refused to obey men rather than God, even though it involved them in great difficulties, often brought persecution down upon them, and in many instances compelled them to emigrate and endure exile. But for every staunch confessor who refused to yield his conscience to oppression and who thus retained his spiritual freedom inviolate there were others, often many others, who in faintness of heart suffered these violations of their conscience, accepting the loss of their spiritual treasures as though it were inevitable, doing so perhaps to their eternal harm. There the Church had a responsibility, and a serious one indeed.

It was a grave matter when Melanchthon, the natural leader of the Church after the death of Lúther, not only accepted the principle of the first Interim (Augsburg) by proposing a modification thereof but himself became the author of the second, the Leipzig Interim, thereby not only seriously curtailing the religious liberty of his people, but very definitely violating their consciences as well and causing many a weak Christian to stumble in his faith. All the excuses of expediency offered by Melanchthon will not erase this blot from his name. In the same manner history will always record that the Prussian Union was not merely imposed upon a helpless flock by the State but was engineered and promoted by many of the Church's leaders. — On the other hand, it was a definite measuring up to these responsibilities when in the course of this Interim Controversy other leaders opposed and exposed the false position of Melanchthon and his supporters, defended the cause of Christian liberty, and helped to bring about the happy outcome that the entire Church once more came to take a right stand on these issues, as witness Article X of the Formula of Concord. But it can only be called a deplorable failure when the Church of the last century, in accepting the Prussian Union, disregarded the violation of the consciences of so many of its members, leaving them no alternative but to get out, either by founding Free Churches

in the homeland or by emigrating to other lands — unless, indeed they were to retain their good standing in the home Church at the expense of a suppressed but deeply wounded conscience.

If we keep such instances from the history of our own Church in mind, it will not be necessary to go far afield for further examples, as for instance the havoc wrought in the Church of the Middle Ages by the exercise of Papal authority and power, or the subsequent intolerance and abuse of power on the part of Calvinism. But it is extremely necessary that we keep the issue in mind, and that we learn to recognize this bane of the Church when it appears even in its less obvious forms. It is a wholesome thing if the Church in its larger aspects, for instance as we represent it here in this convention of our Synodical Conference, develops and retains a certain degree of sensitiveness toward these issues, if it becomes freedom-conscious and liberty-minded, if it becomes keenly aware of the need of heeding the voice of a minority and safeguarding the spiritual liberty and respecting the conscience of even a single Christian. We shall presently be speaking of such situations where one must, and where the Christian will, practice consideration and restraint in the exercise of his freedom. For liberty unrestrained becomes license and disorder. But the real danger lies in the other direction, as history has shown plainly enough.

It should be interesting to survey the practice of the Synodical Conference with reference to these principles. Doctrinally it has, as we have seen, stood for these truths which comprise the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. Its preaching has been a proclaiming of liberty to the captives. But has it been active in guarding this liberty, in defending this treasure? The history of the Synodical Conference has admittedly been one of controversy. In itself this is neither good nor bad. But when we study the nature of these controversies, when we note that many of them, particularly those related to the doctrines of election and conversion, have dealt with the central truths of the Gospel, then we realize that this was a contending for the liberty of the Christian. Even though not the whole area of these doctrines was

covered by these controversies, even though the issue was restricted to a few limited points, quite clearly defined and localized (*intuitu fidei*; the conduct of man in conversion), Luther's principle concerning the error in one point only was kept in mind. Our fathers preferred to bear the reproach of being called intolerant rather than to permit error to vitiate the truth that was so dear to them. They were uncompromising, admittedly so. But it was not mere stubbornness on their part. They knew what they were doing and why they did it. Let Dr. Walther be their spokesman: "When a theologian is asked to yield and make concessions in order that peace may at last be established in the Church, but refuses to do so even in a single point of doctrine, such an action looks to human reason like intolerable stubbornness, yea, like downright malice. That is the reason why such theologians are loved and praised by few men during their lifetime. Most men revile them rather as disturbers of the peace, yea, as destroyers of the kingdom of God. They are regarded as men worthy of contempt. But in the end it becomes manifest that this very determined, inexorable tenacity in clinging to the pure teaching of the divine Word by no means tears down the Church; on the contrary, it is just this which, in the midst of greatest dissension, builds up the Church and in the end brings about genuine peace. Therefore woe to the Church which has no men of this stripe, men who stand as watchmen on the walls of Zion, sound the alarm whenever a foe threatens to rush the walls, and rally to the banner of Jesus Christ for a holy war!" (Walther, *Law and Gospel*, p. 28.) May we in these days of negotiation, concession, and compromise imbibe something of their unswerving devotion to the truth.

Coming to the question of their attitude towards the encroachment of human authority upon the liberty of Christians, it is quite natural that these people, who had left church and home in protest against the religious regimentation of the Union as it operated in Prussia or was introduced in other states of Germany, should seek to incorporate into the churches they founded here the ideal of freedom, to make sure that the liberty of the individual Christian and the rights of the minority should be well guarded. Hence the polity of the

Church, based upon the royal priesthood of every believer, operating through the exercise of this function in the individual congregation, culminating in synods so constituted and organized that there should be but one sovereignty in the Church, that of the Word of God. These principles will stand. Nor is their acceptance today a mere matter of empty form. Where there have been instances of human authority asserting itself unduly — and who would claim that there have not been such? — I am sure these have been due to failure of the human equation, rather than to any wilful departure from the basic principle. But that is no reason for being complacent about the matter. Rather let our love for the liberty which our Savior has purchased for us by His blood always inspire the stoutest of resistance to any attempt to abridge the proper liberties of the Christian.

(To be continued)

Kirchengehichtliche Notizen

A Statement. — Under this title, and together with a rather significant accompanying letter, a group of Missouri Synod pastors and professors have sent out a pronouncement which was bound to cause extensive repercussions, particularly since it has subsequently been published rather widely. We recognize that the issues raised by this document constitute an internal problem of our sister synod, and shall not presume to say how they shall be settled, but because of the bearing of this document on the wider problem of Lutheran union, in which we also have a stake, we feel that we owe our readers an authentic copy of the text as well as a discussion of at least some of its implications. We shall try to keep this discussion as objective as possible.

E. R.

Letter and Statement

Dear Friend and Brother:

The enclosed Statement is being sent to you with the compliments of the forty-one pastors who adopted it by unanimous resolution and ordered it printed and mailed over their signatures to all pastors of Synod.

Naturally, we do not regard this Statement as a finished product or as the last word on the subjects under discussion. We do believe, how-

ever, that it goes to the root of some of the most vexing problems confronting our Synod. Moreover, it gives expression to our mature convictions — convictions which lie close to our hearts and have been thoroughly tried in the light of the Word and before the tribunal of our own consciences. In view of this, we urgently request you, dear Brother, to study this Statement carefully and objectively and to evaluate it by the criterion of the Holy Scriptures.

The meeting which culminated in the adoption of this Statement was held in Chicago on September 6 and 7. Concerning the nature of this meeting, the invitation said the following: "This will be nothing revolutionary or iconoclastic. On the contrary, our meeting is to be sane and soundly Lutheran, evangelical, positive and constructive."

The considerations which prompted the meeting and the purpose for which it was held were set forth in the following paragraphs of the invitation:

"In recent years, especially since the Saginaw Convention, a strange and pernicious spirit, utterly at variance with the fundamental concepts of the Gospel and the genius of the Lutheran Church, has lifted its ugly head in more than one area of our beloved Synod. This spirit has its origin in a wrong approach to the Holy Scriptures and in a tragic misconception of the very essence of the Gospel and the nature, functions and mission of the Church. It is characterized by barren, negative attitudes, unevangelical techniques in dealing with the problems of the individual and the Church, unsympathetic legalistic practices, a self-complacent and separatistic narrowness, and an utter disregard for the fundamental law of Christian love. One need not be a prophet to forecast what the results will be if this unevangelical and intolerant spirit is left unrestrained and to its own devices. Spiritual life will be blighted. The organism of the Church will be paralyzed. Ecclesiastical persecution will occur with increasing frequency. The onward march of the Gospel will be obstructed and one open door after another will be closed to us.

"During the past year this alarming phenomenon in our synodical life has been the topic of many discussions. In every case the conviction prevailed that it is our sacred obligation to do everything within our power to preserve our precious evangelical Lutheran heritage. But invariably the question arose, What can be done?

"Several groups in different parts of the country have arrived at the same answer: We must, to begin with, arrange a meeting of kindred minds to study the situation."

The meeting which resulted from this invitation was very gratifying. It was marked by spirited and thorough-going discussions, which showed that men in all parts of Synod had been giving much prayerful thought to the matters under consideration and that they were sure that the time had come to give utterance to their convictions as a contribution toward the preservation and propagation of the precious heritage of historic Lutheranism.

We shall gratefully receive any comment on this Statement, as well as requests for additional information regarding its substance and purpose. Please address your communications to the chairman of the Committee, E. J. Friedrich, Wheat Ridge, Colorado.

And now may the Lord bless the humble efforts which we are putting forth in His Holy Name.

Yours in the cause of Christ and His Kingdom.
September 20, 1945.

THE COMMITTEE.

IN NOMINE JESU

A Statement

We, the undersigned, as individuals, members of Synod, conscious of our responsibilities and duties before the Lord of the Church, herewith subscribe to the following statement:

ONE

WE affirm our unswerving loyalty to the great evangelical heritage of historic Lutheranism. We believe in its message and mission for this crucial hour in the time of man.

We therefore deplore any and every tendency which would limit the power of our heritage, reduce it to narrow legalism, and confine it by man-made traditions.

TWO

WE affirm our faith in the great Lutheran principle of the inerrancy, certainty, and all-sufficiency of Holy Writ.

We therefore deplore a tendency in our Synod to substitute human judgments, synodical resolutions, or other sources of authority for the supreme authority of Scripture.

THREE

WE affirm our conviction that the Gospel must be given free course so that it may be preached in all its truth and power to all the nations of the earth.

We therefore deplore all man-made walls and barriers and all ecclesiastical traditions which would hinder the free course of the Gospel in the world.

FOUR

WE believe that the ultimate and basic motive for all our life and work must be love — love of God, love of the Word, love of the brethren, love of souls.

WE affirm our conviction that the law of love must also find application to our relationship to other Lutheran bodies.

We therefore deplore a loveless attitude which is manifesting itself within Synod. This unscriptural attitude has been expressed in suspicions of brethren, in the impugning of motives, and in the condemnation of all who have expressed differing opinions concerning some of the problems confronting our Church today.

FIVE

WE affirm our conviction that sound exegetical procedure is the basis for sound Lutheran theology.

We therefore deplore the fact that Romans 16:17, and 18 has been applied to all Christians who differ from us in certain points of doctrine. It is our conviction, based on sound exegetical and hermeneutical principles, that this text does not apply to the present situation in the Lutheran Church of America.

We furthermore deplore the misuse of First Thessalonians 5:22 in the translation "avoid every appearance of evil." This text should be used only in its true meaning, "avoid evil in every form."

SIX

WE affirm the historic Lutheran position concerning the central importance of the *una sancta* and the local congregation. We believe that there should be a re-emphasis of the privileges and responsibilities of the local congregation also in the matter of determining questions of fellowship.

We therefore deplore the new and improper emphasis on the synodical organization as basic in our consideration of the problems of the Church. We believe that no organizational loyalty can take the place of loyalty to Christ and His Church.

SEVEN

WE affirm our abiding faith in the historic Lutheran position concerning the centrality of the Atonement and the Gospel as the revelation of God's redeeming love in Christ.

We therefore deplore any tendency which reduces the warmth and power of the Gospel to a set of intellectual propositions which are to be grasped solely by the mind of man.

EIGHT

WE affirm our conviction that any two or more Christians may pray together to the Triune God in the name of Jesus Christ if the purpose for which they meet and pray is right according to the Word of God. This obviously includes meetings of groups called for the purpose of discussing doctrinal differences.

We therefore deplore the tendency to decide the question of prayer fellowship on any other basis beyond the clear words of Scripture.

NINE

WE believe that the term "unionism" should be applied only to acts in which a clear and unmistakable denial of Scriptural truth or approval of error is involved.

We therefore deplore the tendency to apply this non-Biblical term to any and every contact between Christians of different denominations.

TEN

WE affirm the historic Lutheran position that no Christian has a right to take offense at anything which God has commanded in His Holy Word. The plea of offense must not be made a cover for the irresponsible expression of prejudices, traditions, customs, and usages.

ELEVEN

WE affirm our conviction that in keeping with the historic Lutheran tradition and in harmony with the Synodical resolution adopted in 1938 regarding Church fellowship, such fellowship is possible without complete agreement in details of doctrine and practice which have never been considered divisive in the Lutheran Church.

TWELVE

WE affirm our conviction that our Lord has richly, singularly, and undeservedly blessed our beloved Synod during the first century of its existence in America. We pledge the efforts of our hearts and hands to the building of Synod as the second century opens and new opportunities are given us by the Lord of the Church.

SOLI DEO GLORIA

In Witness Whereof, we, the undersigned, affix our signatures this seventh day of September in the year of our Lord 1945, at Chicago, Illinois.

ACKER, LAWRENCE
 AMLING, C. M.
 ARNDT, W.
 BARTELS, H.
 BAUER, W. E.
 BEHNKE, C. A.
 BERNTHAL, AUG. F.
 BOBZIN, AUG. F.
 BRETSCHER, PAUL
 BRUENING, WM. F.
 BRUSTAT, A. W.

CAEMMERER, RICHARD R.
 COATES, THOMAS
 DEFFNER, L. H.
 ENGELBRECHT, H. H.
 FRIEDRICH, E. J.
 GEISEMAN, O. A.
 GIESELER, C. A.
 GLABE, E. B.
 GRAEBNER, THEO.
 HANSER, ARTHUR R.
 HEMMETER, BERNARD H.

HEMMETER, H. B.
 HILLMER, WM. H.
 HOFFMANN, OSWALD
 KRETZMANN, A. R.
 KRETZMANN, KARL
 KRETZMANN, O. P.
 KUECHLE, GEO.
 KUNTZ, WERNER
 KURTH, ERWIN
 KUMNICK, H. H.
 LINDEMANN, FRED H.

LINDEMANN, HERBERT
 LOOSE, F. W.
 MEYER, ADOLF F.
 MILLER, PAUL F.
 POLACK, W. G.
 SAUER, O. A.
 SCHROEDEL, THEO. H.
 THEISS, O. H.
 WEBER, EDMUND W.
 WENCHEL, J. FREDERIC
 WIND, H. F.

* * * *

Discussion of "A Statement". — One cannot help wishing that the foregoing "Statement" — but without its companion letter — had been written in less troubled times or, better still, that it had been written now, but with real detachment and as an impartial warning to all who have become involved in the controversies of our day over the problem of Union and its related issues. For it undeniably contains many things which in themselves are sound and true, and touches on many other topics which would be profitable for discussion by all concerned.

In view of these current issues a declaration of "unswerving loyalty to the great evangelical heritage of historic Lutheranism" is certainly very much in order, and there will hardly be any one in our circles who will not deeply "deplore any and every tendency which would limit the power of our heritage, reduce it to narrow legalism, and confine it by man-made traditions" (Statement I). There is, furthermore, real need in our day for reaffirming "our faith in the great Lutheran principle of the inerrancy, certainty, and all-sufficiency of Holy Writ," and any tendency "to substitute human judgments, synodical resolutions, or other sources of authority for the supreme authority of Scripture" is certainly much to be deplored (Statement II). Because the Gospel is addressed to the heart of man, the conclusion of VII expresses a truth of the highest order, one which all of us may well take to heart. Nor should we who from earnest conviction are resisting the trend toward union and are challenging the Doctrinal Affirmation — which is now before our several synods — as a departure from the former stand of the Missouri Synod and our Synodical Conference, ever forget that the spirit of uncharitableness, legalism, intellectualism, and traditionalism has always constituted a dangerous pitfall for those who undertake to defend an established doctrinal position. A thorough searching of our own hearts on this score is very much in order.

There are other sections in this "Statement" which also have unquestioned merit — if viewed by themselves. But taking all things into consideration, the entire solemn manifesto together with the circumstances under which it was issued, the fact remains that it is nevertheless a highly

partisan document. For as one studies it more closely, it becomes increasingly clear that its signers represent a single school of thought with reference to a group of closely related issues, such as prayer fellowship, non-divisive doctrines, the question of offense, unionism, the applicability of Rom. 16:17 to the problem of Lutheran union, and similar matters. It also appears that their conclusions all point in one and the same direction, toward closer understanding, co-operation, and the beginnings of fellowship with Lutherans from whom we have been separated in the past. In this respect Statement VI assumes a peculiar importance because it clearly, although perhaps not by design, creates a foothold for the new theory of selective fellowship, recently advocated by the Fellowship Committee of the A. L. C. as a means for consummating a desired connection in several directions simultaneously.

It becomes a serious matter when, with these conditions as a background, the advocates of change use such extremes of light and shadow in drawing their picture as they do in this "Statement" under discussion. Since the authors do not make themselves clear to the contrary, the impression will prevail that the virtues which they describe are to be found in those who have associated themselves with their cause, while the faults which they decry must be the unfailing marks of all those who are opposing this trend. Then the broad and sweeping indictments of the "We deplore" passages will in effect become blanket charges leveled indiscriminately at all who may happen to disagree as to these issues. In these very months we are being urged to study the Doctrinal Affirmation. Suppose there is some one who has weighed it conscientiously, but found it wanting, and who for such reasons is not ready for the fellowship for which it should provide the doctrinal basis. Must he not expect that in the eyes of readers who are not thoroughly familiar with the entire situation he will seem as one who by man-made walls and barriers and by ecclesiastical traditions would hinder the free course of the Gospel in the world (Statement III), who is incapable of applying the law of love to our relationship to other Lutheran bodies (Statement IV)? By their solemn pronouncement his own brethren have built up this impression and spread it abroad. Even the fairest and most well-meaning critic will now inevitably be placed under a cloud.

If our analysis of the "Statement" seems severe, its authors have no one to blame but themselves. In their companion letter they have claimed for themselves the quality of being "sane and soundly Lutheran, evangelical, positive and constructive." In the following paragraphs they have branded their opponents with a list of varied invective which is quite beyond the range of the ordinary writer. And all this without a word to intimate that at least some of the resistance to the proposed changes may stem from deep concern for the Truth of God and from sincere love and loyalty to our Savior and His Church. It is this that makes the "Statement" so highly confusing and misleading, to say the least.

In support of our evaluation of the "Statement" we bring a number of quotations from other Lutheran periodicals. From an editorial in the *Lutheran Standard* (A. L. C.) for December 15, under the caption, "*The Voice of our Brethren*": "This 'Statement' is reminiscent of the spirit and courageous forthrightness of Luther's reformatory writings. . . One need not to be a prophet to realize that the manifesto which these influential pastors have drawn up and sent to every pastor in the Missouri Synod is going to prove an extremely important and valuable contribution to a better understanding among Lutherans in America and to the promotion of the cause of Lutheran unity. Knowing at least something about the mind of the American Lutheran Church, we do not hesitate to predict that this statement will at once strike a joyfully responsive chord throughout our circles. Here is indeed the voice of our brethren! Here is something to which we in the American Lutheran Church can voice a grand and hearty Amen! . . . It seems to us that these brethren in the Missouri Synod are especially deserving of brotherly encouragement on the part of fellow Lutherans in other church bodies. As is clearly indicated in the covering letter that accompanied the sending of the 'Statement' to the pastors of the Missouri Synod, this 'Statement' was the direct result of carping criticism and faultfinding, of the working of 'a strange and pernicious spirit' within the Missouri Synod. To be almost brutally frank about it, the reactionary element in the Missouri Synod has been sniping at men of the type of the two Lindemanns, O. A. Geisemann, President O. P. Kretzmann, and the editors of the *Lutheran Witness*. Now this group that has been attacked speaks out plainly but lovingly. That means much, for they are under fire. Shall not we, who have suffered no such internal attack, heartily support our brethren who are under fire?"

Under the heading "*Notable Pronouncement By Missouri Pastors*" the *Lutheran Outlook* (A. L. Cf.) in its December issue has this reaction: "Aside from the epoch-making character of the manifesto itself, it must be regarded as a document of supreme importance in view of the outstanding pastors and leaders of the Missouri Synod who have attached their names to it. . . . In view of the traditional attitude of the Missouri Synod toward such questions as prayer fellowship and unionism, the position taken by the group which met in Chicago on September 6 and 7 must be regarded as well-nigh revolutionary." After itemizing a number of these revolutionary statements, the *Outlook* continues: "The Chicago statement may be said to have a two-fold character: first, it sets forth incontrovertible Scriptural truths, and, secondly, it contains a confession of sins. From both of these points of view, it is a hopeful augury of better things to come within the Lutheran Church in America. It has been the failure of many within the Lutheran Church to stand squarely on the revealed truth of God that has led to many of the difficulties and misunderstandings that have distressed our beloved Church, and it has been a proud unwillingness to admit human sin and error, as well as human prejudices and lack of charity, that has

kept the Lutheran household of faith so sadly divided. And this applies to every Lutheran group — not Missouri alone.

"The question that remains unanswered is: Will the Missouri Synod heed these voices crying in the wilderness? These men are speaking in prophetic language. They have been given a clear revelation of the mind of God in the light of the fearful crisis which confronts mankind today. And they have evidently counted the cost. The Missouri Synod by their manifesto has been brought to one of the crossroads of destiny. In what direction will it set its face?"

So far the *Outlook*. We find the last question particularly significant, but perhaps in a different sense from that of the *Outlook*.

E. R.

"**Doctrinal Content.**" — The *Declaration* of the A. L. C., in 1938, contained the following sentence: "With the other points of doctrine presented in the *Brief Statement* . . . we are conscious of being in agreement." With this declaration, as became more evident later, the A. L. C. did not accept the respective paragraphs of the *Brief Statement* as such, but merely wished to express a general agreement with their "doctrinal content." The idea of approving the "doctrinal content" of a document, without accepting it as a whole, again appears in a resolution adopted by the A. L. C. Committee on Fellowship at its meeting in Columbus on November 8 and 9.

"3. In view of the fact that the *Doctrinal Affirmation* is officially before the Church for study as a possible instrument for establishing unity with the Missouri Synod, we advocate that this document be given serious study by all our brethren, to determine whether they can approve it, either *in toto* or as to its doctrinal content. The committee believes that the approval of its doctrinal content will suffice for the establishment of doctrinal unity with the Missouri Synod."

Is a document, drawn up for the purpose of composing past differences, sufficient for this purpose if one, perhaps each, of the subscribing parties reserves the right to ignore its terms, the wording and phrasing in which their joint confession is couched, and subscribes merely to what they may consider as the doctrinal content, while the co-signers may find a different "doctrinal content" confessed in the same document?

M.

"**Selective Fellowship Favored by Committee on Fellowship.**" — This heading is taken over bodily from the *Lutheran Standard* for December 1, 1945. On November 8 and 9, the said committee held a meeting in Columbus, Ohio. From a "statement of policy" adopted by the committee we here copy the following paragraphs which pertain to "selective fellowship".

"The Committee on Intersynodical Fellowship of the American Lutheran Church, conscious of the responsibility laid upon it to promote the cause of Lutheran unity in the most effective way, and in response to inquiries as to the policies and specific procedures to be pursued in the attainment of this end, has adopted the following principles for its own guidance and to give clarity and direction to this movement among the brethren in the Church:

"1. We believe that, under the providence of God, the American Lutheran Church has been given favorable opportunities to promote the cause of Lutheran unity in America, and therefore should put forth energetic efforts to consummate such unity with the United Lutheran Church in America and with the synods of the Synodical Conference.

"2. We believe that the most promising immediate means of working toward this end is the adoption of the principle of selective fellowship, and therefore we advocate the adoption of this principle at the next convention of the Church."

To practice and advocate "selective fellowship", one must entirely ignore the fact that a synod is a church, a body of Christians held together, not by some man-made set of rules, but by a common confession of faith and by a common practice expressive of the faith so confessed. "Selective fellowship" across synodical boundary lines by members of two bodies that are still separated by a conflicting confession and practice, in reality, is nothing but an attempt to blow hot and cold at the same time; and a church advocating it, thereby signs its own death warrant as a "pillar and ground of the truth."
M.

Adult Instruction. — While instruction of outsiders in the tenets of the Christian religion and the preparation of adults for confirmation and membership has been carried on in the Lutheran Church of our country from its very beginning the last decades have witnessed a tremendous increase in this field of mission endeavor.

In the last century, during the period of the influx of the great masses of Lutheran immigrants from Europe, the work of gathering and organizing them into Lutheran congregations was clearly the first and foremost duty, the God-given task of our Church. At this time the constituents of our Church already established were still using the languages of their respective European home lands in their homes, their schools, and their churches, especially in the Middle West. This fact enabled them to carry on church work among their newly arrived fellow-Lutherans most effectively. At that, the field was so vast and the number of available laborers so inadequate that frequently our Church saw its strength overtaxed in the garnering of the harvest before its very doors. Consequently many of the Lutheran immigrants of those days became a ready prey for various Protestant sects who, likewise, strained every effort to gain them.

Home mission then was something entirely different from what it is now. Now our home mission means evangelistic work among the unchurched of our country. Only gross ignorance of, or willful blindness to, the actualities can blame our fathers for leaving this field almost untouched. Their work, of which we have spoken above, left them neither time nor strength for an undertaking of this kind. When one considers that, according to census figures, approximately one half of the inhabitants of the United States are without any church connection the immensity of the field as well as the enormity of the task become readily apparent. This work is carried on today almost exclusively in the language of our country by our Church which has become or is rapidly becoming a one-language, an English-speaking church. That does not mean we do not stand ready to bring the saving Gospel in their own tongue to those who do not understand English.

Once the accretion of unchurched adults to our Church was rare, now it has become an every-day occurrence beside its normal growth through the children reared in our congregations. Quite naturally more interest has been aroused, greater attention is paid to the preparation of adults for church membership. The quest for literature appropriate to their instruction of them has become livelier than ever. Of course, the Bible, the Catechism and the Hymnal are, and always will be, the tools for the awakening and nourishing of a healthy life of faith. However, in consideration of the limited time for instruction and the difference between the adult mind and that of the child, the need is felt and expressed for some books which are especially written and adapted to the teaching of the adult.

Another reason why helps for the instruction of adults are eagerly sought must not be overlooked. It lies in the changed conditions under which we Lutheran Christians are living in this country of ours, in comparison with those obtaining a generation or two ago. Formerly the very fact that our fathers were foreign-tongued people acted as an effective barrier to shield their sons and daughters and to keep them safely within the fold. Our congregations were like islands whose inhabitants were closely knit together by a religion, a language, and customs common to all of them. When a stranger — say by marrying a son or daughter, which was happening occasionally — settled among them, the power of environment was usually so strong that he was either made to conform and was thus absorbed, or that he soon pulled stakes and left. At any rate, he did not long remain a disturbing element. Then family life meant much more than now. Christianity was a vital force influencing the up-growing generation to walk in the paths of righteousness. Besides Christian schools of a sort, often conducted by the pastors, in which all the children of the congregation were prepared for confirmation and communicant membership, had been established everywhere. Add to this the *Christenlehre* which cared for the confirmed youth of the Church, and which was usually held in the presence of all the church membership, either

in a separate or, as was frequently the case, in the regular Sunday service, and you have a rather well balanced and sufficiently thorough training of the young for Christian man- and womanhood from the days of childhood through the years of adolescence.

The picture is a different one today. The fervor of our pioneer days has abated. After the stress and strife of planting our Church on the soil of this new country and establishing it as a self-supporting, consciously Lutheran institution in the days of our fathers, we have made ourselves thoroughly at home in the surrounding world, and in the place of the arduous struggle for purity of doctrine and a sanctified Christian life we are now in danger of a complacency which, in the end, spells spiritual death. It can hardly be denied that our people in large numbers have become pleasantly indifferent to our great Lutheran heritage and are losing the priceless treasure, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. On the other hand, modern life has not merely forced fathers and mothers, sons and daughters to seek gainful employment for the proper support of the family, but urges them on beyond necessity to earn money to satisfy the craving for the doubtful, often sinful pleasures the world so alluringly holds before them. Home, then, in many instances, is not much more than a place for eating and sleeping and for receiving one's mail. Thus an atmosphere is created which is certainly not conducive to the practice of the Christianity which we are confessing with our mouths. Formerly the members of the family looked forward to the hour or two in the evening when they could enjoy each other's company after the day's work was done. Those were the days when at least in many, if not in all, Christian homes regular family devotions were held, when in the intimacy of the family circle the mature Christian personality of the parent could and did exert its powerful influence upon the younger generation.

Furthermore, in spite of a noticeably fresh interest in Christian day schools there are still far too many of our congregations which, of necessity or otherwise, offer their children nothing in the way of Christian training but the Sunday School. And — what should be almost unbelievable — even where Christian schools exist there are any number of children who have nothing but a Sunday School training when they apply for confirmation instruction. Besides, the barrier of language separating our Lutheran people to some extent from their fellow-citizens, has fallen. Our young people are exposed to the full impact of sectarianism, worldliness and unbelief, against which they must give battle in their daily contacts with others in factories, shops and offices, while at work or at play. *Christenlehre* is almost unknown in our Church today. The necessity of holding at least two forenoon services during the time of bilingualism has made this form of adolescent instruction obsolete.

All this is resulting in the loss of an alarmingly large number of our young people of post-confirmation age. To combat this appalling state of affairs Bible classes, on some evening after working hours or at any other time convenient to our young people, are conducted in our congregations.

However arranging such Bible classes is one thing, to get the youth of our congregations to attend them in quite another. How discouraging for the conscientious pastor to have a handful of his young people in attendance when his goal is to have all of them sit at Jesus' feet and meditate on the "one thing needful" under his guidance! In many congregations young people's societies, have been formed which provide also recreation besides Bible instruction. Has this solved the problem how to keep our young people under the influence of the Gospel, how to guard them against worldliness and apathy? We find no fault with an arrangement which stresses the chief purpose the Church has in fostering such societies and then incidentally also offers Christian young people an opportunity for innocuous amusement and comradeship. If we only remain on our guard, knowing the depravity of the human heart even in a Christian, against the very real danger of bringing the world into the Church by such means. The danger is there that the Church in providing for recreational activities of its membership is neglecting its one and only duty of preaching the Gospel of salvation in Christ Jesus. Do we not know how loath we are to believe in the power of the Gospel as the only means of building the Church of Christ? *Hand auf's Herz!* Do we know of any one having been brought to Christ or having been kept with Him by one or the other form of amusement offered him at picnics, rallies or what have you? Of course not. Still the social doings of the church societies are played up so much before the general public that a stranger might well wonder why other places of amusement are taxed while the churches competing with them are tax-exempt.

Many Protestant denominations in our country do not seem to have any other message but what is called the social Gospel with the goal of making the world a better place to live in. Are we in the Lutheran Church here and there guilty of hiding our light, the light of the forgiveness of sins for the sake of the atoning blood of Christ, under a bushel when we give the appearance of being more concerned about the physical than the spiritual well-being of our fellow-men? Because our efforts in the recreational field are readily appreciated by people within as well as outside of our congregations, we may unconsciously give more time to them than we should, to the detriment and at the cost of our spiritual work. Reading a church bulletin one sometimes receives the impression that the congregation almost begs pardon for having a course of Bible teaching in connection with its young people's society. Have you never heard the complaint that at an entertainment the parish hall is filled to overflowing, while the people stay away in droves when the Word of our blessed Savior is to be pondered? But why keep on? We are all agreed it should not be so. And then we go on frantically searching for something else by which we might possibly achieve better results.

Instead of uselessly haranguing each other let us pause and soberly listen to the apostle Paul. What does he say of the message we are charged to bring to the world? "We preach Christ crucified, unto the

Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God" (I Cor. 1, 23. 24). The Jews were the Church of God here on earth at that time. But what happened when the Lord of the Church became incarnate as the son of a woman of the house of Israel? "He came into his own, and his own received him not" (John 1, 11). How few there were that gathered around Him and confessed Him as their Lord and Christ! If He had a Judas among the Twelve, what can we expect? We are His disciples, He is our Master. Charging us to preach the Gospel He adds: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believed not, shall be damned" (Mark 16, 16). And, to speak in the words of St. Paul: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10, 17). By nothing else.

Taking our stand on this truth and firmly holding to it, we, indeed, doing well to scrutinize our way of bringing the message of salvation to the people. Do we pursue the best possible method? Are we zealous in doing the Lord's work? Do we reflect the love of Christ for sinners in our approach? And the like. We shall then be grateful for any literature that may be helpful to us in our desire to remove in our mode of presentation anything that may impede the effect of the Gospel, helpful in the fulfillment of our prayer to be at all times clear channels through which the water of life pours forth into the hearts of sinful men. This writer has used with profit for instruction of adults "*Beginner's Home Study in the Word of God*" by Carl Manthey-Zorn, published 1910 by Concordia Publishing House. He has on his desk for some time a book of instruction written by Pastor O. Riess, the title of which the reader will find in the "Büchertisch" of this number of the *Quartalschrift*.

M. LEHNINGER.

1546 — Luther's Death — 1946. — Luther's death, which occurred 400 years ago in the early morning hours (2:45 A. M.) of the eighteenth of February, 1546, recalls to our minds the last labors performed by the Reformer in the service of his country and of the Church.

When Luther left Wittenberg on the 23d of January for Eisleben to settle a mining dispute between the counts of Mansfeld, he was on his way to perform a last service to his little "fatherland", as he preferred to call Mansfeld, and to his "beloved sovereigns". Praying at the open window in the evening of February 17, he referred to his "beloved fatherland" in the fuller sense of the word as to the whole German nation. Luther was moved by a strong patriotic love for his fatherland and by a clear sense of right and wrong in the affairs of his country. He admonishes the count of Mansfeld not to rob his subjects of their property which they can call their own according to the divine right. He rebukes the braggarts and bullies (Eisenfresser) who defy the "God of recompences". He couched his forebodings of Germany's downfall into these characteristic words:

"Germany is doomed and will be called a has-been. . . . Germany has been — and it will never again be, what is has been." While these forebodings found their fulfillment a hundred years later, when Germany had been ravaged and depopulated by the Thirty Years' War, they have been realized by the German people in a still fuller sense of the word four hundred years later, in this our year, 1946.

But Luther in these last days in Eisleben did not only give thought to the sins of the German nation but to the sins of the whole world. It was again in the evening-hour of the 17th of February that Luther, according to the report dictated by Justus Jonas and Michael Coelius at four o'clock of February 18, spoke of death and eternal life and in this connection said: "O my Lord, twenty years are but a short span of time. Yet it suffices to lay the whole world waste, if man and wife do not live together according to God's creation and order. What a vain creation this is! Indeed, we adults must live such a long life . . . that we may experience much malice, faithlessness and misery in the world and be witnesses of the fact that the devil is such an evil spirit. The human race is like a sheep-fold ready for the slaughter."

Luther, however, did not regard his labors finished in the interest of the Mansfeld Counts, before he had brought about a reconciliation between the two brothers. "The two brothers, Count Gebhard and Count Albert, are again to become brethren" he writes to his wife on the 14th of February. The nature of the settlement for which Luther labored from the 28th of January to the 17th of February in Eisleben was to be a Christian agreement effected by him whom they honored as their spiritual leader and father. It was a spiritual service which Luther rendered these two brothers. As such he evaluated it, when he said at the evening-meal of February 17th: "If I succeed in reconciling my two sovereigns, the Counts, and if, God willing, I carry out the purpose of my trip, I'll return home and lay myself down to sleep in my coffin."

While Luther already labored in the Word in bringing about a reconciliation of the two Counts, he did so still more when he prayed for the Church, when he preached in the pulpit, and when he wrote and warned against his enemies. It was on that last evening of his sojourn on earth that he spoke the following words in prayer: "Graciously preserve the church of my dear fatherland from harm to the end in the pure truth, in steadfastness, and in the true profession of Thy Word, that the whole world may be convinced that you have sent me for just this purpose. O my Lord and God. Amen, Amen." After his evening prayers he would still spend five or ten minutes in conversation with his friends, Michael Coelius, pastor in Mansfeld, and Justus Jonas, superintendent in Halle. Bidding them good-night he would add: "Dr. Jonas and Herr Michael, pray to our Lord that the cause of His Church may prosper. The Council of Trent is very wroth." The last night before his death he once more shook hands with his friends, bade them good-night, and said again: "Dr. Jonas and Magister Michael, and you others pray for your Lord God and

for His Gospel that it may prosper. For the Council of Trent and the wicked Pope are wroth at it." Finally, in his last free prayer in the early morning hours of the 18th of February, we again find him speaking of the wicked Pope and all the ungodly who dishonor, persecute and revile Jesus Christ, whom his heavenly Father has revealed to him, in whom he believes, and whom he preaches and confesses.

And how did Luther confess his Lord Jesus Christ in his last four sermons preached shortly before his death at Eisleben! Justification, sanctification, the Church, and the Word are the subjects of his discourses. The reader may acquaint himself once more with the content of these sermons in the 12th volume of the St. Louis edition. Before Luther reached Eisleben he had already preached on the 26th of January in Halle, where the flooded Saale forced him to remain from the 25th to the 28th of January. Having reached Eisleben he preached there in St. Andrew's on the 31st of January, and on the 2nd, 7th, and 15th of February. The 15th was a Monday. On the 14th Luther performed the ordination of two candidates of the holy ministry. But "on the 15th of February, two or three days before his death", as Mathesius expressly says, "he preached his last sermon on the Gospel of Matthew, chapter 11."

When Luther left Wittenberg for Eisleben he had taken with him his last controversial treatise, *contra asinos Parisienses Lovaniensesque*. While the Reformer never finished this polemic, still he had brought it with him in a chest and continued to write on it while at Eisleben. After his death the manuscript was found in his pockets and entrusted to Caspar Cruciger, who was to complete it. "Should he, with God's help, be able to return to Wittenberg," Luther had told his friends, "he would also write against the silver-plated lawyers (silberne Juristen, thus called by Luther because they were after the almighty dollar), and also against those who slander the Sacraments." In this manner Luther, who labored both in the written and the spoken Word unto the end, thought of bringing his life's work to a close. His Lord, however, purposed otherwise. He called His untiring laborer to his rest and reward, before he could finish his task. We, who by the grace of God still labor in the Word, have every reason to recall to our minds, even after four hundred years, the labors of this great witness to the truth, and to remember the Word of God which he has spoken unto us and to follow his faith, considering the end of his conversation (Hebr. 13, 7).

P. PETERS.

Pope's Appeal to Non-Catholics. — It does not take us by surprise that the year-long commemorations throughout the Roman Catholic world of the fourth centenary of the Council of Trent were climaxed by Pope Pius XII with an appeal to Christians everywhere to return to the Catholic faith. This appeal, the *Religious News Service* informs us, was published on the same date — December 13 — when the Council of Trent,

summoned to combat the rise of Protestantism, began its deliberations in 1545. In his appeal the Pope repeats the prayer which closed the final session of the Council in 1563: "Vouchsafe, O Lord, our God, what thou hast promised would one day occur, namely that there be but one flock and one shepherd." This "one flock" here, of course, means the Roman Catholic Church, "the mother and mistress of all churches", and the "one shepherd" denotes the pope as "the vicar of Christ on earth". Consequently Pius XII speaks in this his appeal of "that necessary union with Peter and his successors, that most unfortunate circumstances four centuries ago, so tragically breached". Speaking of the union of the one flock and one shepherd we, as Protestant Christians, can only speak of it as our Lord Jesus Christ has taught us in his highpriestly prayer: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us" (John 17, 21). Our Highpriest and true Shepherd has given us His Word, which the Council of Trent with its definitions and decrees cannot replace. Wherever this Word of Christ is preached and wherever His voice is heard we have the true Church of Christ. Therefore the appeal of the Pope with its emphasis on "that necessary union with Peter and his successors", on "the achievements of the Council of Trent . . . marking the beginning of a new epoch", on "the moral reform brought about by the Trentine Council", on the decrees of this Council as "the apex of the scientific studies of theologians and councils" is void of all influence on those who are taken captive by the Word of God and liberated from the power of the Antichrist.

P. PETERS.

University of Erlangen Library Saved. — Latest reports from Germany reveal that none of the buildings of the famous University of Erlangen in Bavaria suffered any harm. The University of Erlangen is the only evangelical university in Bavaria, which province is a stronghold of Roman Catholicism in Germany. From the very beginning the theological faculties were predominant at Erlangen. Among the men who once brought fame to Erlangen through their teaching for a time at this illustrious university were Thomasius, Franz Delitzsch, Luthardt, Frank, Hauck, and Kolde. The influence of Hofmann was disastrous. It was Th. Zahn, the New Testament exegete, who attracted thousands of theological students from German and foreign countries to Erlangen. We are informed that he died as a nonagenarian during the last war. It is only too natural that these theological professors would also see to it that their library would receive as many as possible of the essential manuscripts and books of theology covering especially the period of the Reformation and Lutheran theology in all of its ramifications. The library comprises more than a million volumes. For the history of our Lutheran Church this is of inestimable value. If we take into consideration that many a famous library has been bombed and perhaps even looted and that only too many of the otherwise wellstocked pastors' libraries have been destroyed, thus

producing an alarming scarcity of valuable books of theology, it is gratifying to hear that the large and famous library of the University of Erlangen has remained intact. Thus perhaps many essential theological books can be reproduced later on or at least be made available to the theological students of all lands. The famous art collection which among others contained paintings and drawings of Albrecht Durer also was preserved. To every student of theology, especially Lutheran, this must and will be welcome news radiating out of Germany midst that over-abundance of otherwise sad and tragic news.

H. A. KOCH.

Twelve Million Displaced Persons. — The aftermath of World War II has displaced no less than 12,000,000 persons seeking shelter in the countryside east of Berlin. Of these 12,000,000, *The Lutheran* for December 26, 1945, informs us, 6,650,000 are being moved into Germany from neighboring countries. About 2,500,000 of them are coming from Czechoslovakia, 3,500,000 persons of German ancestry from Poland. *The Lutheran Standard* for January 12, 1946 tells of the plan which is to provide for seven million persons: "All the Germans from Poland are to resettle in the Russian and British zones. Those from Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary are to be resettled in the American and the French zones." If everything proceeds according to plan these migrating millions will be resettled by July. But till then a high percentage will have died in transport, on the highways or in caves and stables from disease and freezing. Indeed "there is no parallel to this in the history of resettlement of peoples." Yet we have a word of the prophet Isaiah which vividly depicts this catastrophe for us: "Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof" (24, 1).

What is being done to alleviate the sufferings of these millions of women, children, and old people, the majority of whom are "innocent victims in the wake of war." Till now the German *Hilfswerk* has been the only agency which was able to give these displaced persons provisional help. The German churches, themselves destitute, have raised about \$1,500,000 for relief among these people. Our Missouri brethren have added \$100,000 to this collection. The British Army of the Rhine has granted to Lutheran Relief, Inc., permission to extend relief to its territories. President Truman, however, has refused to allow American church organizations to ship clothing, food or medical supplies to any part of occupied Germany (RNS 1/22/46). A petition asking President Truman and Congress to extend UNRRA services to the needy of conquered Germany and Japan was adopted, the RNS (1/25/46) reports, by the 38 district presidents of the Missouri Synod at their convention in St. Louis.

P. PETERS.

The Protestant Church in East Germany. — The catastrophe which has befallen the Protestant Church in East Germany is comparable

only, we are told by Bishop Wurm, to the destruction of the once flourishing Christian Church in North Africa by Mohammedanism. In East Prussia and Pomerania the Protestant church had numbered $3\frac{1}{2}$ million members. It has been utterly destroyed. In Silesia the Evangelical church numbered more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ million. Of these scarcely a few hundred thousand remain. (Comp. *Lutheran Standard* for December 22, 1945.) East Germany is not only losing its German population, it is losing, yea, it has lost its Protestant population. — With singularly little opposition from within or without, East Germany had accepted and carried out the Reformation. It was as early as the year 1523 that Margrave Albert of Brandenburg-Ansbach, General of the Teutonic Order, met with Luther, after he had already, in 1522, admitted Lutheran preachers within his province. George of Polentz, Bishop of Samland, placed himself at the head of the reforming party, and on Christmas day, 1523, proclaimed with great joy in the cathedral at Königsberg that the Savior had been once more born for his people. In 1544 the University of Königsberg was established to educate preachers for the independent Prussian Church. Today Königsberg represents the most western point of the Soviet Union. Pomerania and Silesia soon followed East Prussia in accepting and carrying out the Reformation. In 1534 the two dukes of Wolgast and Stettin formally proclaimed their acceptance of the Lutheran doctrine at the provincial Diet of Treptow und John Bugenhagen (Pomeranus), pastor of the principal church of Wittenberg, was called to organize the newly-founded church. The University of Greifswald, at which Bugenhagen had studied, held out longest against the advance of Lutheranism, but became a Protestant university in 1539. Now Greifswald is under Polish rule. After Luther's German writings had found widespread acceptance by the people in Silesia and after his Latin writings had been read by the educated, princes and bishops gave the Reformation their support. In 1564 all were members of the Lutheran Church with the exception of Bishop Balthasar of Breslau, who, however, had studied in Wittenberg in 1519 and who did not endeavor to counteract the work of reform. During the Thirty Years' War these provinces were devastated and their lands ravaged by both sides. Great as this devastation must have been, still it cannot be compared with that of World War II, which finds its climax in the uprooting and expelling of millions of peoples from their homelands, where they have resided for centuries and have been instrumental in the spread of the Gospel truth. Appalled by the greatness of their suffering and of the loss of lives, we fail to give thought to the effects of this forced emigration on the Protestant church of East Germany. Having our attention called to it, however, we gradually grow aware of the fact that the expulsion of these millions not only sweeps away the cultural, but above all the church work of centuries. Despite the Counter Reformation prior to, during, and after the Thirty Years' War, the Protestant population in East Germany continued to be in the majority. At the census of 1925 East Prussia had a Protestant population of 1,889,957, a Catholic population of 339,540; Pomerania a Protestant

population of 1,784,842, a Catholic population of 657,573; Lower Silesia a Protestant population of 2,120,458, a Catholic population of 925,784. In other words, a country that has harbored millions of Protestants in the past four hundred years and that had no less than 6,000,000 Protestants in its boundaries prior to World War II, is now bereft of its Protestant population. Many of these will become victims of starvation, rape, and murder before they ever reach the German boundary, many more will fall prey to starvation and the cold of a severe winter even after they have reached the confines of the present Germany with its cities destroyed and without the means of livelihood for the greater part of its population. No, it is not only the German nation, or what is left of it, that is losing millions of its citizens, but it is the Protestant Church which is losing untold numbers of its members. The Thirty Years' War with its Counter Reformation had done much to tear away millions of Protestant Germans from their hearths and altars, but World War II with its aftermath has done and is doing more.

P. PETERS.

The Reformed Church in Hungary. — Hungary prior to World War II had more church schools than state schools. The Reformed Church, according to a statement made by Bishop Ladislaus Ravasz, president of the General Synod of the Hungarian Reformed Church, to a correspondent of the *Religious News Service*, had 2,000 elementary schools, 58 high schools, four colleges, a law school, and three theological academies. Yet all these schools are becoming state-controlled because the church, weakened by the financial debacle in Hungary and impoverished by inflation, is not any longer able to support its own schools. As a result the church will no longer be able to maintain control of social institutions and schools, which are now being financed by the state. 140,000 acres of church land, most of which had belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, but which had been used to support social institutions, has been confiscated by the state. While the state has not yet interfered in study programs and while the Communists have refrained from attacking the church for political or ideological reasons, still Bishop Ravasz considers the autonomy of the church to be but "theoretical and precarious". At least a large section of the church's activities is becoming state-controlled as effectively as in Slovakia, where church schools and the Roman Catholic Caritas have been taken over by the state. It, of course, goes without saying that as a result of this precarious financial condition the church in Hungary is also in need of Bibles — its immediate need is that of 150,000 Bibles — and also in great need of food. Here indeed the preaching of the Gospel, whether by word of mouth or by means of the written word, must be combined with the rendering of material help.

P. PETERS.

The Lutheran Church in Russia. — What has been the fate of the 17,000,000 Lutherans in Russia, who prior to World War I had found a home in the Volga country and other parts of the great Soviet Union?

This question we must ask ourselves again and again, although little or no information concerning even the remnant of these millions reaches us. Every bit of news, however, even the most meager, concerning the condition of those who have survived, is something for which we are grateful. A former teacher in the parish schools of the Volga country, Dr. Edward J. Amend, of Salem Church, Stillwater, Okla. (ULCA), has written an account of the Lutheran Church in Russia in *The Lutheran* (December 19, 1945), News Magazine of the United Lutheran Church in America. This account based on two letters received last spring from relatives in Russia and on others received before the war, reads: "There is no formal church organization existing. Almost everyone who formerly professed the Lutheran faith is at present in Siberia. The Lutheran Church, therefore, has completely disappeared during the years of warfare, starvation, and revolution. The last sign of the survival of any ordained pastor came to me in the form of an open postcard from Pastor Kluck of Catherinenstadt (Marxstadt), received in 1932, in which he begged me not to write to him, because correspondence from abroad made his position even more unbearable. Already in 1929 the 94 remaining pastors for the one million Lutherans in Russia had been exiled or killed, and the Lutheran Seminary closed. Truly, this number must have become very small by now after so many years of indescribable hardships and oppression. Keeping in mind that until the outbreak of World War I there were 17,000,000 Lutherans in Russia, more than three times the total Lutheran population of North America, we are indeed facing a catastrophe to the Lutheran Church in Russia exceeding, as far as numbers are concerned, that of the Lutheran Church in East Germany.

Still this account speaks more of the Lutheran Church in Russia in the past than in the present. Most recent information concerning the churches in Moscow has been received by the *Religious News Service* (December 31, 1945) from the Reverend Leopold J. Braun, first Roman Catholic priest permitted to hold services in Moscow since the revolution. He informed reporters at his recent return to the United States after a twelve years' stay in Moscow "that religion was encouraged for all faiths in Russia". Still persons who desire to establish a church, must first gain permission from the state. Twenty persons can gather together and petition for a parish. If the petition is approved, they elect an executive committee of three, one of whom is president. The state furnishes them without charge, with a church, sacred vessels, vestments, furniture etc. Apart from the Orthodox churches, there are now in Moscow, according to the report of the Rev. Leopold J. Braun, "one Synagogue, one Protestant church, formed by a merger of Lutheran, Evangelical, and Baptist sects, and his lone Catholic church, the Church of St. Louis, which has 30,000 adherents." This report pertains to only one city of the great Soviet Union. Still it is a very significant and very characteristic report of present-day church conditions in modern Russia. For sake of comparison we also are informed that before the revolution, March 15, 1917, Moscow had 462

Orthodox churches, but by 1941 these had dwindled to 26, and that before the revolution there were five Roman Catholic dioceses in Russia and twelve apostolic administrations including, as we learn from another source, 2,000 Catholic churches. How many of these were in Moscow is not stated, still the National Catholic Almanac for 1945 speaks of only one Catholic church remaining at the beginning of 1939 in the whole Russian area. This one lone surviving Catholic church is undoubtedly that of the Rev. Leopold J. Braun. That this priest at no time during his twelve years in Moscow, as he repeatedly told reporters, was hampered in his spiritual ministrations by the law is certainly of little import over against the fact that the thousands of Catholic and Protestant churches in Russia are a thing of the past. Whatever the prospect of the growth of the Orthodox Church in Russia, and even of the Catholic Church may be, we as Lutherans are, above all, concerned about the Lutheran Church in the Soviet Union which may never again be restored within its former boundaries, which may never again appear as a formal church organization. "What is the outlook for possible restoration of that faithful company?" Dr. Amend rightly asks. At present, we can only answer, there is no outlook at all. Our comfort, however, is and remains that in the midst of the millions, who have secretly practised some form of Evangelical Christianity even during the strictest regime of the Soviets "the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his" (2 Tim. 2, 19) . . . "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Mt. 16, 18).

P. PETERS.

Friedrich von Bodelschwingh †. — The Rev. Dr. Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, director of the Bethel Institutions in Bielefeld, Germany, died on the 8th of January at the age of 68. He was elected as the first Bishop of the Evangelical Church of Germany in May of 1933, but was forced to resign in June of the same year to be succeeded by Bishop Ludwig Müller. As director of the Bethel Institute, known as the "City of Mercy", Dr. von Bodelschwingh headed an institution which according to the *Religious News Service* of January 14, 1946, housed an average of 2,000 invalid, crippled, epileptic, and insane patients.

P. PETERS.

Ernst Sellin †. — Dr. E. Sellin, a former professor of the University of Berlin, died at the age of 78, having been accidentally shot on the streets of Berlin, as the *Kirchenblatt* for February 2 informs its readers. Professor Sellin is especially known for his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Sechste, neu bearbeitete Auflage, 1933) and for his *Kommentar zum Alten Testament*. His *Einleitung* has been translated into English. He is also widely known for the excavations which he conducted in 1902 and 1903 at Taanach, in 1907–1909 at Jericho, and in 1913–1914 and 1926–1927 at Balata near Shechen.

P. PETERS.

Büchertisch

The Babylonian Genesis, The Story of the Creation. By Alexander Heidel. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill. Price, \$1.50.

The author of this study, Dr. Heidel, Research Assistant on the Assyrian Dictionary Project of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, is well known to those of our pastors who have attended the Pastors' Retreat at Mt. Morris, where Dr. Heidel has served as lecturer, as also to our Seminary students, who have heard him speak on the subjects treated in his study before their "Forum". It is therefore not at all surprising to those of us, who have learned to know the author as a dependable guide through the records from Babylonia and Assyria and their points of contact with the Old Testament passages, that he has written this study "primarily for the Old Testament scholar and the Christian minister". In it he does not only give us an up-to-date translation of the Babylonian Epic, Enûma Elish, of the tablets representing versions of the creation story, of excerpts from Damascius and Berossus, but also enters in upon a detailed discussion of all Old Testament parallels in full recognition of the doctrine of inspiration as taught in the Scriptures. In his "Preface" the author at once points out that "the creation and flood stories of the Babylonian Genesis as well as the Code of Hammurabi abound in striking parallels to the corresponding portions of the Old Testament". This observation is basic for the preceding statement in this "Preface", "that the Old Testament is not an isolated body of literature but that it has so many parallels in the literature of the nations surrounding Israel that it is impossible to write a scientific history of the Hebrews or a scientific commentary on the Old Testament without at least a fair knowledge of the history and literature of Israel's neighbors". We fully agree that it is impossible to do full justice to the Hebrew original, with its typical phrases, its figures of speech, its imagery, without giving due consideration to these parallels. The comparison which is drawn in this study between certain passages of the Babylonian Genesis and the Biblical Genesis including passages from the Psalms and Prophets, therefore represents the most valuable contribution by the author to just these requirements of the Old Testament scholar and the Christian minister. Dr. Heidel has succeeded in pointing out the essential differences existing between these two groups of parallels. He also has called attention to their similarities by emphasizing that "some of these Old Testament figures of speech are no doubt due to foreign influence of some kind" (p. 94). The question, according to our opinion, is not so much whether some of the Old Testament parallels are due to foreign influence and whether others have been suggested to the sacred writers by their own observation of nature (comp. p. 94). Be this as it may, the fact that these figures of speech and this imagery are at all used by the Old Testament writers, that we can speak of them as "parallels"

in a specific sense of the word, and that we can draw certain comparisons, suffices to demonstrate to us the singularity of the Old Testament speech and mode of expression. And as these parallels in the literature of Israel's neighbors — we also welcome the comparisons drawn by the author between the Ras Shamra tablets and the Old Testament writings — increase in number, the necessity on the part of the Old Testament scholar and Christian minister to compare these parallels with one another and to keep the differences and similarities well in mind will become more and more apparent. The final result of such a continuous comparison will be just this that the Old Testament student will ever be reminded of the great and wondrous fact that the Holy Ghost spoke through the sacred writers in a language embodying figures of speech and imagery with which not only Israel was familiar, but also Israel's neighbors.

Our attention has been called to the fact that on page 92 of this study, eighth line from the bottom, the words "which, incidentally, is not even mentioned in this passage" ought to be omitted.

Since the available stock of this edition, published in 1942, will probably be sold out within about a year, readers who are without a copy should not postpone sending in their orders.

P. PETERS.

The Atomic Bomb and The Word of God. By Wilbur M. Smith.
Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Ill. Price, 25 cents.

In this "message", the author, member of the Faculty of the Moody Bible Institute, sets forth what he believes "the Word of God has to say about the *principle* which has been introduced in the creation of the atomic bomb". Professor Smith is not to be understood as implying that the Bible contains "a *prediction* of the atomic bomb" but as believing that it "does contain a most astonishing prediction regarding an event yet to take place, in which the *principle* of destruction is exactly the principle now used for the first time in the atomic bomb" (p. 10). In order to illustrate this the author first of all discusses the principle of the atomic bomb by describing the elemental factors concerning the bomb itself. This description is followed by a study of the prophecy of St. Peter concerning a final conflagration on this earth (2 Petr. 3, 7, 10-14), in which the dissolution of the elements is set forth. Other Biblical references to this final conflagration, especially those of the prophets, are also adduced by way of illustration. The author closes his "message" with an admonition based on the Scriptures as to what manner of persons we Christians ought to be in view of the final judgment by fire. The "Notes" and the "Bibliography" serve as a valuable incentive for a further study of these Bible passages, in the interpretation of which Professor Smith has exercised due restraint.

P. PETERS.

Amerikanischer Kalender für deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1946.

Literarischer Redakteur: J. C. Müller. Statistischer Redakteur: P. Armin Schröder. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis 18, Mo. Preis 25 Cents.

The Lutheran Annual 1946. Editor: O. A. Dorn. Statistical Editor: Armin Schroeder. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis 18, Mo. Price, 25 cents.

For the first time since World War II these two calendars contain up-to-date statistics of the Ev. Luth. Free Church of Germany based on a report recently received from Pres. Petersen, furnishing information regarding the whereabouts or fate of the 52 pastors and the one teacher of pre-war days. Only in a few instances, however, was the full address available.

P. PETERS.

What Does The Bible Say? A Manual for the Instruction of Adults.

Second and Revised Edition. Price: Single copy \$1.00, postpaid; in half dozen lots, 75 cents each.

* * * *

Instructor's Manual, Parts I and II. Price, \$1.00 each, postpaid, By Oswald Riess, Pastor Ev. Luth. Church, Detroit 24, Michigan.

We announce the publishing of these books with our warmest recommendation. Please read under *Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen* the article on "Adult Instruction". L.

* * * *

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 43

April 1946

Nummer 2

Was Luther Needed?

A Wreath on Luther's Grave February 18
1546 — 1946

Under this caption we bring in the following pages an article by the well-known author, Dr. W. Dallmann. He reveals the deep moral corruption in the Church of the pre-reformation period. There were many men before and at the time of Luther who were alarmed by this widespread decay of morals and were anxious to bring about a reformation in head and members. In witness thereof we point to the great church councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel.

However the greatest harm done to the cause of Christianity was hidden from the eyes of the learned men of these councils. The precious Gospel of salvation by the free grace of God in Jesus Christ was almost entirely forgotten. Instead the obtaining of salvation was sought in penitential works prescribed by the Church. Luther, a conscientious son of his Church, was brought to the brink of despair before he, by the mercy of God, in his study of the Bible found peace of heart in the righteousness of Christ, attained by His vicarious atonement and imputed to a sinful world. This message henceforth he preached; for this he was ready to lay down his life. And thousands upon thousands join us in giving glory and praise to our God that He restored anew to the Church through the person of the great reformer the One Thing Needful, the Gospel.

The author of this article is, of course, in full agreement with us when we say that the foregoing statement is the chief answer to the question, "Was Luther Needed?" Luther attacked the evil at its root. This of itself brought about a reform in morals at

which the reform councils had tried their hand in vain. How deep the morass of immorality was in which many of the representatives of the pre-reformation Church were weltering is brought to light in the following article.

* * * *

The English Catholic voluminous historian, Hilaire Belloc, in his *The Great Heresies*, 1938, has a chapter, "What Was the Reformation?" in which he writes: "No one can deny that the evils provoking reform in the Church were deep-rooted and widespread. They threatened the very life of Christendom itself. All who thought at all about what was going on around them realized how perilous things were and how great was the need of reform."

Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere spurned the huge bribe to vote for Alexander VI. Fearing the new Holy Father's poison and stiletto, he fled to France and tried to get Charles VIII to depose the simoniacal pope, but the simoniacal pope bought the king and kept the tiara on his head. The Vicar of Christ tried to get the cardinal but could not find his hideout. Politics makes strange bedfellows. On the death of Pius III the cardinal made a dirty dicker with his deadly enemy: he would let Cesare Borgia keep all his loot for the votes of the Spanish cardinals. "The bargaining goes on in the open streets," reports the Venetian Giustiniani. In 1503 he simonized himself into Julius II, taking the name from Julius Caesar, whom he admired as the greatest man in history.

Honor among thieves? Not in this case. Julius stripped Caesar of all his ill-gotten lands and closed the apartment of Alexander, not to be reminded of the "Marana—Circumcised Jew," and was angry if one doubted his charge. In his presence a preacher denounced Alexander as a monster of vice.

He had astrologers set the day of his coronation. This was not witnessed by his bastard sons, the last having died the year before; his daughter Felice was married to the prefect of Rome.

Imperia de Cugnatis lived in a sumptuously furnished palace in the fashionable district around the St. Angelo bridge. She was musical and wrote sonnets. Her guests were Cardinals Cornaro, Gonzaga and others of the upper crust. She died on August 15, 1512, at the age of 26 or 31, was buried in a marble mausoleum in San Gregori, and her epitaph tells the world she was a noble

matron worthy of the great name of a Roman. Her portrait is in Raphael's *Stanza della Segnatura*, the *Calliope*. Sadoletus and Beroaldus sang her praises. Such courtesans were followed to church by poets and painters and princes and prelates. "At Rome virtuous women had no place; but Phryne lived again in Imperia," says John Addington Symonds.

"The heathen are chaster and purer than these men who lay down the laws of religion to the Christian nations," writes Admiral Philip of Burgundy, who heard "the chief cardinals" crack the most indecent jokes when the relics of St. Peter were shown at Easter in 1509. Federigo Gonzaga was a hostage of the Holy Father, who let him attend a supper over which presided Signora Albina, *cortesana romana*, and Federigo was twelve! The only one trusted by the dying "God on earth."

In 1509 Venice had 300,000 people of which 11,654 were harlots. A directory gave the addresses and prices of the first-class ones—Livia Azzolini asked 25 scudi, Veronica Franco only 2. The latter sent a volume of her verses to distinguished foreigners, for instance to Montaigne, who wondered at the many courtesans, some of 150 of whom lived like princesses. Battista Mantuanus complained of the neglect of public worship. Erasmus writes: "I have with mine own ears heard the most horrible blasphemies of Christ and His Apostles" — by priests of the papal court at Mass. Luther was there in January, 1511, and priests rattled off 7 masses while he sang one; they told him, "Hurry, hurry, send her Son home to Mary"; he heard of priests saying, "Bread you are and bread you remain."

Luther was best pleased with the German national church, Santa Maria dell Anima, back of the Piazza Navona. Bramante had something to do with the plans; the cornerstone was laid on April 11, 1500, by Ambassador Matthew Lang, bishop of Salzburg. Parson Heinrich Bode was helped by half a dozen German chaplains; about 40 German and Dutch papal employees attended here, the meeting place of all German and Dutch residents and visitors. Here clergy and worshippers were much more reverent than in the Italian churches.

On Palm Sunday, 774, Karl the Great on his knees crawled up Pilate's stair, kissing each of the 35 steps, and at the top was

received by Pope Adrian I. Luther beat Karl. He crawled up the stairs and at the top had worked his grandfather Heini out of purgatory!

John II of Portugal did homage to Pope Innocent VIII for countries just discovered by Bartholomew Dias. His successor Emmanuel did the same to Pope Julius II after the voyages of Gama and Vespuccius: "Accept in fine the earth itself, for thou art our God."

Like words were used to Leo X in 1513, on account of Albuquerque's conquests in Asia.—John Fiske, *Discovery of America* I, 458.

Audrea Navagero called Julius "a new god sent down from heaven to earth . . . and Italians would pay him yearly honors with prayer and praise," says Symonds.

Castiglione speaks to Pope Julius II: O father, O shepherd of the nations, O great master of the world, who rulest all the human race, giver of justice, peace, and tranquil ease; thou to whom alone is committed the life and salvation of men, whom God Himself made lord of hell and heaven, that either realm might open at thy nod," says Symonds.

Erasmus on a Good Friday heard the preacher address most of his sermon to the pope, "the good, great, and all-powerful Jupiter." And Julius believed that gospel. Would the Holy Father deny the faith and be worse than an infidel? God forbid! He loved his own and at once clapped the cardinalian red hat on four cousins.

"The Pope is determined to be lord and master of the world's game," reported Domenico Trevisano to Venice. "I shall one day reduce your Venice to its original condition of a little fishing hamlet."

"And we, Holy Father, if you are not more reasonable, shall reduce you to the condition of a village priest," retorted Pisani.

Venice was crushed and sued for peace. "If your country were not there, we should have to create it."

In 1510 the god offered the crown of France to Henry VIII.

On July 12, 1512, Julius introduced the 200 Swiss guards, "church defenders for all time." Konrad Pellicanus admired

them "all dressed alike in scarlet breeches and black velvet doublets," designed by Michelangelo.

Julius made and broke treaties and waged wars against the French and the Spanish "barbarians" to defend the Church against her enemies—"as if there could be worse enemies than wicked popes," grinned Erasmus. He was a two-fisted fighter, in one hand he wielded the sword of Mars and in the other the spiritual sword of the interdict.

On August 26, 1505, led by the Host, the God on earth with 22 cardinals led his host in a "crusade" into a bloody battle against Bologna, "leaving S. Peter's chair to assume the title of Mars, the god of battles, to display his triple crown on the field, and to sleep under a tent; and God knows how fair to behold in the field were his mitres, his crosses, and his crucifixes."

He entered the city on November 11, and Erasmus wrote: "I cou'd not but groan when I compared this triumph, which many a secular prince would have thought too pompous, with the majestic tranquility of the Apostles, who conquered the world by the Word of Christ."

On Palm Sunday, 1509, he entered Rome with even greater pomp, and Luther in his Antithesis between Christ and Antichrist, contrasts the entrances on the two Palm Sundays.

It seems the red-blooded he-man dearly loved a bull fight, and in 1509 Erasmus described one pulled off in the garden of the Vatican.

Before Mirandola in January, 1511, a shell killed three of his servants and barely missed the Holy Father, who dedicated it to the shrine of Loretto. He was so bloodthirsty he had himself hoisted up to the walls in a wooden box. He fell sick and the ambassador of Mantua found him in bed "smelling, in my opinion, not very canonically."

The sick God on earth said grimly: "They shall not have me alive; I will take poison first."

Il papa terrifice made war on a widow defending her children.

The Holy Father swore like the trooper he was. He flung a crutch at a poor fellow fleeing from his curses. His favorite oath was "By God's blood," the same as Shakespeare's "S'blood—By His blood."

Hearing his army had been beaten before Ravenna he blasphemed: "Art Thou, in the name of a thousand devils, now on the side of the French? Dost Thou in this manner protect Thy Church?" Then he turned his face to the ground and prayed, "Holy Swiss, pray for us."

Since Stephen I died on August 2, 257, Julius II was the first pope to grow a beard, a clump of "terrible hair, a great ogreish beard, impenetrable thickets of ever-ramifying foliage." Why? It was a consecrated beard—not till he had driven the French from Italy would he shave!

When Prince Arthur died Henry VII wished to keep the 200,000 scudi matrimony of Catherine of Aragon and marry her off to Prince Henry. Of course, that was all wrong: of course, the pope could make it all right. At this even the hard-boiled Julius balked—didn't think he could do *that*. Only on the pleading of the dying Queen Isabella could he at long last bring himself to do *that*.

The mighty Mars was also a magnificent Maecenas.

La Magliana, nine miles out on the way to Ostia, was a luxurious hunting lodge built by Cardinal Alidosi of Pavia, which Julius had beautified by the brushes of Sangallo and Michelangelo.

In 1508-9 the swashbuckler had his upper rooms decorated by Vannucci Perugino, Suardi, Sodomia, Peruzzi, Lorengo Lotto, Michel del Becca, and others.

He had Michelangelo carve his statue. "With a book?" "A sword, a sword; I am no scholar, not I." Also as Moses leading the Church out of Egypt into the Promised Land; and in 1508 in the Sistine Chapel paint "Mankind after the Fall is led to Christ."

He had Raphael paint him—one of the most striking portraits of all time. He had him paint in 1509 in the Camera della Segnatura:

1. The striving of humanity towards God by means of aesthetic perceptions—the Parnassus.
2. The exercise of reason in philosophy and science—the School of Athens.
3. Order in Church and State—the Gift of Church and Secular Laws.
4. Theology.

They picture Pico's famous phrase: "Philosophy seeks Truth; Theology finds it; Religion has it." And it corresponds with what Marsilio Ficino in his Academy of Noble Minds planned when he characterizes our life's work as an ascent to the angels and to God.

"These compositions are the highest to which Christian art has attained."

The God was a Gargantuan trencherman and a Falstaffian tankard man; and thereby hangs a joke, yea, twain.

1. "We have no pope after midday"—dead drunk.
2. Raffael on one wall painted Julius at mass, on another coming in from the Belvedere, much more highly colored than the other, for which he was faulted. But Marcantonio Colonna replied the critics were all wrong, the pope being sober at mass and very red-faced coming from drinking at the Belvedere.

He founded the Schola Cantorum and the Vatican Museum and ordered excavations. The Venus was found.

Felice de Fredis in his vineyard in the ruins of the baths of Titus found a statue. "It is the Laocoon of which Pliny speaks!"

In a grand triumphal procession the ancient treasure was taken to the Capitol and then to the Belvedere. "All Rome, cardinals and people, hasten by day and night to the vigna; it is like a Jubilee."

Jacopo Sadoletto greeted it with an elegant poem praised by Lessing.

Part of a group of Ajax bearing a body was dug up, which Michelangelo rated in the highest rank of ancient statuary come down to us and Bernini declared the finest marble in Rome. It is known as Pasquino, where the wits placed their wicked witticisms, whence we get the name pasquinade.

Where Cincinnatus tilled his modest field Nero built his Circus and burned the living torches of Christians. The region was malarial and even the wine was suspect. "Drink Vatican, drink poison," said Martial. For camping on these "infamous Vatican grounds" the German and Gallic soldiers of Vitellius paid

with their lives, writes Tacitus. Here, after Constantine's great victory over Maxentius, the Kaiser and Pope Sylvester reared a fine basilica for a tomb of St. Peter. Here rested Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, Nicholas I, and many other heroes of the faith. This venerable shrine of all Christendom the Holy Father of all Christendom would destroy and replace with one "more beautiful and more magnificent," to outdo the famed fane of Diana of Ephesus. The College of Cardinals protested: Il Papa terribile laid the cornerstone on April 18, 1506.

Donato of Urbino, il Bramante, ruined the shrine and was called "Ruinante." He promised a miracle in stone, to throw up into the sky the dome of Hadrian's Pantheon on the Cross of Christ. "Perhaps the most universal and gifted mind that ever used its mastery over masonry."

A hundred and fifty years later Jesuit Cardinal Sforza Pallavicino, the historian of the Council of Trent, writes: "This material edifice of St. Peter's has destroyed a great part of his spiritual building. To procure the prodigious millions required by a construction so enormous, recourse was had to means which gave the first occasion to the Lutheran heresy, and inflicted upon the Church, in the end, the loss of many millions of souls."

Archbishop Katzer of Milwaukee pointed to a picture of St. Peter's and said to Mr. Pestalozzi, a descendant of the famous educator: "That is the costliest church we ever built." In a few years Luther wrenched from the god the whole Protestant world.

Andrea Guarna da Salerno in the "S'm'a," Milan, 1517, has Bramante being refused by St. Peter. "Why did you destroy my temple in Rome which, by its very antiquity, called even the least devout to God?" The architect confesses he likes to destroy, should like to destroy the world, tried, indeed, to ruin the Pope. "But you failed in that." "Yes, for Julius did not put his hand into his own pocket to build the new church, but relied on indulgences and the confessional." He proposes to make his own conditions for entering Paradise; he will reconstruct heaven itself. "I shall begin by getting rid of this road which is so steep and difficult, that leads up here from earth; I shall make one broad and easy, so that feeble old souls can come up on horseback. Also I shall pull down this Paradise of yours and build another with

much finer and more cheerful residences for your *'beati'*. "And where do you propose to lodge my people while you are constructing all this?" "Oh, your people are accustomed to inconveniences: they have had a great many in their time. Some flayed alive, some stoned to death, they obtained their citizenship here by all sorts of discomforts. Besides, in this salubrious air, they will not take cold. . . . You are not pleased with my plans? Very good, I shall go to the other place then!"

This was long before the Theses of Luther.

Cardinal Battista de Ferrari of Modena knocked at heaven's door; Peter demanded 1,000 ducats, but went down to one; the cardinal could not pay one ducat; Peter told him to go to the devil: since he could not pay, the devil chased him to a place to be tormented with eternal pain.

In April, 1510, the Venetian ambassador Domenico Trevisano reckoned the pope's regular income at 200,000 ducats; his fees 150,000—about \$5,000,000; that of the 33 cardinals at 18,000 ducats each, though some had much more.

The Servant of the Lord's servants had his tiara studded with 39 diamonds, 29 emeralds, 22 sapphires, 69 rubies, 27 balases, 571 pearls, an inscription written with small diamonds punctuated with small rubies.

In spite of the huge sums spent on war and building and art the successor of the Fisherman left 400 000 ducats.

The Vicar of Christ made money by selling indulgences.

The papacy could be restrained by no agreements, seeing that it granted for the benefit of the vilest persons, dispensations, suspensions, revocations, and other devices for nullifying its promises and evading its wholesome regulations; the elections of prelates were set aside; the right of choosing provosts, which many chapters had purchased with heavy payments, was disregarded; the greater benefices and dignities were bestowed on the cardinals and prothonotaries of the pope's court; expectatives were granted without number, giving rise to ruinous litigation; annates were exacted promptly and mercilessly and sometimes more was extorted than was due; the cure of souls was committed by Rome to those fitted rather to take charge of mules than of men; in order to raise money, new indulgences were issued, with suspension of

the old, the laity being thus made to murmur against the clergy; tithes were exacted under the pretext of war against the Turks, yet no expeditions were sent forth; and cases which should be tried at home were carried without distinction to Rome, etc.

Savonarola influenced the mighty Michelangelo, who read Dante, Savonarola, and the Bible and sang this sonnet: "Here chalices are made into swords and helmets; the cross and the thorns become lances and shields; and Christ's blood is sold by the spoonful. He will never come again to these countries watered with His sweat, this Rome, which traffics in His skin, and the ways of salvation are henceforth closed! . . . How can one hope for that better life, being led to it under standards like these!"

Ulrich von Hutten wrote:

"The tradesman Julius cheats the credulous world:
He locks up heaven which he possesses not.
Sell what is thine, O Julius! Shameless 'tis
To sell to others what thou lack'st the most."

Cardinal Pompeo Colonna of Ostia mounted the Capitol, described the corruption under the papal tyranny, and called for the republic.

Like Bramante, Michelangelo also ruined the ancient ruins and used them for quarries.

Amid all the excavating, building, sculpturing, and painting by the giant geniuses the Campagna was haunted by the wild ox, robbers and wolves infested the Coliseum, and Benvenuto Cellini went pigeon hunting in Rome.

Marcantonio Altieri about 1508 in the "Nuptial!" wails: "Rome, once queen of the world, is today so fallen that its very inhabitants regard it as only a sombre and horrible cave. How many families once rich, powerful, illustrious, are now either completely extirpated, or else half annihilated! How many dwellings, once erected for the pleasure of people of quality are now destroyed—their very existence scarcely to be recognized. But why speak of palaces? It suffices to glance at whole sections of the city . . ."

Cardinal Adriano Castellesi di Corneto, secretary of Pope Alexander VI and his host at the fatal supper, wrote the true philosophy from the four doctors of the Church in direct opposi-

tion to the Renaissance and humanism, a blow aimed at Julius II. Every scientific pursuit, indeed all human intellectual life, is useless for salvation, and even dangerous. Dialectics, astronomy, geometry, music, and poetry are but vainglorious folly. Aristotle has nothing to do with Paul, nor Plato with Peter; all philosophers are damned, their wisdom vain, since it recognized but a fragment of the truth and marred even this by misuse. They are the patriarchs of heresy; what are physics, ethics, logic compared with the Holy Scriptures, whose authority is greater than that of all human intellect?

John Colet in Italy got to know the works of Marsilio Ficino and others, lectured on Paul's Romans and Corinthians at Oxford, became Dean of St. Paul's and the founder of its famous school, rejected relics and Aquinas, was appointed by Archbishop William Warham to preach the Convocation sermon in 1512. He lashed the clerical vices so stingingly that Bishop Fitz James of London would burn him for heresy; but the heretic was saved by the Archbishop and King Henry VIII.

The Franciscan crowned poet Thomas Murner in 1512 preached in rhyme at Frankfurt and never tired of dwelling on the scandals of the clergy, from bishops to nuns. All are sensual and rapacious. When the lay lord has shorn the sheep, the priest fairly disembowels it, the begging friar gets what he can and then the padrone. If the bishop wants money he makes the priests pay for keeping their concubines. The nun with the most children is made abbess. If Christ were on earth today He would be betrayed; and Judas would be reckoned an honest man. The devil is really the ruler of the Church, whose prelates perform his works; they are too ignorant for their duties and need coadjutors—it were well for them could they likewise have substitutes in hell. The wolf preached and sang mass so as to gather the geese around him, and seized and ate them; so it is with prelate and priest who promise all things and pretend to care for souls until they get their benefices, when they devour their flocks.

Under the name of Schelmenzunft and Narrenbeschweering they were received with immense applause. So also Eulenspiegel, Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff*, Johann Faber's *Tractatus de Ruine Ecclesie Planetu*.

Kaiser Maximilian I one day broke out in a loud laugh. Why? "I laughed to think God would have entrusted the spiritual government of the world to a drunken priest like Pope Julius and the government of the empire to a chamois hunter like me." Yes, it is to laugh—or to cry.

The corruption was so great that ever since 1507 he planned to add to the imperial crown the papal tiara on the death of Julius. He pawned his jewels to Fugger for a loan of 200,000 or 300,000 ducats to buy the election.

In June, 1510, he wrote his daughter Margaret, governess of the Netherlands: "That cursed priest, the Pope, won't on any account let us go to Rome in arms for our imperial crown in company with the French, because he is afraid to be called before a council by us two for the great sins and abuses which he and his predecessors have committed and daily commit, and also some cardinals which fear reformation," etc.

"Maximilian, the future Pope."

In September he asked Jacob Wimpheling, who with Geiler of Kaisersberg and Sebastian Brant for years had been denouncing the decay of religion, to answer certain questions about the reform of the church. The good Catholic preacher pointed out ten distinct abuses. If these things go on the people might follow the Bohemians, rise in arms and separate from Rome. Yet he had no plan of action. He even warned the Kaiser against action. The three clerical electors might not stand by him. The begging friars might rouse the people to rebellion. The Pope might launch an interdict or depose him, as other popes had done.

On the 10th Max had Wimpheling make a list of grievances—*"Gravamina Germaniae Nationis cum remediis et avisamentis ad Caesarem Maiestatem."*

Cardinal Pompeo Colonna shouted from the Vatican: "Rome is the slave of idlers, cowards, foreigners, and low-born men." and with 15 cardinals tried to form a republic.

At the Synod of Tours the French bishops rebelled against the god in 1510. Five French cardinals called the Council of Pisa, which on January 21, 1512, suspended the god. The god retorted by banning the whole Council, naming eight cardinals to reform

the papal court, calling the Fifth Lateran Council to Rome, and forming the "Holy League" to defend himself.

The Council was opened on April 19, 1512, by the pious Augustinian General Aegidius of Viterbo flaying the corruptions of the Church.

Ranke writes the Holy Father was "worn out by the consequences of intemperance and licentious excesses."

The god repented of his wicked life, asked for the simplest funeral, died on February 20, 1513, but was excluded from heaven by the most brilliant colloquy of Erasmus. In the sack of Rome in 1527 his ashes were scattered.

The French Catholic Audin in his "Luther" admits, "Scepticism entered full sail into the kingdom of faith."—Vol I, p. xxvii.

The eminent historian Jules Michelet says in his "Luther": "Grace had departed from Italy. It certainly presented at this period something which has seldom, nay which has at no other time, been exhibited in history: a systematic and scientific perversity; a magnificent ostentation of wickedness; in a word, the atheist priest proclaiming himself monarch of the universe." P. 13.

The French Jesuit Cardinal Robert Bellarmine admitted some years before Luther, "religion was almost dead."

What was it that shattered Christianity in the sixteenth century?

The Jesuit Robert I. Gannon, President of Fordham, answered: "It was the Italian Popes themselves—the Popes and Cardinals and Bishops of the Renaissance who buffeted the face of Christ and tore His seamless garment into shreds. For they were a lot of pagans who paraded as living Catholics, dressed in the holy vestments of the priesthood and soaked with the spirit of the world."

The Catholic Clayton writes in his "Luther": "The popes of the renaissance needed money, and money they would have. They knew there was no serving God and mammon, and preferring the latter, the service of mammon brought heavy punishment." P. 7.

Pope Adrian VI confessed to the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation at Nuernberg in 1522, the Church was diseased

from the Pope down to the lower clergy and Luther was God's scourge for the sins of the clergy.

The French Catholic Audin says: "It was a triumph for Luther."—Luther, Vol II, pp. 42-44.

On July 2, 1944, Pastor V. B. wrote in M. T.:

"Dallmann is a peach. (Writ sarcastic?)

"Why did the Church need a sweeping reformation in the 16th century?

"This: Dirty Germany and dirty England.

"And this: The clergy became unruly and bad, also millions of the lay folks.

"The Church did own worlds of the land. Luther knocked hell out of things."

Even the furious and sulphurous Rev. Lucian Johnston admits, "Luther has done good to the Church by frightening her into renewed life."

Lawyer William Samuel Lilly, Secretary of the Catholic Union of Great Britain, in his "Renaissance types" admits: Luther's revolution was the salvation of the Papal Church. A Catholic historian has called the Council of Trent the greatest thing effected by him. . . .

"We may, with Goethe, confess a debt to Luther in respect of that freedom from the fetters of spiritual (mental?) narrowness—'von den Fesseln geistiger Borniertheit'—characteristic of this new age, which is of all liberties the most precious, which is the true foundation and the real safeguard of all."—Pp. 301-308.

Franz Xaver Kiefl, Catholic Professor of Dogmatics at Wuerzburg and then Praelat of the Dom at Regensburg writes:

"Luther called forth a movement of the spirits which shook centuries, in this Providence through him cleansed the Church in its innermost sanctuary from the seductive allurements of the Renaissance culture and through this bitter medicine kindled new, young life in the whole organism of the Church. And Luther was the mighty instrument of Providence in this cleansing work. Real corruptions gave him an occasion for attack. A justified religious ground-thought he carried to extremes and with boundless pertinacity expanded the ground-thought and drove

the Church into a fight for its deepest foundations of life." -- Hochland, October, 1917.

The Catholic monk and priest Erasmus in September, 1527, wrote the staunch Catholic Duke George of Saxony, the Church was so corrupt that it needed a stern physician to cut and cauterize. "What could I, a pigmy, do against the champion of so many giants? Luther could not have done his great work if God had not been with him (John 3, 2)."

Pastoral Table of Duties

According to the Pastoral Letters

V. The Work of the Pastor. 2.

A. Reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.

In our last article we stressed the first three words of 2. Tim. 4, 2: "Preach the word." There are three more imperatives in this verse which need stressing to impress the pastor with this phase of his work. Many other directives in the Pastoral Letters pertain to the pastor's work. Consequently we have not yet finished "The Work of the Pastor."

2. Tim. 4, 2: "Preach the word, be instant in season, out of season; *reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine* (R. V. teaching)." Reprove, rebuke, exhort; *elegxon, epitimēson, parakaleson*; these three also belong to "preach the word." They also are the voice of the Holy Ghost. They also demand our faithful attention and conscientious application. They are part of our work. They are there because God wants them taught and preached as His Word.

Our Lord Himself and the holy Apostles have left us fine examples in the divine art of rebuking, reproving, exhorting.

But first, is it clear to us that reprove, rebuke, exhort mean just this one thing: "Preach the word." Also that it is urgently important that it be done in season and out of season. All Scripture is not alone profitable for doctrine, but also for reproof, for

correction, for instruction in righteousness (2. Tim. 3, 16). But Scripture, nothing else, is the tool of the pastor also in this part of his work.

Reprove; *elegxon*, imperative aorist active of *elegchō*: To show one his faults, demand an explanation, to chasten, to punish, to convict, refute, confute, generally with a suggestion of the shame of the person convicted. Thayer quotes Schmidt: "*Elegchein* hat eigentlich nicht die Bedeutung 'tadeln, schmaehen, zurechtweisen,' welche ihm die Lexika zuweisen, sondern bedeutet nichts als ueberfuehren." That would make "convict" the proper word for *elegchein*, convict of anything wrong. And many Bible texts bear that out: Mt. 18, 15; John 8, 46; 16, 8; 3, 20; Luke 3, 19; Eph. 5, 11. 13; Tit. 1, 9. 13; 2, 15; 1. Tim. 5, 20; 2. Tim. 2, 20; and elsewhere in Hebr., James, Jude and Revelation.—"Convict," however, not by reasoning and scolding, but by preaching the Word.

We reprove from the pulpit. Chiefly though, this work is done in private; for it has to do with lost sheep of our flock who need to be found again. Our people can fall into grievous sin or into error, or become lax in their life of faith and need to be brought to the knowledge and acknowledgment of their sins, to repentance and faith in Christ, the proof of God's unlimited mercy. How often we must lead members back to the Savior, back to salvation, back to the fold!

Our English versions of the Bible are not consistent in their translation of *elegchein*. The A. V. translates it with "rebuke" in 1. Tim. 5, 20; Tit. 1, 9. 13; 2, 15. The R. V. has "reprove" in 1. Tim. 5, 20 and Tit. 2, 15, but "rebuke" in Tit. 1, 13. In Tit. 1, 9, both have "convince." Luther is consistent in his translation: "Strafen." The Vulgata has *arguere* in 1. Tim. 5, 20; Tit. 1, 9; 2, 15; but *increpa* in Tit. 1, 13.

In both the A. and R. V. Tit. 1, 13, reads: "Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith."

In verses 7-9 Paul had built up to the thought that a bishop must be a man "holding fast the faithful word as he has been taught (R. V. which is according to the teaching), that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gain-sayer (R. V. much clearer: that he may be able both to exhort in

the sound doctrine and to convict the gainsayers)." *Parakalein* (exhort) and *elegchein* (reprove) are necessary, "for there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision." v. 10. Their "mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses (R. V. men who overthrow whole houses), teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." v. 11. This testimony (*martyria*) is true coming even from the mouth of one of their own prophets. Therefore rebuke them sharply. Luther: "Um der Sache willen strafe sie scharf." Whom? The Christians in Crete. 1. "That they may be sound in the faith." *Hina hygiainōsin en tē pistei*.—We could learn from Paul what it means to be concerned about the soundness of faith! —2. That they be kept from "giving heed to Jewish fables," or to the "commandments of men who turn away from the truth." (R. V.)

Contenders for such things had come to Crete and had subverted whole families and that for filthy lucre's sake. These were men with glib and pious tongues, "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof," 2. Tim. 3, 5; "supposing that gain is godliness (R. V. that godliness is a way of gain)," 1. Tim. 6, 8. They claimed to be Christians. They came in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they were ravaging wolves. And because they were of the "circumcision" and could boast of their knowledge of the Old Testament they were able to impress those simple Christians from among the heathen. Therefore Paul is so emphatic in his language: "Reprove them sharply"; tell these Christians in no uncertain terms that these false prophets are perverting the faith and substituting the law for the Gospel. Show them that as they follow these men they will lose the Gospel, Christ, and salvation. Show them all this in clear and strong language, "so they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil," 2. Tim. 2, 26, and may "be sound in the faith." Tit. 1, 13.

"Reprove them sharply." That is a call to action for us. They "of the circumcision" have not ceased troubling the faithful and leading them astray. We think of a Dowie, Aime McPherson, and many others. They fit the picture painted in v. 10. 11 perfectly, even to the "for filthy lucre's sake." Nor can we forget

the many, many sects which always have sprung up and still continue to spring up like mushrooms.

Tit. 2, 15 reads: "These things speak and exhort and rebuke (R. V. reprove) with all authority." Rebuke, *elegche*: Reprove.

We dealt with this passage in Article IV. Now we are concerned only with *elegchein*. Titus should speak with all authority, exhort with all authority, reprove with all authority. *Tauta*, all that Paul speaks of in this chapter, "the things which become sound doctrine (R. V. the things which befit the sound doctrine)." Luther: "Du aber rede wie sichs ziemet nach der heilsamen (oder gesunden) Lehre."

All these things (about individual groups of Christians, about Titus himself, about Christians in general, about the grace of God) Titus should speak, exhort and reprove.

Let us look at v. 11-14 in particular and note the beautiful pattern for preaching sanctification. V. 11: "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men." That's the foundation. Then the conclusion in v. 12: "Teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world." The grace of God teaches us to deny (this is negative sanctification) ungodliness and worldly lusts. Luther: "Dass wir sollen verleugnen das ungoettliche Wesen und die weltlichen Lueste." This is the same thought which Christ puts this way: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself." Mt. 16, 24. In Rom. 13, 13 Paul puts it like this: "Let us . . . cast off the works of darkness." And in Eph. 4, 22: "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." See also Col. 3, 8; 1. Pt. 2, 1; James 1, 21; Hebr. 12, 1; 1. John 2, 15-17.—We should (this is positive sanctification) live soberly, *sōphronōs*, temperately, discreetly, maessig, nuechtern, enthaltsam; righteously, *dikaiōs*, uprightly, agreeable to the law of rectitude, gerecht; godly, *eusebōs*, piously, fromm, gottesfuerchtig, gottselig. Conf. Rom: 13, 12; Gal. 3, 27; Eph. 4, 24; Col. 3, 10. 12-14.—All this as long as we are in this present world. It means, practically, letting our light shine, being the salt of the earth and praising God by our everyday conduct.

But we have the old sinful flesh to contend with and all its

lusts, the temptations of the world and Satan. That necessitates the battle between the flesh and the spirit. To strengthen the spirit, Paul says, v. 13: "Looking for that (R. V. the) blessed hope and the glorious appearing (R. V. the appearing of the glory) of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ." Always ready, always waiting, that strengthens the spirit.

Then Paul continues, v. 14: "Who (Christ) gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people." R. V. omits "peculiar" and says instead: "for his own possession." Luther: "Und reinigte ihm selbst ein Volk zum Eigentum." Of this people Paul says: "Zealous of good works." Luther: "Das fleissig waere zu guten Werken." Sanctification is self-evident for the Christian. Luther states this truth beautifully in the second article: "That I may be His own and live under Him in His kingdom and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness."

In v. 11-14 we have the perfect pattern of the preachment of sanctification. That way is not natural to us. That means: Learn of Paul.

Paul makes it clear to Titus that the preachment of sanctification can produce results only as it is built on these facts: Christ has redeemed them and made them "his own possession," "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people," 1. Pt. 2, 9, and Christ wants the Christian to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts. Such exhortation is needful to every Christian at all times, since the urge of his sinful nature and the temptations of the world and Satan keep him from following "after holiness" (R. V. sanctification) in all seriousness. The desire is always there to also enjoy the things and pleasures of this world, not to break with sinful habits, and to hang on to false teaching. How hard it is, for example, to leave the lodge, to "come out from among them and be separate and touch not the unclean thing." 2. Cor. 6, 14-18. Speak, exhort, rebuke; use every possible means to convict the Christian of his sin and of his need of sanctification.

Rebuke, too, "with all authority," *meta pasēs epitagēs*: an injunction, a mandate, command with every possible form of authority. Schierlitz: "Der Auftrag, der Befehl, der Nachdruck,

Ernst." The last two are meant here. Speak, exhort, rebuke—emphatically and forcefully with all seriousness and gravity. As the ambassador and servant of Christ and the steward of God do these things, because souls are in danger of being lost, sheep of Christ's flock are in danger of straying. Certainly God's command and brotherly love demand such speaking, exhorting and rebuking in all seriousness. The means? The Word; the Word only. The Law and the Gospel used in the interest of a soul's salvation by a man who knows that only the Gospel can create the desired result.

Zorn's comment on these verses in "Vom Hirtenamt" is: "Nachdem der Apostel dies gesagt hat, diese edle, kurze Summa des ganzen Evangeliums (v. 11-14) mit Betonung der darin enthaltenen wahren Christenheiligung, gegeben hat, wendet er sich an den Titus und an jeden Diener am Wort und Pastor und sagt: *Solches*—naemlich das v. 1-10 Angezeigte, *aber mit dem v. 1-14 gegebenen Beweggrund*—rede, 'lehre und ermahne,' lege dringend ans Herz 'und strafe,' ueberfuehre der Suende und Uebertretung, wo du solche findest, und gebrauche hierzu *fuer den alten Adam* der Christen das in heiligem Feuer flammende und alle Suender und Uebertreter verzehrende und verdammende *Gesetz*, 'mit ganzem Ernst,' griechisch: mit allem Gebot, indem du von Gottes wegen den Christen gebietest, dass sie sich—nach dem Vers 1-10 Angezeigten, aber aus dem Vers 11-14 gegebenen Beweggrunde—heiligen. Dies 'Gebot' und Gebieten ist also *kein gesetzliches* Gebot und Gebieten. Es ist ein *gnaediges, evangelisches* Gebot und Gebieten.—So hoch der Himmel ueber der Erde ist steht dies Gebot und Gebieten ueber allem gesetzlichen Gebot und Gebieten.—Es ist ein vaeterliches, gnaediges, erbarmendes, liebreiches Gebot und Gebieten des versoehnten Gottes an uns, seine Kinder, welches er durch seine Diener am Wort ausgerichtet haben will. Es ist ein Gebot und Gebieten, welches den heiligen Geist mit sich bringt und uns entzueudet zu einem aus tiefstem, von dem Geist Christi und des Vaters regiertem Herzen kommen: Amen, ja, o lieber Gott, so soll es sein, so will ich tun; das hilf mir! Und doch ist es ernst. Ja, 'mit allem Ernst' soll ein Diener am Wort so reden und ermahnen und strafen."

"So also soll ein Pastor seine Gemeindeglieder ermahnen:

Er soll sie ermahnen, abzutreten von allem Boesen und anzuhängen allem Guten (V. 1-10), *weil* sie in Gnaden sind, *weil* sie so teuer erkaufte sind, *weil* sie durch das grosse Opfer Jesu Christi erloest sind von aller ihrer Suende, *weil* sie das Volk des Eigentums sind, *weil* Gott sie selig machen will, *weil* Gott sie hier auf Erden immer mehr und dort im Himmel vollkommen heiligen und sie als seine Kinder sich aehnlich machen will. V. 1-14. Dabei soll der Pastor auch das *Gesetz* brauchen, das aber nur um des alten Adams der Christen willen, um, insonderheit wenn dies noetig erscheint, diesem zu steuern, die Christen von ihrer Uebertretung und dem ihnen deshalb drohenden Verderben zu ueberzeugen, und auch um ihnen die Werke klar vor Augen zu stellen, die Gott gefallen. Aber zur eigentlichen Ermahnung soll er das Gesetz in keinem Wege gebrauchen. So soll ein Pastor mit allem Ernst zur Heiligung ermahnen, denn dies ist Gottes ernstlicher Wille und aus seiner Gnade fliessendes Gebot. Und kein Christ soll den so ermahnenden Seelsorger verachten! V. 15."

Our English Bibles, in 2. Tim. 4, 2, translate "rebuke" for *epitimōson*: to tax with fault, chide, rebuke, reprove, censure severely, admonish or charge sharply. What is the difference between reprove and rebuke? The dictionary says: "To reprove is to express blame or censure, often without harshness, rebuke implies sharp or stern reproof." Matthew uses the word *epitimaō* frequently: 8, 26; 12, 16; 16, 22; 17, 18; 19, 13; 20, 31. The English Bible translates "rebuke" in all places except 12, 16, where it uses "charge."

"Exhort," again, gives a different slant. *Parakaleson*. The New Testament uses it to convey two meanings: 1. To admonish, to exhort, to enjoin a thing by exhortation; 2. to beg, to entreat, to beseech. In 2. Tim. 4, 2 both are applicable. Exhorting is never by command, but always by beseeching. 1. Thess. 4, 11: "Furthermore then we beseech you, brethren, and exhort you by the Lord Jesus Christ." 2. Thess. 3, 12: "Exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ."

Reprove, exhort, rebuke. Let the chips fall where they may. This is our work, brethren! This is why we are in office. This is part of preaching the Word. It is work which is easier not to do, and it is easy to do it in the wrong spirit. Questions: Are

we doing it,—let us say over against lodge members? Faithfully? Having in mind the salvation of souls? In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ?—Everything depends on that. Some honest self-examination along this line is always in place.

We dare not overlook the words the Holy Ghost adds: "With all long-suffering and doctrine (R. V. teaching)." They put a finger on the spirit which God wants' in our exhorting, rebuking and reproving. "With all long-suffering." *Makrothymia*. Thayer: "Patience, endurance, constancy, steadfastness, perseverance, forbearance, longsuffering, slowness in avenging wrong." Schierlitz: "Die Langmut, die Nachsicht im Ertragen der Beleidigungen, Geduld im Ertragen jedweden Uebels, Ausdauer." Luther: "Mit aller Geduld." Langmut, longsuffering, patience are best suited to give a translation of *makrothymia*.

A pastor learns quickly that his exhorting, reproving and rebuking seldom bring the desired fruits at once. How long it takes sometimes! How useless this work seems at times! But the Holy Ghost says: *Makrothymia*. Don't give up. Try again and again. Your aim is to re-win a soul for Christ and for salvation. Is that not worth patient work? Worth waiting for?—This is war between the devil and us. He will not easily give up the soul he got back into his power. And he has a strong ally in the old Adam. But Christ is in this fight with us. He bought that soul with His holy, precious blood. Therefore: Don't give up. Think of this also. God's longsuffering and patience over against us never cease.

Exhort, reprove, rebuke with all longsuffering and teaching. Teaching of the Word, of course. Study the Bible for every case you have and gather the weapons you need to fight for a soul against the devil. Take into consideration the spiritual knowledge, perception, foundation, power of the person with whom you have to deal; also his environment and upbringing. Our biggest mistake in this work is that we assume too much, take too much for granted.—Not alone, then, longsuffering, but also teaching the Word, "sound doctrine," what the Bible teaches about the case in hand. And this teaching must accommodate itself to the spiritual knowledge and foundation of him with whom we deal.

Timothy and Titus had to work with people who had been

heathen. They knew the fundamentals of their faith, but were weak in the knowledge of Christian doctrine and of the demands of sanctification. Therefore Paul stresses teaching; and teaching with longsuffering and patience. Though our people can not be called former heathen, yet so many of them are woefully weak in knowledge and understanding of Christian doctrine. For that reason the pastor dare take nothing for granted. Nor dare he lose patience. Nor dare he be angered when these people do not even understand why they should be exhorted.

Reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and teaching. That injunction is still in force. It calls for faithfulness. It belongs to: "Preach the word."

B. * Relationship of the Christian to the civil government.

Although the Christian is not of this world, he is in it and always finds himself a citizen in some earthly government. His King, of course, is Jesus, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who has all power in heaven and on earth. He belongs to this King because Jesus bought and redeemed him with His precious blood. He lives under Him in His kingdom and serves Him and has in faith sworn to be loyal and obedient to Him.

What then is the Christian's relationship to his civil government? To the king or ruler of the state in which he lives? These questions have created uneasiness in more than one Christian's heart. The Lord has given a clear answer in His holy Word. Paul writes Rom. 13, 1: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God, the powers that be are ordained of God." Peter (1. Pt. 2, 13, 14): "Submit yourself to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to kings, as supreme, or unto governors as unto them that are sent by him." And v. 17: "Honor the king." The Holy Ghost has used the Pastoral letters also to instruct the Christians regarding their attitude toward earthly governments. Pastors shall teach that to the Christians. Comp. Tit. 3, 1; 1. Tim. 2, 1, 2.

In Paul's day this was a burning question. That was a time of evil and of persecutions. Christianity was a hated religion in the Roman Empire. Christians were automatically outside of the pale of the law. The law eo ipso condemned them. They were

outlawed and could be killed, or driven from house and home; their possessions could be confiscated by the state—because they were Christians. Paul himself suffered imprisonment on account of his activities in the interest of Christianity. He died the death of a martyr. Under such circumstances the question would easily arise in the minds of Christians: Do we have to recognize such a government and be loyal and obedient to it? God gave them the answer as we quoted above.

Tit. 3, 1 leaves no doubt concerning what God wants us pastors to teach Christians about their relationship to earthly governments. "Put them in mind *to be subject* to principalities and powers, *to obey* magistrates, to be ready for every good work." (R. V. much better: Put them in mind *to be in subjection* to rulers, to authorities, *to be obedient*; to be ready for every good work.) Luther: "Erinnere sie, dass sie den Fuersten und der Obrigkeit untertan und gehorsam seien." *Hypomimnēske autous archais kai exousiais hypótassesthai*. *Hypomimnēske*, imperative present active: Cause one to remember, recall to mind, put one in remembrance. The tense denotes that Titus should continuously put this into the minds of the Christians. The *autous* are the Christians who belonged to the congregations in Crete. *Hypótassesthai*: to subject one's self, to obey, to submit to one's control, to yield to one's admonition or advice. Schierlitz: "Sich unterwerfen, sich dem Willen jemandes fuegen." The tense again denotes "continuously."—This word occurs twice in the second chapter. V. 5 the young women *hypotassomenas*, obey and subject themselves, *tois idiois andrasin*, to their own husbands. V. 9 the slaves should *hypótassesthai*, subject themselves *idiois despotais*, their own masters.

Then follows the verb *peitharchein*, infinitive present active: To obey a ruler or superior, to hearken to, to obey. This word is used four times in the New Testament; here and three times in Acts. Acts 5, 29: *Peitharchein dei*: We ought to, we must, it is a must to obey God rather than men. Acts 5, 32: "The Holy Ghost whom God hath given to *tois peitharchousin autō*," those who obey him. Acts 27, 21 Paul says: "*Edei men, ō andres, peitharchēsantas moi*." "You should have, o men, hearkened unto me." Thus we see that Paul enjoined Titus to remind the Chris-

tians continuously "to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient." (R. V.) *Archais kai exousiais*. *Archē*: Beginning, origin, the leader, the first place, *principality*, ruler, magistracy. Schierlitz: "Der Anfang, der Beginn einer Sache, die *Obrigkeit, die Gewalt im Staate*."—*Exousia*, "the power of authority, the power of ruler or government; (the power of him whose will and command must be submitted to and obeyed), one who possesses authority, a ruler, human magistrate." Thayer. Schierlitz: "Die buergerliche Macht, die *Obrigkeit, die Macht habende Person*."

The R. V. comes closest to the Greek. Luther's translation is also very good. The point of Paul's admonition is that Titus remind the Christians always to be obedient to their rulers. Note: Not to some rulers or governments, but to any and all.

The Christians have no right to decide for themselves what type of government they would be ready and willing to obey. It is their business to be obedient to their government in all matters which are not contrary to faith, to the Word of God. Christians can not rebel against a government (Rom. 13, 2) which is not fair to them, which is against their religion, as, for example, the government of the Jews (Herod and the Sanhedrin) was in the day of Christ, or as the Roman government was. Even though Herod killed James and imprisoned Peter with the intention of killing him; even though the Sanhedrin put Peter and John behind bars because they preached the risen Christ, or had Stephen stoned because he witnessed that Christ was the promised Messiah, or persecuted the Christians in Jerusalem and other places and authorized Saul to spy out the Christians; even though the Roman government from Nero on persecuted Christians most horribly and other governments have done the same throughout history; nevertheless Rom. 13, 1-7; 1. Pt. 2, 13. 14. 17; Tit. 3, 1; 1. Tim. 2, 1. 2 are written in the Bible. And Christ had His say too: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." Mt. 22, 21.

We can draw an illustration from our own times to make our thought clear. Christians have suffered severe persecution in the Soviet Union of Russia. After twenty years of the existence of this government there were no open churches left in Russia; there is no Lutheran pastor alive. Buildings were confiscated by the

state and used as brothels, stables or theatres; pastors were killed or exiled to Siberia and many Christians with them. The Christians meet in the dark of night in caves, forests, cellars, barns. No lights, no hymns, no sermons. They that meet exhort one another; someone recites a Scripture text; and fervent prayers are sent to the throne of grace. If they are caught, they are either killed or deported to Siberia. Now—does this apply to the Christians of Russia: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." Right, it does.—Reports are prevalent that the Russian government has changed its attitude toward religion. Maybe. But we cannot forget that the Lutheran pastors of Latvia, Estonia, etc., were refused rationing cards when the Soviets took control of the Baltic states. They had the choice of leaving their country or starving. Again, does the injunction to be subject to the higher powers apply to the Christians of those states? Right again, it does.

All that Christians can do under such conditions is to suffer as did the Christians in Rome, Jerusalem, and so many other places. On the one hand, the Christian dare not revolt against his government; on the other, he dare not deny his faith. He must say with John and Peter: "We ought to obey God more than men." Acts 5, 29. Cf. 4, 19. If any government demands something of the Christian which means a denial of faith, he will rather suffer than obey. But he will not rebel.

Though the Christian is a citizen of the Kingdom of Christ, he yet is subject to the government which has power over him, no matter whether it is antagonistic or friendly.

The type of government has nothing to do with the Christian's obedience. Democracy, theocracy, autocracy, republic, kingdom or empire, the Lord says: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." Rom. 13, 1. "Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." V. 2.

Pastors, continuously "put them (Christians) in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient." Tit. 3, 1. R. V.

Most of us in our country do not fully realize the blessings of freedom of religion as we have had it here. There are not many

countries where it exists. The trend of late years, however, bodes ill in this respect for us too. In Europe there is hardly a country where there is real freedom of religion. There the government has its finger in religious matters constantly. State churches are the thing and so-called Free Churches have a hard row to hoe. When I read the constitution of Poland the first time and saw paragraphs 112-114, I was astonished to see those wonderful words about freedom of religion. But when I asked an official how he could square these words with the treatment the Free Church received at the hands of the government, he said with a smile: "Sir, these paragraphs are suspended."—Freedom of religion or not, the Word of God stands for us pastors: "Put them in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient."

In 1. Tim. 2, 1. 2. Paul strikes another note in this relationship between the Christian and his government. "I exhort therefore that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving thanks be made for all men, for kings and all that are in authority." Paul goes from passive obedience to a truly remarkable activity for all that are in authority. Pray and give thanks for them all. A Herod too? A Nero? A Stalin? Yes, for all. We pastors must put our people in mind of that too. For this purpose, "that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." V. 2.

Be obedient to, pray and give thanks for the government which has power over you. Are there any congregations who have never heard this, who have never been put in mind of this Bible injunction?

C. The Christian and good works.

The Christian is in this world for a purpose. God does not lift one who has found Christ right out of this life into the eternal bliss of heaven. God wants the Christian on earth for a short or long period of time. And He wants him here for a purpose. Christ says: "Ye are the salt of the earth," Mt. 5, 13. "Ye are the light of the world," v. 14. "Let your light so shine before men that they may see *your good works* and glorify your Father which is in heaven," v. 16. Eph. 2, 10 Paul says: "We are his work-

manship, created in Christ Jesus *unto good works*, which God hath before ordained (R. V. prepared) that we should walk in them." Peter writes: "Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles, that whereas they speak against you as evildoers, they may *by your good works*, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation."—The Christian is left in this world *to do good works* by which God is glorified and sinners are forced to ask: What makes Christians so different from us?

Good works are *selfevident* for the Christian. After all, he is a new creature in Christ. He has forgiveness of sin and thereby life and salvation. He has a new heart, a heart which loves the Lord and is intent on pleasing Him.—In his natural state no man can do good works, for "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," Gen. 8, 21. In his renewed state he is eager to do them. This means war, "for the flesh lusteth against the Spirit," Gal. 5, 17. The Christian needs encouragement not to listen to the flesh, not to do evil works. Paul puts that down in his Pastoral Letters, especially Titus, as the work of the pastor.

Tit. 3, 1: "Put them in mind . . . to be ready *for every good work*." V. 8: "This is a faithful saying and these things I will that *thou affirm* constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful *to maintain good works*." V. 14: "And let ours also learn *to maintain good works* for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful." And 2, 14: "Who (Christ) gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people *zealous of good works*." Conf. also 1. Tim. 2, 10; 6, 18; 3, 17; 2. Tim. 2, 21; Tit. 1, 16; 2, 7.

It is the Holy Ghost Who through Paul lays stress on *good works*. It is He Who stresses the teaching and preaching of good works as the work of the pastor. It is He Who stresses the importance of being "a pattern of *good works*." Tit. 2, 7.

Good works are an essential part of the Christian's life. They are the *fruits of his faith*. Faith is active. If it isn't active it is dead. James 2, 20: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" V. 14: "What does it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and *have not works*? Can faith (R. V. that faith) save him?" A life without good works is proof that faith is not a matter of the heart, but merely

of the lips. God wants a faith which is active in the pursuit of sanctification and godliness.

Our duty, brethren, is to preach and teach and exhort our people to bring forth good works, the fruit of faith. That is a privilege, not a burdensome duty. A minister of Christ enjoys the work which goes with beseeching and exhorting Christians to be rich in good works and rebuking them who are not. But how to go about this work? Law? Gospel? The Law seems to be the efficient instrument to whip up good works. Who gets things done faster than law-men? Catholics offer a fine example; Protestants, too, and among them some so-called Lutherans. But the Lord is interested in fruits of faith, not law-products. Faith has nothing to do with the work which is done through fear of punishment or through selfish motives. So much of this kind of work is done to satisfy the base instincts of man, to earn honor, merit, thanks, notoriety, etc. But God says: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," Rom. 14, 23.—Here we could point out the inherent dangers of bazaars and socials and suppers, etc., which are a part of so many of our churches.

Only the Gospel can bring forth fruits of faith, really good works. See the pattern the Lord lays down in Tit. 2, 14, 15. Read from 11. That is all built up on the grace of God and the work of redemption of "our Savior Jesus Christ." He "gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a people for his own possession," (R. V.) Appreciating such grace and redemption makes the Christian ask: How can I please my God and Savior? How can I show my gratitude? The result is a people "zealous of good works." *Zēlōtēn kalōn ergōn*. *Zēlōtēs*: "One burning with zeal; most eagerly desirous of, zealous for a thing." Thayer. It is the Gospel which works this zeal. By the Gospel we pastors exhort our people to good works. It brings forth fruit. It makes men who are *zealous of good works*.

We should ask: What are good works? Varied definitions are possible. We can find definitions which actually contradict each other. We would have to say that a good work is something which the Christian does in faith in his Savior Jesus Christ to the glory of God and the welfare of his neighbor. That very defini-

tion makes it plain that only a Christian can bring forth a good work. Who else could do anything to the glory of God and the welfare of his neighbor?

"Why trouble ye the woman? She hath wrought a *good work* upon me," Jesus said to his disciples when they murmured against the woman who anointed him. Mt. 26, 11. "Dorcas was full of *good works* and almsdeeds which she did." Acts 9. She made coats and garments for the widows. Mary, by her good deed of anointing Christ, showed her love of the Lord; Dorcas, by her work, showed her love for her fellow Christians.

Paul writes to the Galatians: "Let us not be weary in well doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." Gal. 6, 9, 10. 1. Cor. 15; 58 he writes: "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye . . . always abounding in the work of the Lord." To the Thessalonians: "But ye, brethren, be not weary in well-doing." 2. Thess. 3, 13. 1. Thess. 5, 15: "Ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves and among all men."

We need that sermon both for ourselves and our people. That life of good works is part of redeeming the time (Eph. 5, 16). It is such a short time for doing good unto all men. All men. The Samaritan did not first investigate the man he found lying by the wayside in his blood. He helped.

Doing good works is a lifetime job. Exhorting to good works is that also. "Put them in mind . . . (continuously) to be ready to every good work." Tit. 3, 1. No pastor can ever say: I have admonished enough. No Christian can ever say: I have done enough. Vacations are out of place in this work. Where would we be if God took vacations in the matter of extending His grace? Daily we "take of his fulness grace for grace." John 1, 16. "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning; great is thy faithfulness." Lament. 3, 22, 23. The time and opportunity for good works continue, and exhortation thereto is always in place.

There are two classes of good works: 1. They that have to do with the spiritual needs of men; 2. They that have to do with their bodily needs. We know that they are interwoven. Yet

we feel free to make this distinction. The first has to do with that which we call mission work. It springs out of the fervent desire to bring the gospel of Christ to them who do not have it, whether they be distant heathen or neighbors. This good work must be done on foreign, inner or institutional mission fields. It is the Church's most important work, for it is the most necessary to men who sit in darkness. With mission work we carry out the Lord's mandate, Mark 16, 15: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." "Ye," that is really all believers. See Mt. 23, 19, 20; Acts 1, 8; 1. Pt. 2, 9. 10. Whether we carry out this mandate by actually going out as missionaries or by making it possible by our offerings for others to go, makes no difference. Only let it be done! Therefore, brethren, preach mission!

The second we speak of as charity. The need of a fellowman moves us to do something, something for his bodily comfort. That can be work for one individual. Or it can be work which makes it possible to found and maintain institutions for the welfare of orphans, old people, sick, etc. Of these works of charity Hebr. 13, 16 says: "But to do good and communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Rom. 12, 13: "Distributing to the necessities of the saints." Of such works of love Christ says Mt. 25, 35. 36: "I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was in prison, and ye visited me." "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." V. 40. Conf. also Mark 9, 41; Mt. 18, 5.

Read Paul's plea for contributions to the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. 2. Cor. 8. 9.

It is God's earnest will that His children here on earth maintain good works, dass sie "in einem Stande guter Werke gefunden werden," Tit. 3, 8. 14. This every pastor should constantly (R. V. confidently) affirm, preach, teach with all authority.—Let us take to heart these three words: Constantly, confidently, with all authority. In this too we are Christ's heralds. We speak on His authority, the highest there is. We teach His words. We need not hesitate to speak with confidence and at every opportunity.

Many pastors are inclined to be timid or half-hearted in this

respect. They fear that their people will not take kindly to the idea of being constantly reminded of their duty, rather privilege, of doing good works for missions or charity. Too bad it must be said—there are some who fear that they will be cut a little short, if their people give too much to missions and charity.

But, brethren, why should any fear enter our hearts? Are we not speaking for Christ and His cause? Is He not Lord of all? "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." It does not take long to learn that all fears—in this respect—are needless. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is a power of God here too and it does create willingness to work and give for God's kingdom. Yes, it works joy in hearts, for it makes them discover the rare privilege it is to work, give and sacrifice for the work of the Lord, the preaching of His Gospel.

Let us get clear on this: God wants a cheerful giver. 2. Cor. 9, 7. To make cheerful givers, tell people what a giver God is. Tell them John 3, 16. Rom. 8, 31. Let them learn ever better what God in His grace has *given* and *gives* to them. Tell them what Christ has given for them. "Who *gave* himself a ransom for all," 1. Tim. 2, 6. "Who *gave* himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity," Tit. 2, 14. "Who *gave* himself for our sins," Gal. 1, 4. "Who loved me and *gave* himself for me," Gal. 2, 20. "Who has *given* himself for us for an offering and a sacrifice to God," Eph. 5, 2. Tell them what God is daily *giving* them: His holy Word; the Holy Ghost; the Sacraments. That makes cheerful givers. It brings fruit in sanctification and willingness to do good works.

We dare not, however, forget another important thought. Tit. 2, 7: "In all things showing thyself a pattern of *good works*." Preaching good works, hammering away at that theme, will not bring the desired fruit, if the preachment never has any effect on us preachers. Are we preaching only to others to *maintain good works*? We must keep in mind what Paul writes: "But I keep under my body (the old Adam) and bring it into subjection: 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 did not exclude himself or Titus: "Who gave himself for *us* that he

might redeem *us* from all iniquity." Tit. 2, 14. We must be included in all these things. We are the people "of his possession," "*zealous of good works.*" Everything that is true of the Christian is true of the pastor. Then we must bring forth the fruits of faith. People have a sharp eye. They notice if a preacher practices what he preaches. That one who is not a pattern of good works does untold harm to the Christians and the work of God. Not practicing what he preaches does more than anything else to nullify a pastor's sermons.

Brethren, it is vital that we be examples of the believers in doing *good works*, in giving and sacrificing cheerfully for the Lord's work. Oh for men who are examples in appreciation of and gratitude for what God and Christ have *given* to them constantly! Can it be said of us: "Your zeal hath provoked (R. V. stirred up) very many." Luther: "Euer Beispiel hat viele gereizet." 2. Cor. 9, 2.

Brethren, let us ever remember that part of our work as ministers of Christ and servants of God which Paul expresses thus: "Reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine," 2. Tim. 4, 2; "Put them in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient," R. V. Tit. 3, 1; "Put them in mind to be ready for every good work," Tit. 3, 1, "*zealous of good works,*" Tit. 2, 14.

Have we been faithful servants in this respect? It is important, for we are working for the salvation of souls whom Christ redeemed and whom He entrusted to our care. We will have to account to Him for every soul.

W. G. BODAMER.

(To be concluded)

"Rebuilding A Lost Faith"

Modern Catholic Action has many ways of appearing and remaining in the limelight of public opinion. It has but one purpose: to enhance the greater glory of Rome, to enlarge its membership and its manifold spheres of influence. One of its characteristic ways is to publish the lives of saints and converts. Thus the attention of the outside world is focused on the Church of Rome ever anew. Perhaps one or the other might be attracted by the magnetic influence of such saints and converts and their singular experiences. Being thoroughly disgusted with the "inner dissensions of Protestantism" and vaguely groping for a religious hold in this rapidly disintegrating world, and furthermore being impressed by the seeming strength, size and "eternal sameness" of the Papal Church (that great and grave theological and historical falsehood!), such impressionable natures fall as comparatively easy victims of slippery and deceitful Roman propaganda.

Indeed, it is true that many turn their backs to Rome because of their own sad experiences with the clergy and otherwise. Let us not deceive ourselves, however, as to the ever increasing membership and influence of the Pope and his dominion. There may be padded statistics, but not all. Rome is not the only sinner in this respect. It is on the alert and on the march. It is profiting by chaotic war and after-war conditions, and again the Lutheran Church is bearing the brunt of the assaults as being primarily responsible for present conditions. There is nothing new under the sun even in this respect. It was so after the last World War. History repeats itself. When men like Dean Inge and the Jewish writer Emil Ludwig can blame everything on to Luther and his "eccentric, revolutionary" ideas, they become mere mudslingers and Rome laughs up her sleeve to see how others in different religious folds knowingly or unknowingly are helping the arch-enemy of Lutheranism along in that methodic war against the truth.

Rome made much of the one hundredth anniversary, on October 9, 1045, of John Henry Newman's conversion to the Roman Catholic faith. Newman had been a prominent Anglican

churchman and an influential leader of the Oxford Movement with its final trend toward Rome. The Pope showed his gratitude and apostolic favor by creating Newman cardinal. Perhaps some of the ground lost in England since the days of King Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth might be regained. It is claimed that Newman popularized Roman Catholicism in England by his conversion. If we study statistics, we are inclined to believe it, for at the time of Newman's birth in 1801 there were approximately only 60,000 Roman Catholics in England and today they number about 4,000,000. The powerful influence of Newman can be seen in the steadily increasing Roman ritualism of the Church of England and the Episcopal Church of our own country. There is very little difference between the pompous ceremonies and robes of Roman ecclesiastics and their Protestant imitators.

Well could the Pope afford to create Newman a cardinal. The creation of Roman cardinals in countries outside of Italy has always served as a weather vane revealing the trend of Roman influence. The newly created cardinals of our Western Hemisphere are a clear indication of the direction of the Papal plans. The pivotal influence of Newman can be felt to this very day in England and other countries, ours not excluded, in the various Newman clubs springing up like mushrooms in various non-Catholic universities and colleges. It does not require much vision to see the master stroke of the Pope in making the author of "*Lead Kindly Light*" cardinal and the outstanding figure of Roman Catholicism in England in spite of the fact that he was once considered an apostate by almost common Anglican consent. Papal shrewdness foresaw the widespread influence.

Of late we have noticed another story of a conversion to Roman Catholicism returning to the bookshelves of the land. We are thinking of the story of his own conversion by John Lawson Stoddard: *Rebuilding a Lost Faith* (P. J. Kennedy & Sons, New York). Perhaps this republished conversion could also pave the way for other conversions. The chaotic global conditions, the dissensions, and the increasing liberalism among Protestants, the vagueness of many personal beliefs among the broad masses of modern Protestantism, the barren rationalism preached from most of the pulpits have caused widespread dissatisfaction. Is it strange

then that Rome should profit by such confused conditions and rampant agnosticism? Is it something extraordinary that the Pope and his dominion should be able to sway credulous and impressionable romantic souls? Why should not stories of famous conversions add to the greater glory of Rome, help win souls, and lead others back into the Roman fold?

John Lawson Stoddard's *Rebuilding a Lost Faith* was first published in 1921. It is the story of the conversion of the one-time famous traveler and lecturer as well as author of his travelogues. The brilliant writer and lecturer reveals his poetic style and learned background in his own story of his conversion. It is again bound to make a deep impression on most readers. If it were a commonplace conversion, we should not take time out to discuss it. The seeming objectivity of thought however of the "American Agnostic," as Stoddard calls himself, paired with a strong personal appeal makes this conversion all the more alluring and dangerous. We should like to place a few danger signs and warning signals because of the lucid, yet deceptive argumentation of the famous author of *Rebuilding a Lost Faith*.

John Lawson Stoddard was born in Brookline, Massachusetts, in 1850. He descended from Puritan stock. The Congregationalist Solomon Stoddard was his progenitor and he again was the grandson of Jonathan Edwards, the staunch defender of Calvinistic predestination against Arminianism. Stoddard's parents belonged to the Congregationalist Church. They wanted their son to become a clergyman of this denomination. His college training Stoddard received at Williams College, his theological courses at Yale Divinity School. In those days it was customary for the Congregationalist laity to take a personal hand in the examination of the future ministers so as to insure orthodox and fundamentalist preaching. They refused admittance into the ministry and to their pulpits to anyone who was not sound in the fundamental doctrines of that denomination. How far has not that church drifted from its original course and goal!

It so happened that one of the theological professors at Yale, at whose feet young Stoddard sat, had liberal leanings and could not hide them from the searching and critical mind of the young student. When the time for the final examination had come, this

professor warned Stoddard not to apply for an examination before the mixed body of examiners, if he intended to cling to his own liberal tenets. The liberal professor knew his uncompromising student full well. This request, however, seemed strange to the young student. The liberal professor could continue his teaching as a theological professor at Yale while he, the applicant for the ministry, would be rejected because of his liberalism. There must be something radically wrong somewhere. The final result was that Stoddard gave up his Christian faith altogether, became an agnostic, and for many years refused to have any connection with the Church whatever. In his travelogues he frequently reveals this agnostic attitude.

For a while Stoddard was in the throes of agnosticism and rationalism. Living in the days of a Bishop Colenso in Africa, of Darwin and Huxley in England, and of Emerson and Ingersoll in our own country, he eagerly imbibed their wisdom and drifted into a practically godless life.

At the end of his public career as a traveler and lecturer Stoddard lived in Italy. There he experienced some of the horrors of the first World War. The downfall of our boasted modern civilization brought him, as he claimed, to his senses and "aroused him like a trumpet of God." Like Augustine he tried to find the truth and comfort in the study of philosophy before his conversion. He recalled the words of Kant: "Two things overwhelm me with awe, the starry heavens and man's accountability to God." He remembered the words of Isaac Newton: "The whole variety of created things could only arise from the design and will of a being existing of Himself." In his notebooks he discovered further statements of Darwin, Bacon, Kelvin and others admitting that the world we live in cannot be truthfully explained without a God creating and ruling the universe. There must be a supreme Creator. From the fields of cosmogony he went to those of ethics looking for an inner evidence of God and finding it in the moral law implanted in man. Thus he was led on to the further conclusion that there must be a divine Lawgiver, an added proof for the existence of God. From here there was but one step to the belief in immortality. It seemed to be absolutely clear to him that the existence of God could be proven conclusively with the

aid of our human reason even though Kant had denied just that. The philosopher of Koenigsberg had been willing to admit the existence of God and immortality as a priori postulates of human reason. While Kant recognized the limitations of human reason, Stoddard believed that a rationalistic proof for the existence of God and for immortality could be given.

Roman Catholic theology is a strange mixture of Scripture, human tradition, and philosophy cleverly juggled and mixed by that artful juggler, the Devil, who rightfully deserves his name *diabolos*. The Roman theological system is surely the Devil's masterpiece of deception. It characterizes the Church of the Antichrist, the very counterpart of the true Church of Christ. Philosophy has not only offered the framework of this intriguing dogmatical system, but only too often even the substance and foundation of its doctrines.

To prove our contention we call attention to the doctrine of purgatory which proves to be such a thumbscrew in confession in the hands of a clever priesthood. Through Origen and Posidonius it can be traced back to Plato in its basic factors. It is pagan in its origin and foreign to Scripture, contrary to the clear words of Christ and not in accord with the analogy of faith.

We also call attention to the Semi-Pelagianism to be found in the Roman teachings concerning salvation. Rome plainly teaches that man's nature is not utterly corrupt after the fall, that salvation is brought about by a co-operation of man's free will with the grace of God. This compromise is the outgrowth of the controversy between Augustine and Pelagius who taught the absolute freedom of the will and the ability of man to work out his own salvation. Knowingly or unknowingly Pelagius goes back to Origen and to the arch-champion of a free will, Aristotle. When the ecclesiastical leaders of the Eastern as well as of the Western Church resorted ever more to philosophy to prove their doctrines and to make them acceptable to human reason and pride, it was only too natural that they would have to revert to Aristotle. Scholasticism as expounded by such leaders as Albertus Magnus, Duns Scotus, and above all Thomas Aquinas is nothing else but an endeavor to unite and harmonize the metaphysics and logic of Aristotle with Christian theology. Aristotle did not only give the

logical framework, but in only too many instances became a teacher of the Church of Rome. It required the acute mind of Luther to disentangle the mesh of Roman theology, find in Aristotle the real father of Scholastic theology who would have to be dethroned by all means. All this proves conclusively the essential role of human philosophy in Roman theology. Many more proofs could be added.

It is only too natural that in a church which owes so many essential parts of its doctrine to human philosophy and the imaginations and fables of man that the line of demarcation between philosophy and theology will be practically effaced. Philosophy is viewed by Roman theologians as a stepping stone to theology, a lower floor of human inquiry into the truth. They are not aware of the limitations of human reasoning. Paul is no longer their preferred teacher, who writes: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1. Cor. 2:14.) They do not wish to heed Paul's admonition to take captive every thought to the obedience of Christ (2. Cor. 10:5). Roman theologians may think and teach that one can transcend from the realms of philosophy to those of theology. Nicodemus too tried to reason out the mystery of regeneration and failed. It cannot be done. It is an article of faith. Revelation is beyond human reasoning. It cannot be grasped, it must be believed.

But why this seeming digression? John L. Stoddard started out with his study of philosophy and arrived at conclusions which lie in the realm of natural theology. At this stage of his search he sought the advice of Roman theologians. They led him to believe that Roman theology is logical and reasonable. This appealed to his natural mind. It did not dawn upon him that he had to bring a greater sacrifice of his intellect in order to swallow among others the fables concerning purgatory, the immaculate conception of Mary, and the infallibility of the Pope than to accept the truth of Scripture with a childlike faith. The former are preposterous falsehoods, the latter unfathomable divine mysteries. It was illogical reasoning that led Stoddard into the folds of Rome. He took captive his reason with respect to the teachings of Rome,

where he should have exercised it, and he used his reason over against Scripture, where he should have bowed to the Word of God. The gulf between human philosophy and theology cannot be bridged by sin-tainted reason. For Stoddard and Rome there is no insurmountable gulf between the two.

After having seemingly found his way from the vast realms of philosophy to the inviting Elysian fields of Roman theology Stoddard goes over to an attack on Protestantism. We find a striking parallel between the conversion and method of warfare of Stoddard and that of a German scholar by the name of Ernst Roloff, who tells us the story of his conversion from Protestantism to the Roman faith in his autobiography: *In zwei Welten. Lebenserinnerungen*. Roloff's father was a leading evangelical preacher in Berlin in his day. Among the professors under whom young Roloff studied he mentions G. Baur of Tuebingen, Luthardt and R. Sohm of Leipzig, and A. Harnack in Berlin. When Harnack began to deny and attack the truths of the Apostolic Creed and to make statements in his "Wesen des Christentums" such as: "Nicht der Sohn, sondern allein der Vater gehoert ins Evangelium, wie Jesus es verkuendet, hinein," the faith of young Roloff was shattered. He confessed that the foundations of his faith had been completely destroyed. Berlin had not built a foundation, it had torn it down. Roloff blamed A. Harnack primarily for his breaking with the Evangelical Church and becoming a Roman Catholic. What a terrible accusation is it not against men like Harnack to have destroyed the faith in the hearts of untold students of theology. After Roloff had turned Catholic he at first entered the cloister at Monte Cassino in Italy. Later on he became the editor of the authoritative German lexicon of pedagogy published by the firm of Herder and Co.

It is very unfortunate that both Roloff and Stoddard should have become the victims of liberal Protestantism. This however does not excuse them before God. They are nevertheless fully responsible to God for their action and cannot shift their responsibility and blame upon Protestantism as such because of liberal Protestants who robbed them of their faith. Both of them exchanged one false theology for the other, the religion of the Antichrist for that of liberal Protestantism, and we are convinced that

of the two damnable heresies that of the Antichrist is the more damnable. This statement of ours may horrify those who with Stoddard cannot see the Antichrist in the Pope and his dominion, but they who see in the papal teachings the nullification of the article of justification with which the Church stands and falls will fully agree with Luther and the true Lutheran Church as to the Antichrist and the Reformer's conviction expressed after Smalcald: May the Lord fill you with a hatred of the Pope!

As intelligent and educated men Roloff and Stoddard should have known that you cannot hold true Protestantism responsible for modern aberrations, as little as you can hold Christianity responsible for the false doctrines and misdeeds of individual members of visible churches, and as little as Rome wants to be held responsible for individual miscreants. It is the doctrine that must be judged on the basis of Scripture and then the practice that develops out of such a doctrine. Both must be in accord with the Word of God. All will have to appear before the final tribunal of Jesus, now our Savior, then the Judge. Faith in Christ alone will decide the issue. Neither the "Essence of Christianity" of Harnack or any other liberal Protestant, nor the Canons of of the Council of Trent are going to be decisive, but the Word of God alone will be the final norm and authority.

It was an easy task for Roman theologians to convince Stoddard that the Church of Rome is "the true Church of Christ founded upon the Rock of St. Peter." In this church he claims to have found the peace of his soul, the perfect unfolding of the teachings and ideals of Christ in the passing centuries. His heart is full of praise and his able pen tries to convey these thoughts of inner peace and happiness to the reader. One who thus extols is inclined to exaggerate, to distort the truth, to praise Rome and to lay all the blame on Protestantism and Luther who have to serve as scapegoats. There is nothing really new in the presentation of Stoddard, yet the way it is said is alluring. One can hear the Song of the Sirens out of his musical language. Luther becomes the apostate who has fallen away from the Church and who is blamed for everything within Protestantism and for Protestantism itself, that thorn in the flesh of Roman pride and arrogance. Stoddard and other Romanists find it so very easy to cast stones at

Luther and Protestantism, but that day will inevitably come when they too will be judged by Him who is the true Head of the Church, Christ, and then there will no longer be any doubt in any one's mind as to where Luther and all true Protestants will stand, and what the fate of the Antichrist will be as revealed in 2. Thess. 2:8, where we read: "That wicked (Antichrist) shall be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth (in the Reformation), and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming (on Judgment Day)."

Regarding the infallibility of the Pope Stoddard makes the claim: "If Popes were to contradict one another as Anglican bishops do, they certainly could not be considered infallible in such matters. But they do not thus contradict one another. Not one genuine instance can be given, in which a Pope has condemned a doctrine which has ever been really taught *ex cathedra* by any of his predecessors." (Page 152.) Well, Mr. Stoddard is wrong on this count too as on many others. Pope Gelasius I (died 496) said of transubstantiation: "*esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis at vini*" (Mirbt: Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums, page 86). At the fourth Lateran Council in 1215 transubstantiation was declared to be an article of faith by Pope Innocent III. We could point out other contradictions, but let that suffice to cast the dogma of papal infallibility overboard. One of the two Popes could not have been infallible even according to Stoddard. Yet both are listed as Popes. Popes they were, but neither of them infallible.

Stoddard goes over to a frontal attack on Protestantism and above all on Luther. He finds the main cause for the disintegration of Protestantism in its claim of the right of private judgment. Luther is looked upon as the author of this "pernicious doctrine." His definition for the right of private judgment Stoddard does not take from Luther as one should have the right to expect from a fair critic, but from the liberal Protestant English theologian Déan Farrar. "In order to ascertain what the Word of God contained in Scripture really is we must find for ourselves and choose what satisfies our reason, for our own private judgment is our final court of appeal to know how much of the Bible we can accept." (Page 8.) Stoddard finally comes to the conclusion: "The Bible therefore in and of itself can never take the place of

a living and infallible teacher. It remains silent under the tortures inflicted upon its texts. The voiceless Book and complicated manuscripts cannot alone decide the matter which disturbs the soul" (page 9). The "infallible" Pope was the only solution Stoddard could conceive. We have seen how "infallible" the Pope is.

Since Stoddard harps on the right of private judgment as the basic evil of Protestantism, we shall single it out among the many statements, with which we could take issue. The author of *Rebuilding a Lost Faith* goes to great lengths to accuse Luther because of his advocacy of the right of private judgment, but it escapes him that the Pope whom he adores has usurped this right of private judgment for himself as no other man here on earth. Already Boniface VIII in his Papal Bull, *Unam Sanctam*, claims: "We declare, determine and decree that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff . . . He judges all things, but himself is judged by no man." At the Vatican Council in 1870 the dogma of papal infallibility was officially decreed and the final statement added: "But if anyone shall venture, which God may avert, to contradict our definition, let him be accursed." Did Luther or Protestantism ever make such a blasphemous claim?

Stoddard also does not see that the very caricature of the right of private judgment is to be found in the dogma of cadaverous obedience of the Jesuits. Regarding the Pope Stoddard has this to say: "As the divinely (!) appointed Pastor of Christ's Church he is protected from the formal enunciation of error in matters of faith and morals. The dogma of Papal Infallibility presented to me no more difficulties. On the contrary, I accepted it with satisfaction and relief" (page 153). Yet when Luther reserved for himself the right of private judgment, he at once became an arch-heretic.

What did Luther really teach regarding the right of private judgment? If we judge him and Stoddard's accusation, we must let Luther speak for himself. We cannot enter into a lengthy discussion of this vital subject, but we should at least like to adduce the basic proofs from Scripture and Luther. Did not Christ tell His disciples: "Beware of false prophets" in His Sermon on the Mount? Did not the Bereans search the Scriptures

daily whether those things were so which the apostles told them (Acts 17:11)? Does not the Apostle John write (1. John 4:1): "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God, because many false prophets have gone out into the world." Thus the Bible clearly teaches that every disciple of Christ, every Christian, every layman has the right and also the duty of private judgment. The Bible gives them the right to judge the teachings of men according to Scripture.

The Church of Rome denies the right of private judgment to the individual Christian. It does not even permit the free reading of the Bible. For most of the Christians of that denomination the Bible is still a closed and not an open book. It is maintained by Rome that the Bible is difficult to understand. It must therefore be interpreted to the Church by the only infallible teacher, the Pope. But what has the Bible to say of itself? Psalm 119, 105 we read: "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." If the Bible is a light, how can it be obscure? Furthermore, the Bible can also be understood by the simpleminded. Psalm 19:7 we read: "The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." The Bible can even be understood and learned by children: "From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures (2. Tim. 3:15).

In his Treatise on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church and other writings Luther emphasises the right of private judgment for every Christian and uses as his proof passages just those passages that we have quoted above.

The humanist Erasmus, the contemporary of Luther, had declared: "To the sacred authorities, the sacred writing and the decrees of the Church I submit my own opinion in all things." Luther answers him in his treatise, *De seruo arbitrio*: "What do you say, Erasmus? Is it not sufficient that you submit your reason to Scripture? Do you submit it to the decrees of the Church too? What can the Church decree that is not decreed in Scripture? Where, then remains the liberty and the power of judging those who have made the decrees? As Paul teaches 1 Corinthians 14: 'Let others judge'" (St. L. XVIII, 1678). In an other instance Luther bases his argument on Matth. 7:15: "Beware of false prophets." He writes: "If they should claim that it is neither

for us to judge what the Gospel is or that it has not as yet been decided by a church council, we do not concede this to them, for Scripture does not give this authority to a council, but to each and every Christian to judge the doctrine and to know and to avoid the wolves" (XXI: 397).

Luther's defense of the right of private judgment has so often and so grossly been misunderstood and misinterpreted. He defended it in this sense alone that no man could dictate to him what he must think and believe, but not in the sense that he may think independently of Scripture and sit in judgment over it as is the opinion of Farrar and others. The right of private judgment does not permit us to think as we please about Scripture and follow our own interpretation of Holy Writ, but it does give each and every Christian the right to go to Scripture directly and to learn and to know from it what we should and what we should not believe regarding the way of salvation and a truly Christian life. The fundamental doctrines pertaining to our salvation are taught so clearly in Scripture that a simple person, yes, a little child can understand them, and the more difficult portions and passages are to be studied and understood in the light of the simpler parts and passages. Since there is and can be nothing contradictory, it being God's infallible Word, a continued study of the Bible will bring more light and an ever increasing understanding of the revealed will of God. Thus the Romanists falsely slander and accuse Luther, the man who felt himself so singularly bound by every word of Scripture: "Ein Wort der Schrift macht mir die ganze Welt zu enge." Every Christian has the right to study and interpret Scripture, which God had opened for us Christians through his servant, Martin Luther. However, there is one restriction. This interpretation must not be according to our own private opinion, not as we may see it, but always in accord with the analogy of faith. *Scriptura ex Scriptura explicanda est.*

At Worms Luther referred to his conscience saying: "It is neither right nor good to do aught against one's own conscience. Unless I can be convinced by clear words of Holy Writ, I cannot and will not recant." He made it very clear that his conscience was bound by the Word of God. Luther never put his own conscience in the place of the Word of God, in the seat of infallible

authority. Rome is guided in doctrine and life by tradition and expediency, the conscience has too often been stifled and smothered. Liberal Protestants hide behind their own fallible consciences and reason. Luther's conscience bound by the Word of God made him stand alone at Worms. Here the right of private judgment in the light of Scripture was at stake. It may have been expedient for him to come to an understanding, a union with Zwingli at Marburg, but the seemingly insignificant word: *est* decided the issue for him. How thankful should we Lutherans, yes, all Christians not be for these decisive battles for the truth of Scripture and the right of private judgment. God and one were the majority in both cases.

Rome continues to rail and rant against this royal prerogative of individual Christians as members of the royal priesthood of all believers to judge all teachings of men, churches, and sects according to God's Word. Cardinal Gibbons in his well-known *Faith of the Fathers* has given frequent expression to Rome's unscriptural attitude on the matter. He writes (Ch. VIII p. 77): "The Church is the divinely appointed Custodian and Interpreter of the Bible. For her office of infallible guide were superfluous, if each individual could interpret the Bible for himself." This is but another version of: "Roma locuta, res finita."

Stoddard calls attention to the results of the use of the right of private judgment in Protestant circles in Europe and in our own U. S. A. It is very unfortunate and disheartening to see how this scriptural principle of the right of private judgment has been abused by liberal Protestants. They have distorted it and would have it be the right of every individual to judge Scripture as he sees fit. They have no right to place their own private judgment over Scripture and claim that they learned this from Luther or that such a practice is in conformity with true Protestantism. The modern liberal theologian asks us to bow before the authority of reason and personal experience. Where God has spoken in His Word, the right of private judgment contrary to it ceases, be it that of Pope or of Protestant. Every heresy or false doctrine is the result of man's placing his own private judgment over and against Scripture. Paul writes to Timothy: "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord

Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth" (1. Tim. 6: 3f). There we have the true reason for all divisions of Christendom, the false pride of man that does not wish to bow to the Word of God. A false use of the right of private judgment has always produced false teachings and divisions. Schleiermacher, Ritschl, A. Harnack and others in Germany accorded to themselves the right to sit in judgment over the Bible, and what was the result for Protestant Germany? Fosdick and untold others in our own country have done the same over here, and look at the disastrous results. The Unitarians have consistently let their reason sit in judgment over the Bible and have carried it to the farthest point. Thus we see that both the Romanists and the liberal Protestants and outspoken Unitarians, who are outside of Christianity, abuse the right of private judgment as taught in the Bible and as advocated by Luther. They are to be blamed and not the Reformer, for he alone abided by Scripture while they sit in judgment over it, accept and reject at will. An impartial study on the basis of Scripture should have revealed this to Stoddard.

In the life and conversion of John Lawson Stoddard we have another proof of the seductive power of the Church of Rome and of that blindness which settles down on otherwise intelligent souls and which is brought on by that arch-fiend of truth and light, the Devil, the Prince of darkness and father of lies. It was a sad revelation for us to have to discover that the famous author and lecturer, whose books and whose brilliant mind we had always esteemed, had entered the portals of Rome and had become impervious to the truth of the pure Gospel.

H. A. KOCH.

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)

(Continued)

III

The proper exercise of this liberty among brethren is a matter of such importance that neither Church nor individual may deny these obligations of true Christian fellowship.

It will not be possible to bring this discussion to a close without touching upon one phase of the Christian life to which the name of Christian liberty is applied in a very specific sense, the area in which lie those things which the Church calls adiaphora, which we define as things "which are neither commanded nor forbidden in God's Word." It may seem puzzling that the same word liberty is used in this case as well as in describing the basic freedom of the Christian, his liberation and redemption through Christ. In the one case we have a very broad and inclusive thing, since the liberty which our Savior has won for us is one in which He has broken all chains that held us fast. In the other case the liberty is revealed as a rather restricted thing, operating only within a very clearly defined and limited field. On the one hand, Scripture goes so far in describing the redeeming of those who were under the Law that it declares that the Law is not made for a righteous man (1 Tim. 1:9); on the other, this same righteous man finds himself under the necessity of looking very closely whether God has declared His will as to a certain matter or not. But our confusion, if such there be, is caused by the fact that we are using a single word where the Greeks had two. Speaking of the basic liberty of the child of God, the New Testament uses the word *eleutheria*, freedom. But when the Apostle Paul (in 1 Cor. 8:8 f.) cites a typical adiaphoron, meat, the eating of which will make us neither better nor worse before God, and then warns, "But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak," he uses the word *exousia* (power,

right), where we in our translation have "liberty." Moffatt translates, "See that the exercise of your right does not prove a stumbling block to the weak." The Christian accordingly has certain rights to which he is entitled, powers which he may exercise or not exercise according to his own free judgment, and in which he has a definite latitude of discretion.

A quick survey of the manner in which Paul uses these two terms will be enlightening. In his First Letter to the Corinthians, in which the subject under discussion is the course which a Christian shall follow in this field of free action, of adiaphora, the key word is *exousia*. When he speaks as follows: "Have we not power to eat and to drink? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?" (chap. 9:4-6), he establishes these things as his right, his *exousia*, which he is free to use. When he mentions his reasons for refraining from the use of these rights, the word occurs again: "We have not used this power (*exousia*), but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the Gospel of Christ" (v. 12). When we hear him saying, "All things are lawful for me, but all things edify not" (chap. 10:23), he is using the corresponding verb form, *exestin*. Other examples could be supplied. But when Paul was urging his Galatians to reject the teaching that they must accept circumcision also if they would be sure of their soul's salvation, his call to them to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free shows the other term, *eleutheria*, *eleutherōsen*. For although circumcision was an adiaphoron in itself, and Paul had treated it as such in the case of Timothy, yet now, when it was urged as a matter of necessity, the basic freedom which Christ had won was under attack, the underlying liberty of the Christian was in danger. For, as the Formula of Concord explains, "in such a case it is no longer a question concerning adiaphora, but concerning the truth of the Gospel" (*Trigl.* 824, 4). Hence *eleutheria* was the fitting word.

Yet this does not imply that the two different thoughts which lie in these two terms have nothing in common. On the contrary, these matters where a Christian may exercise

his own discretion and judgment, where he has an *exousia*, are within his rights only because of the original grant of liberty which his Redeemer has conferred upon him. They are a perfect fruit of this basic freedom. On the other hand, when a Christian uses this right and power with judgment and discretion, with wise restraint rather than unbridled self-indulgence or reckless indifference as to the effect his action may have upon a weak brother, then he thereby reveals that the glory of the liberty which he enjoys in Christ and the greatness of the price at which it was won have not been lost upon him. Nor need we feel that when such a Christian finds himself in a situation where there is no latitude of discretion, no *exousia*, because God has spoken in the matter, that he is then in any way deprived of his basic freedom when he complies with the declared will of God. He is rather in the position of a child whose obedience to the will of his father is a free and willing one. His attitude is an expression of a very wonderful fact, namely, that in the new man which has been born in him the will is constantly — and freely — being brought into conformity with the will of the Father. No part of his spiritual liberty, his *eleutheria*, has been lost. Nor is it a surrender of rights when a Christian, following the example of Paul, practices stern self-restraint in the exercise of his privileges. The fact that it is *self-restraint* and *self-rule* makes all the difference in the world. This is not *loss* of the *exousia*, but controlled, wise, responsible *use* of these rights and powers.

Before taking up the principles which should guide us in the exercise of this *exousia*, this Christian liberty, let us consider another factor which may be helpful in defining the area in which it operates. We find that the will of God may definitely be recognized not only from His spoken or written Word, but also by His actions. In fact, quite frequently these constitute a very specific definition of His will, and thereby provide a very clear indication as to His immediate intention and purpose. This should not mean, of course, that we now proceed to interpret every happening in this world according to our fancy. There are many things which God merely permits, and other actions of His where His ways are wondrous

and unsearchable. But since His Word teaches us where we do see His hand in action and where such action constitutes a recognizable indication of His will, a Christian will observe and respect this just as surely as a dutiful child recognizes the wishes of its parents by the same token. It is unthinkable that a true child of God should set itself against something which its heavenly Father has done or is doing.

Our Savior uses this principle in His reply to the Pharisees concerning divorce: "What God, therefore, hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt. 19:6). For a Christian there is no further choice where God has thus acted. St. Paul employs the same method when he teaches every soul to be subject to the higher powers, pointing out that there is no room for any further exercise of discretion in this field, since God's action in investing a given government with power has already clearly revealed His will in this respect: "There is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13). An even clearer instance appears in Acts 11, where Peter relates how God's actions in sending the Holy Ghost upon Gentiles in the house of Cornelius had induced him to take the unprecedented step of receiving them into the Church by Baptism without any intermediate stage: "Forasmuch then, as God gave them the like gift as He did unto us . . . what was I that I could *withstand God?*" (v. 17). In Acts 15 this incident becomes the basis of Peter's argument against those who were insisting that circumcision must be required, to make the Gentiles Jews before they could come into the Church: "God . . . giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us . . . put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now, therefore, *why tempt ye God*, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" (vv. 8-10). So clearly had God's actions shown the way and revealed His will.

This observation will have a twofold bearing on our study of the Church and Christian liberty. The one is in the matter of the divine call. Since according to Acts 20:28 it is the Holy Ghost through whom the Church of God has been provided with the overseers who are to feed it, a well-founded Christian congregation will not place the call which it extends

to its pastors and teachers on a par with a business contract, subject to arbitrary limitations and to being abrogated at its pleasure. It will recognize that the right and freedom to do this, which it would undeniably possess if this were a purely secular relationship, is definitely limited by the fact that in its pastor or teacher it has a servant who has been given it by God. This truth it may never ignore. — The other point at which this principle bears upon our topic is in the fellowship which our joint membership in the Church represents. Just as the faith of an individual Christian is not of his own making, but is a gift of God, so unity of faith, which is the indispensable prerequisite of any true fellowship, is certainly not the work of men. Wherever it occurs, it is a gift of God in the fullest sense of the word. Therefore it does not lie within the option of those who, by the grace of God, share such a fellowship whether they wish to recognize it or not, whether they shall continue or terminate it. Through His gift of unity in faith God has made His purpose clear. His true children will claim no right or power which would conflict with this plain will of their Father.

This will apply with particular fitness to our Synodical Conference, this rather loosely knit organization, which nevertheless serves to give expression to a very high type of Christian fellowship. No one familiar with the history of the Conference can fail to note that this has not been a superficial unity, easily arrived at, but that it has been marked by an earnest concern about doctrine, and by a serious spirit of confessionalism. The more we think about it, the more we see it as something which the hand of God has wrought. Therefore we have particular reason for "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:4). It is not for us to decide whether we wish to continue this fellowship or not. God has created it, given it. To ignore this, to let this fellowship of faith lapse by our neglect, or to destroy it in a moment of wilfulness would most certainly be sinning against a very precious gift. What is to be preserved, however, is not necessarily the outward organization. The important thing is the inner fellowship, the unity of faith. This dare not be denied *unless, indeed, it no longer exists*. But that is not a

question of mere membership in a body. The old Norwegian Synod was entirely within its rights when in 1883 it stepped out of the outward organization, since the fellowship of faith was in no sense repudiated thereby, as the close relation which still obtained for many years thereafter clearly shows. But whether even this dissolving of the outward ties only was a wise use of an admitted right is another question. I am sure that the Norwegian brethren who are with us in the Synodical Conference today will trace many of the tragic events in the subsequent history of their synod, at least in part, to this external separation of 1883.

Incidentally, this provides us with an illustration proving that it is not only important to define these rights, to have knowledge concerning them, but also to concern oneself very seriously with the proper exercise of this liberty, especially among brethren in the Church. For to exercise a right means to wield power. *Exousia* includes both thoughts. Now, it is certainly clear that power carelessly or inconsiderately used may work untold havoc in the Church. A few paragraphs devoted to a study of this side of the question will therefore certainly be in order.

The guiding principle is very clearly laid down in connection with Paul's great discussion of these "rights" to which we have already referred. Again two words serve to set forth the principle. Both occur in the same passage: "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient; all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not" (chap. 10:23). The first word, *sympherei*, which our A. V. translates with "expedient," implies that which is good, useful, profitable; the other, *oikodomein*, literally means house building, also simply building. Hence the general term "edifying," which is used by the A. V., is in itself very correct, particularly since the text does not name the object of this building process. Yet from the very composition of the original Greek word it is clear that the image of the structure that is to be built is never very far in the background. Indeed, Paul indicates quite soon what he has in mind with both terms. In v. 33 he uses the noun, *symphoron* in place of the verb: "not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved." So the

thought of what is expedient is still there, but it is the profit of *the many* which is to serve as a guide. In chapter 14:4 the Apostle becomes specific as to the house building. Discussing the orderly and profitable use of charismatic gifts by the Corinthian congregation, he says, "He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth *the church*." The trend of Paul's thought is clearly toward that classic expression in Ephesians (4:12) which sums up the purpose underlying the entire work of redemption; which explains the aim in the giving of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers; which sets forth the goal toward which shall be directed their single-minded efforts: the edifying of the body of Christ.

With this objective ever in mind, Paul virtually takes his Christians through an intensive course in practical Christianity. He was too wise and experienced to lose sight of the importance of the individual Christian. Nor does his principle call for that. He knew that the body of Christ is comprised of many members, who are added patiently by the work of the Holy Ghost, one by one. Therefore he teaches the Corinthians to value the individual most highly, even though he be weak in his faith, perhaps to a point where the overscrupulousness of some must have been most trying to those who were better informed. For he asks them, "Through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?" (8:11). This concern for the weak brother is therefore definitely a part of the edifying of the body of Christ.

But the Apostle's interest in the individual does not lead him to forget the larger aspects of his work. Nor shall the Corinthians lose sight of it: "Give none offense, neither to the Jews nor to the Gentiles *nor to the Church of God*; even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit but the profit of many, that they may be saved" (10:32f.). It is certainly not by mere chance that this practical letter includes the beautiful illustration in which the Church is likened to Christ's body (12:12-31), and which so clearly states the relationship which should obtain among brethren: "that there should be *no schism in the body*, but that the members should have the same care one for another" (v. 25).

But what Paul taught he also practiced. His personal example underscored every word of his precept most emphatically. Dr. Lenski has a beautiful passage on this. "Paul's conduct is a fine example of a Christian who has the most perfect right to do a certain thing, and whom no one dare deny this right, who nevertheless declines to use that right, yea, declines it completely. He has the fullest liberty according to nature and even according to Law, and yet he voluntarily forgoes that liberty. Never arbitrarily; never to secure earthly advantage; and never because he weakly yields to the demands of arrogant men. The Christian forgoes his right for some truly Christian reason, namely, for the sake of Christ and the Gospel and the salvation of men. He voluntarily lays aside his right, in order to help his brethren, especially the weak brethren. He will suffer much in order that they may not lose or be lost." (*Commentary, Corinthians, p. 371f.*)

This picture of the conduct of a Christian in the use of his rights and freedom indicates that these are indeed high standards to follow. But if we are duly conscious of the perfection and glory of the basic liberty of our Redemption; if we understand something of the wonder of this *eleutheria* where-with Christ hath set us free and of the tremendous price with which it has been bought, can we want it otherwise? Conduct such as Paul teaches and exemplifies will entail many a sacrifice, it is true, will result in many a situation where we shall need to forgo our rights. But if we recall that He through whom alone we have these rights secured them for us by His humiliation and death, then we can surely neither justify nor choose a lesser standard of conduct. Phil. 2:5-8 comes to mind, that familiar passage which I should like to give in Moffatt's translation: "Treat one another with the same spirit as you experience in Christ Jesus. Though he was divine by nature, he did not set store upon equality with God, but emptied himself by taking the nature of a servant; born in human guise [?] and appearing in human form, he humbly stooped in his obedience even to die, and to die upon the cross." It is a danger signal, therefore, when our thinking begins to run in the other direction, when we use the doctrine of *adiaphora* as a defense

for our actions, when in the question of offense given the weak we shift the burden of proof to the other fellow. To take this attitude is to miss the entire point of Paul's sublime, selfless teaching and example in this matter and to reduce it to a sterile system of casuistry. It has been truly said that in leaving an open field where a Christian has the right to choose his own course, God has created a proving ground which will quickly demonstrate the extent of our grasp of the basic principles of His redemption. We might also add that it is a field where He exercises and trains us in humbly following in the footsteps of our Savior.

It will hardly require proof that these principles governing the proper exercise of our liberty, our *exousia*, will have a vital bearing on the problems confronting us in our Synodical Conference today. For the very reason that there is nothing rigid and compulsory about its organization, there is much opportunity for the development, on the part of the constituent synods, groups within these synods, and even individual members, of policies and actions for which their authors can claim full freedom of self-determination, provided they are not in conflict with the Word of God. Yet it must still be recognized that an inconsiderate, selfish use of these rights not only can, but will work havoc in the Church; that there is therefore great need for applying those guiding principles of Paul according to which we learn to use our *exousia* wisely, choosing out of the many things that are lawful only that which is expedient, not for one, but for many, and which will edify the body of Christ, taking care throughout to avoid or eliminate all that will have the opposite effect. These are the obligations of true Christian fellowship, which, I am sure, none of us are willing to deny.

It is only natural that the movement toward Lutheran Union should bring these considerations still more into the foreground, since it not only touches that vital cord which binds us together and which virtually makes the Synodical Conference, namely, our unity of faith, but also at the same time creates so many new and uncharted situations, both for those who are involved in the movement itself, and others whose role must be that of students and observers. For this

reason it is imperative that every one concerned (and finally that means every member of the Conference, since the final outcome will affect us all) consider carefully which of these policies and actions lie in the area of our Christian liberty, whether such freedom can be used to the edifying of the Church or whether it would result in harm, and particularly also where such freedom of action ceases because we meet with some clear expression of the will of God. But whatever the situation may be, the obligation of Christian fellowship remains and is to be followed faithfully in dealing with the problem of Union, even as with any other problem before the Church.

This obligation really operates in two directions. When Union is under consideration, the thought of extending the fellowship is naturally foremost and receives by far the greater amount of attention. Nor is there in itself anything improper about this desire to establish contact with others who confess the same true faith, to strengthen one another by a mutual declaration of this faith, to stand together for the truth until error be overcome and thereby still others can share this joint confession. This is the principle on which the Synodical Conference was founded and which has brought together these synods which share this fellowship now. Nor would there be anything amiss with a further extension of this fellowship, provided the truth which we confess is not impaired or weakened thereby. But the fascinating possibilities of expansion should not cause us to forget the much more prosaic, but supremely important matter of conserving the existing fellowship. Here, in my judgment, lies the real problem of Lutheran Union as far as we of the Synodical Conference are concerned. This does not imply that this Conference is to become a closed corporation, incapable henceforth of extending its influence to new horizons. But common sense tells us that particularly when Union is under discussion the position of spokesmen for a body is infinitely stronger when it is known that they speak for men who stand united in their convictions. The strength of our testimony lies in the fact that it is founded in the Word of God. But it is hindered when it is known that we ourselves are disagreed concerning it.

Simple candor should compel us to admit that our mutual fellowship has been strained rather severely by the events of the four years which have passed since this Conference last met. It is my good fortune that today I am not under the necessity of analyzing this situation and prescribing a remedy. For the entire matter of the proposed Union with the American Lutheran Church has entered upon a new phase since the recent convention at Saginaw, where the Synod of Missouri made Union with the American Lutheran Church contingent upon approval and acceptance of a single document of agreement, which is to be studied during the interval and then acted upon by the convention of 1947. Let it be our fervent prayer that after full and adequate study of this new document by all concerned we of the Synodical Conference shall find ourselves in complete agreement, whether it be to accept or reject it. For let there be no mistaking in this, such a matter is not an adiaphoron, which can be decided one way or the other without affecting our fellowship. It cannot be. If it is a clear and unmistakable presentation of the truth, it must be accepted, eventually by all of us. If it is weakened by vagueness or error,* it must be rejected, and again by all. It has been said that this new document, if accepted, bids fair to become a modern confession of our Church. That may well be. But if that is to be the outcome, our fellowship will survive no straddling of the issue.

But although we may now dispense with an analysis of these past differences, the future holds problems of its own, and to the extent that we can foresee them, or at least recognize them as possibilities which may become realities, we owe each other a frank and brotherly attempt to establish mutual understanding and precautionary measures on a number of situations that may arise.

Synods standing in close relationship to each other traditionally suffer from an assortment of incidents which are a cause of friction. Sometimes these are the result of thought-

* I hope that no one will charge me with setting up a ratio of two to one against acceptance by mentioning vagueness in addition to error. I have tried to show in an earlier part of this paper that the truth cannot be compromised, even by vague generalities, without seriously impairing it.

lessness, of some accidental slip; sometimes they come through an excess of zeal on the part of some board or official; some have come through our discussions of the Union question. Singly these incidents, with some exceptions, may not appear to have serious consequences. Collectively, however, they can build up a strain which may suddenly precipitate a serious situation. We shall never be without such incidents. But their dangerous effect can be neutralized if for the sake of the Church we not only seek to cultivate a greater degree of Christian tact and courtesy, striving to conquer our natural irritableness and pride, not only to guard our words and actions with greater care, but also to learn from Paul's readiness to forgo his personal rights to yield something on our part, if it can be done without surrendering the truth. Let us learn to ask not only whether we have "rights," *exousias*, but whether our insistence on them will be profitable, will edify the Church.

Among Christians it will also be understood, however, that there are a good many things which are not to be yielded, neither for the sake of keeping peace in the fellowship nor of the establishing of new ties. There the truth stands above all. Where that is at stake, there may be no mutual give and take. It does not lie within our *exousia* to make any concessions there. This truth is God's Word, not ours. Not a single word of it may be yielded for the sake of some immediate advantage, be it in the matter of Union or elsewhere. This is the reason why even the lesser incidents referred to before need to be most carefully weighed before we set them down as unjustified and unjustifiable personalities. Paul's rebuke of Peter at Antioch was for the sake of the truth of God, hence not a personal issue in which he should have shown some willingness to yield a point for the sake of general harmony. When the new document of agreement is placed before the Church, let it be judged not according to the promise it holds of effecting or preventing Union, but solely according to the Word of God, of which nothing may be yielded.

Neither should there be any thought that there be anything less than full and free discussion of the document, its several points, and even of developments in the Church which

may have a bearing on their understanding — whether it be in our own circles, those of the American Lutheran Church, or even in a wider field. In so far as these developments may throw light on the document, they will be proper material for discussion. Though it might seem conducive to peace and good feeling if at least the sister synods would keep silence until the document has been judged by the two bodies immediately involved, that is a point which also may not be yielded. It does not lie within our discretion. There must be full opportunity for the watchmen who have been placed on the walls of Zion to function. To the editors of the several synods must be conceded the right to inform their membership as to the content and meaning of the “agreement.” The point, however, where we not only may but should make concessions to each other and practice brotherly consideration is, of course, in keeping the discussion on a temperate and objective level. More should not need to be said.

A final matter in which concessions dare not be asked, even though they may seem desirable in the interest of mutual understanding and good will, is where such concessions would be at the expense of some one’s conscience. That is agreed among Lutherans. It was the reason for Luther’s stand at Worms as well as that of the Protestants at Speyer and the Confessors at Augsburg. Because of these classic examples we are much more apt to recognize this principle in its larger application than when it turns up much closer to home and upon less grand and dramatic a scale. But here Paul’s tender concern for the conscience of the individual, and his patience with the same, even in very minor matters, should not be forgotten. In the matter of meats he wants no one to be led into a surrender of his conscience. “For whatever is not of faith is sin” (Rom. 14:23; in Goodspeed’s translation: anything that does not rest on conviction is wrong). Now this does not mean that conscience shall become a tyrant in the Church, where men may simply entrench themselves behind the demand that their consciences must be respected and make an impregnable fortress out of a technicality, regardless of whether their position is founded in Scripture or not. Nor does it mean that there can never be a solution for such situa-

tions. It does mean, however, that where the issue arises, both sides be willing to resort to patient, brotherly discussion on the basis of the Word of God, until it appears whose position is really the correct one; and if such discussion should reveal weakness on the part of a brother, that there be patient instruction which does not terminate unless he either has seen the light and changed his position or it becomes clear that he seeks, in an untenable matter, to make his conscience a law for the Church.

It is clear that the better solution by far is to keep the issue of an individual's conscience from coming up, not by highhanded methods of suppression, but, on the one hand, by guarding carefully against any hasty resorting to this weapon instead of discussing an issue on its merits in the light of Scripture, and, on the other, by refraining from asking any concessions until we have fully assured ourselves that we are thereby not asking a man to yield something which for him at least, and perhaps in fact as well, is founded in the Word of God.

But if it must be recognized that there are certain things which dare not be yielded, not even for the sake of restoring peace and harmony, there are other steps which can and should be taken, which will materially ease the tension which has existed in the past. One of these is to provide for the fullest measure of mutual co-operation during the period to come. Any undue delay in our exchange of information, as to the nature and text of the new agreement and similar matters, is not only bound to create new strains, but will result in an atmosphere in which mutual trust and understanding cannot thrive. Here perfect frankness alone will serve.

Another necessary measure for averting further tension and restoring a wholesome degree of confidence is the elimination of further incidents and practices which anticipate union between bodies which are at present only negotiating toward this end. By this are meant happenings which, at least to those who are not of the inner circle, and therefore to the average member of our Church, seem to imply that the question of Union is as good as settled, that discussion and acceptance of

the document is only a matter of form, the outcome being no longer in doubt, and that success of the Union movement may soon be looked for even in a far wider field. A continuation of such incidents would go far to make a calm, objective, fruitful discussion of the document almost impossible. On the other hand, an earnest attempt to rectify this trend, even though it may not be possible at once to undo everything that has been done or to escape every commitment that has been made, will do more to restore proper relations within our own Synodical Conference fellowship than any other measure which I could suggest.

It may be argued in favor of some of these undertakings that they lie in the field of Christian liberty, being neither commanded nor forbidden in the Word of God. I doubt whether this can be said of every case in the past. But even, if none should be considered for the future save such as in themselves are adiaphora, lying well within the admitted rights of every Christian, the question still remains whether under the existing circumstances anyone who is concerned about the preservation of our existing fellowship should avail himself of this right or whether, according to the example of Paul, he should not forgo this right rather than risk giving an offense. Let us not forget that the Formula of Concord was speaking of admitted adiaphora when it rendered this judgment:

“Moreover, by such yielding and conformity in external things, where there has not been previously Christian union in doctrine, idolaters are confirmed in their idolatry; on the other hand, the true believers are grieved, offended, and weakened in their faith; both of which every Christian for the sake of his soul’s welfare and salvation is bound to avoid, as it is written: ‘Woe unto the world because of offenses!’ Also: ‘Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.’ (Matt. 18:6, 7.)” (Trigl. 1057, 16.)

As we enter upon the decisive period where the new document of agreement is to be published, discussed, and finally decided upon, let us keep these several things in mind:

Let us show all possible consideration toward each other, yielding our *exousia*, our rights, willingly where the body of Christ will be edified thereby, but recognizing those things also in which nothing may be yielded, where conscience is bound by the Word of God. These are the obligations of true Christian fellowship which none of us may deny. Knowing how they rest upon the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, we do not count them harsh and severe, but prize them as a glorious possession. God grant that we stand fast in His Word. This alone can preserve for us the unity which we have so long enjoyed in our Synodical Conference. This alone can safely extend our unity into a wider fellowship.

Sanctify us, Lord, through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth.
Amen.

A Correction

Some friends called my attention to the fact that a sentence which appeared over my signature about fifteen years ago is causing confusion today. The sentence occurs in a book review in the *Theol. Quartalschrift* for October, 1931, on p. 297, reading: "The reviewer is of the opinion that Moses, by the way he speaks of the seventh day, seems to indicate that he has eras in mind."

This sentence is misleading and does not adequately express my views. *It is herewith retracted.*

How it can be made to cause confusion may be seen from the following sentence contained in Dr. Theo. Graebner's recent pamphlet on *Prayer Fellowship*, p. 18: "In official papers (namely of the Wisconsin Synod) the theory has been set forth that 'days' in Genesis may signify 'periods'."

I have never held an evolutionistic era-theory, nor any era-theory. I have insisted that the "findings" of science, geology for instance, dare not influence our interpretation of Gen. 1, or of any other Scripture passage; rather, that Scripture is its own interpreter, and judges all science. I hold that in any question every Scripture statement that may have a bearing on it must be duly considered.

JOH. P. MEYER.

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

Fellowships — or Fellowship? — It is only natural that in times when the thought of union between church bodies is in the foreground, the question of joint prayer and its implications should also receive a particular measure of attention. For prayer is such an important part of the Christian life, and joint prayer such a natural result where Christians meet that its functions and particular sphere, under these prevailing conditions, cannot safely be ignored. Therefore a treatise like Dr. Graebner's "Prayer Fellowship" (Book Review, page 157) is certainly both timely and appropriate. It is obvious that in the course of such a discussion a great deal will depend on seeing clearly whether the fellowship of prayer is separate and distinct from other fellowships, *e. g.* that of the altar or the pulpit, or whether these are basically the same — in other words, whether we have Christian *fellowships* or *fellowship*.

The booklet under discussion is apparently written from the first point of view. It is true that it begins with the statement that "Christian fellowship is a relation among certain human beings who have been brought into a certain relationship to God." It goes on to say: "One of the means by which this fellowship finds legitimate expression is prayer." These premises certainly justify the hope that the discussion which is to follow will emphasize the basic identity of prayer, altar, and pulpit fellowship. Yet on page 9 we read: "There is a difference between prayer fellowship on the one hand and altar and pulpit fellowship on the other hand." And on closer examination it becomes clear that the greater part of the argument follows this last line of thought and operates with the distinction indicated there. Thus one section of the booklet seeks to demonstrate that prayer is not essentially a confessional act. A sharp and definite contrast is therefore established when it is stated a few pages later that "Altar fellowship must always be defined as confessional fellowship." This emphatic distinction must be kept in mind when the author goes on to say: "I am not introducing here the denominational angle except to say that indifference to the doctrines professed in the act of altar fellowship is the one essential '*unionism*' to which we have reference in church history." So these various fellowships are set apart, different areas defined where they operate, different implications ascribed to them. The result is an involved line of reasoning in which the reader finds it increasingly difficult to keep his bearings as he proceeds. A further complication is injected when prayer fellowship, which has already been set apart from altar and pulpit fellowship, is now declared to be "fundamentally" different from joint prayer (p. 14). Another factor which adds to these already formidable difficulties is the question of the degree of error which may separate the different church bodies, and the bearing which this may have on the problem of fellowship in general and prayer fellowship and joint prayer in particular.

It seems to us that the entire matter will not only be simplified and clarified, but that full justice will at the same time be done to every angle of the problem if it is approached from the second point of view mentioned above, that of the single fellowship.

It is obvious that Christian fellowship can come into being and flourish only where God's Spirit has done His work of kindling faith in Jesus Christ. There a new life has begun. Man is born again — of God (1 John 5:1). And since this work is done in many hearts, fellowship results among these regenerate children of God. "Every one that loveth Him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of Him." This fellowship is a great, glorious, living thing. It manifests itself in countless ways: in the gathering of the disciples on the evening of Easter, in their remaining together at Jerusalem while they were awaiting the fulfillment of the Father's promise, in the life of the Mother Church as it is described in the last verses of Acts 2 and again in chapter 4, in the relation of the Mother Church to the congregations which now began to spring up on every hand, and in the manner in which it was recognized that the barrier that separated Jew from Gentile had now been removed by God Himself. It manifested itself most beautifully in the concern of the Greek churches for the famine-stricken brethren of Judea, which Paul was so careful to cultivate. Returning to the classic description of Acts 2:42 we note that it lived by the Word ("They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine"), that it commanded recognition in its own right and was recognizable by itself (the "fellowship," *koinōnia* of this verse), that it manifested itself particularly in the breaking of bread ("from house to house") and prayers.

Even as the fellowship was cultivated, strengthened, and perpetuated by the Word, the *didachē* of Christ and His apostles, so there was one thing also which endangered and destroyed this fellowship, namely departure from, and persistent disobedience to this same Word. "If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my disciples indeed." If it was a matter of unrepentant sinful conduct, the stern injunction was, "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person" (1 Cor. 5:13). If it was a matter of doctrine, the warnings were to watch, beware, avoid, shun, receive not, withdraw — the very opposite of the terms which describe the exercise of Christian fellowship: "Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God" (Rom. 15:7). It is interesting to compare the *proslambanein* of this passage with the *lambanein eis oikian* of 2 John 10, where the question of doctrine and fellowship is also under discussion. Only by faithful adherence to the truth of God's Word will this fellowship remain inviolate.

There is nothing in Scripture to indicate that the course which is to be followed in this question of fellowship is in any way contingent upon the degree of the specific error which may be involved. When patient admonition is indicated, and there are many situations where this will be the case, it is not because the error happens to be of a minor

nature. Where on the other hand separation is called for, it is not simply because the error happens to touch on some fundamental doctrine. We shall see that the pertinent passages reach much deeper. It is true that the occasion for these warnings is often some flagrant attack on a most vital doctrine. But it should not be overlooked that the warning itself is usually stated in quite general terms. A case in point is 2 John 9f. The observation is made in a footnote on page 5 of Dr. Graebner's booklet that "the verses plainly refer to antichrists, deceivers, who deny the Incarnation." This is quite true if we think only of the occasion which brought forth this warning. But the warning itself goes farther. Beginning with verse 7, we have first of all a description of the specific case: "Deceivers . . . who confess not that Jesus Christ is come into the flesh." Verse 8 then goes on to point out the resulting danger: "that we lose not those things which we have wrought." But when the Apostle comes to the warning which he wants to impress upon his readers, we find that this is couched in terms as general as it is possible to make them: "*Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God (pas ho proagōn).*"

It will not do to break down the force of this passage by arguing that the *didachē tou Christou* is the doctrine concerning Christ, His person, nature, and incarnation — a sort of Christology. For the *didachē tōn apostolōn* of Acts 2:42 is not an "Apostology," the doctrine concerning the Apostles, but the doctrine taught by them. So the *didachē tou Christou* is the doctrine taught by Christ, coming from Christ, also simply called the *didachē*.

An even less admissible argument would be to use the concluding words, "hath not God," as an indication that this warning is to apply only to extreme cases of error. The sense of this passage is governed by the *pas*. That is the emphasized word. *Everyone* who goes beyond (advances some notion of his own) and does not remain in the doctrine of Christ comes under this category. Naturally we are shocked at this severe judgment. Of course we cannot see how every error can have such dire consequences. We feel that there surely must be some allowance made for errors of a minor type. When these perfectly natural thoughts occur to us, let us remember that it is not our business to see and explain and understand. When God chooses to reveal how immeasurably far-reaching the implications of any departure from this doctrine of Christ may be, who are we then, to survey the degrees of error and weigh their various implications and perhaps grant a magnanimous dispensation in favor of such as in our shortsighted and fallible judgment seem to be of a less serious nature? We may rest assured that such cases where an individual does not follow his error through to its final consequences and does not in fact depart from the foundation that is laid, will be recognized by God, and that such a person therefore will be saved, even though his "work," vitiated by his error, must perish in the fire of God's judgment. This is taught very clearly by Paul in the well known passage in 1 Cor. 3 — this, and nothing

more. And we thank God for this knowledge from the bottom of our hearts, for it assures us of the personal salvation of countless souls outside of the necessarily limited fellowship of an "orthodox" church body. But we do not presume to draw this decision into our own jurisdiction, thus to condone at least some deviations from the true doctrine. It has no bearing whatever on the question of fellowship with which we are concerned.

It is most regrettable therefore that Dr. Graebner has taken those passages of the Apology that speak of doctrinal errors which do not overthrow the foundation as matters that "are both forgiven them and also corrected" (p. 232-233, par. 20) into this discussion of confessional fellowship, and that he has drawn from these charitable statements of the Apology concerning the personal faith of some errorists ("derhalben sie dennoch Christen sind") the conclusion that these are "matters which do not destroy the requisite fundamental unity of the Church spoken of in the Augsburg Confession" (p. 20). Nor is it fair to the Augsburg Confession to quote: "And to the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments", without adding the next sentence which by its contrast clearly shows just what the things are which lie beyond this minimum requirement, and on which the Confessors would have been perfectly ready to yield a point or two: "Nor is it necessary that human traditions, that is, rites or ceremonies, instituted by men, should be everywhere alike." In this connection it would have been well to heed the warning of Dr. Willkomm who in his "Augsburger Bekenntnis" touched on the movement toward uniting Lutheran bodies which was then (1930) in progress and, even while wishing them the best of success, then went on to say: "But here there is also a danger that men may content themselves with a partial unity, with unity in that which they designate as chief and fundamental doctrines. To this end they like to rest their case on the *satis est* (it is enough) of the Seventh Article of our Confession. But one must be very careful here not to misuse this statement. The contrast which is before us in this Seventh Article is not: Unity in the chief *doctrines*, and freedom in the secondary *doctrines*, — but rather: Unity in the chief *matter*, namely the pure preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the Sacraments, and freedom in secondary *matters*, namely in ceremonies instituted by men."

We believe that these lapses (which are not characteristic of the earlier theology of the author) may be traced at least in part to the confusion created by the involved line of thought which must result when one proceeds from the point of view of several distinct fellowships. For this reason we shall continue to speak of *one* fellowship, one *koinōnia*, which manifests itself in many different ways. When prayer, altar, and pulpit fellowship are mentioned, these are therefore not so many different fellowships, but outstanding ways in which this one great fellowship manifests itself among Christians. Even as this fellowship is disturbed

and eventually destroyed by false teaching, so true unity of doctrine is required for its preservation.

Only by retaining this simple and natural point of view can the church exercise the utmost degree of charity and patience without lapsing into doctrinal indifference when dealing with errors that may arise in its own midst, and in its dealings with other church bodies keep its testimony firm without weakening it by vagueness in matters of doctrine.

E. REIM.

Dr. Willkomm on Union. — In a previous article we have quoted from Dr. Willkomm's "Augsburger Bekenntnis." Although these remarks of the Director of the Theological Seminary of the Saxon Free Church at Zehlendorf were directed at conditions which prevailed in Europe almost twenty years ago, yet they contain so much thought which is pertinent to our current problems that we herewith offer a free translation of the entire section from which our quotation is taken.

Against False Ideas About the Unity of the Church.

"It is peculiar to the situation prevailing in the Church of our day that attempts at Church-union recur with ever greater frequency. That would be most gratifying if the objective were always and in every case the true unity of the Church. But this is unfortunately not always the case. Men seek an outward union of church bodies without first uniting themselves in the truth. The requirement of doctrinal unity is often waived from the very beginning and as a matter of principle. Or men feel that they may be satisfied with agreement in the outstanding, chief doctrines of Christianity, and hope to bring this about by means of negotiations, the outcome of which is very frequently anticipated by joint worship conducted by representatives of the different church bodies.

"Such attempts at union are under way among those churches also which adhere to the Lutheran Confession. Who would not welcome this and wish them the best of success? But here there is also a danger that men may content themselves with a partial unity, with unity in that which they designate as chief and fundamental doctrines. To this end they like to rest their case on the *satis est* (it is enough) of the Seventh Article of our Confession. But one must be very careful here not to misuse this statement. The contrast which is before us in this Seventh Article is not: Unity in the chief *doctrines*, and freedom in the secondary *doctrines*, — but rather: Unity in the chief *matter*, namely the pure preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the Sacraments, and freedom in secondary *matters*, namely in ceremonies instituted by men.

"It should also be carefully noted just what our Confession means by 'Gospel.' Certainly not what a Harnack understands by the term; but also not merely the Gospel in the narrowest sense, perhaps merely the Article of Justification. On the contrary, the Confessors are clearly thinking of the entire doctrine of salvation in Christ, as they have set

forth 'almost the sum' of it in the 21 Doctrinal Articles. For to the entire doctrinal presentation apply . . . the concluding words of the XXI. Article: 'Even as we would certainly not like to place our own soul and conscience into highest and greatest jeopardy before God by any abuse of the divine word or name, nor bring upon our children and descendants a heritage of any other doctrine than that alone which is consistent with the divine word and Christian truth.' What Luther had often said with such emphasis was known to the Confessors of Augsburg also, that the truth which is revealed in Scripture is a unit from which nothing may be detracted without damage to the whole. They were familiar with the illustration of the bell which loses its tone when it suffers but a single crack; they knew that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump (Gal. 5:9). It was utterly foreign to their thought to treat any open departure from the clear teachings of Scripture as though it were of little importance. So Melancthon declares in the Apology: 'Impious teachers are not to be received or heard because these do not act any longer in the place of Christ, but are antichrists. And Christ says Matt. 7, 15: Beware of false prophets. And Paul, Gal. 1, 9: If any man preach any other Gospel unto you, let him be accursed.' (Trigl. 243f.)

"Let us take heed, therefore, lest we make a loophole in the hedge of the Confession out of the *satis est* of the Seventh Article, through which unionism and indifference to the pure teaching of the divine Word may creep in. Let us hold fast to the demand that we *agree* concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments (*eintraechtlich* nach *reinem* Verstand'). Let us pray for this unity, this unity in the truth; by cultivating doctrine and by refuting error, let us labor faithfully to preserve this unity where by the grace of God it exists, and work for it where it does not. This passage from our Confessions expresses the justification of our stand as a Church particularly against the People's Churches (Volkskirchen) of Germany. For this agreement concerning doctrine is precisely what is lacking there, even among the best. We have it, by the grace of God. Let us be diligent to preserve it (Eph. 4)." E. R.

Concerning the College of Cardinals. — The nauseating display of pomp in the creation of new cardinals in Rome has not failed to focus the attention of the world on the Church of Rome. The event was so timed as to coincide with the 400th anniversary of the death of the arch-opponent of Rome: Martin Luther. The attention of the world was not to be centered on the seemingly insignificant city of Eisleben in Germany, where Luther died. It was a disheartening spectacle to see so many would-be Protestants and the newspapers take strange cognizance of the Papal show for the City and the world. We, too, took cognizance of it, but with different and critical observations.

Originally the title cardinal was given to clerics connected with any cathedral chapter. The cathedral was the seat of the bishop and the

cathedral itself was called a *cardo*, the Latin word for: hinge. A priest connected with such a cathedral could be called a cardinal. The title was quite general at first, but reserved at that for the cathedral chapter of any diocese. In 1567 Pope Pius V restricted the title cardinal to clerics of the Church in Rome. It was another step in the centralization of power and influence in Rome. In 1586 Pope Sixtus V, claiming to imitate Moses when he chose seventy elders to govern the Israelites, established the number of cardinals at seventy. He too wanted helpers and advisers in the government of the Church of Rome. Six of these were to be cardinal bishops who were to preside over bishoprics located in the suburbs and the vicinity of Rome, fourteen were to be cardinal deacons who were to serve in the administrative corps of the Pope. Originally some of the cardinal deacons had come from the lay service of the church, but since 1917 it is at least required that a cardinal be a priest. The general rule is that the cardinals be chosen from the ranks of the bishops, the Pope alone making the choice of his personal advisers. The remaining fifty were to be cardinal priests. While the cardinal bishops and deacons were to be stationed in Italy and primarily in Rome, the cardinal priests could have their domicile in various parts of the world. However they would have to have a titular church in Rome, which could be served by another Roman cleric. Rome does not want any cardinalate entirely disconnected from any diocese. It is an integral part of their doctrine of the visible church as well as of their hierarchical and sacerdotal system. This insistence of Rome to have each cardinal take over a titular church in Rome without necessarily giving up his bishopric in his own country is significant. The most potent reason however is to bind or hinge the cardinals of foreign lands primarily to Rome and Italy, the seat of the Papal Church.

The completion of the college of cardinals and the choice of a majority of non-Italian cardinals has been viewed as a change of Roman policy. This is a wrong conclusion. The whole Roman ideology is based on Rome being and remaining the seat of the Papacy. Only in a case of extreme urgency would the Pope consent to go into exile temporarily. It is erroneous to think and to expect that the center of influence would be taken away from Rome and perhaps be brought to our Western Hemisphere, which today constitutes the financial stronghold of Rome. This has been shrewdly counteracted by hinging the cardinals to cathedral churches in Papal Italy. Here they constitute the council or senate of the sovereign in the government of the Church, and act as administrators of the Church during a vacancy of the Holy See, and elect the new pope. Thus they form a kind of permanent Synod in Rome.

Furthermore it must not be overlooked that the cardinals of foreign countries are bound by a secret oath of fidelity to Rome and the Pope. When the Pope places the red hat upon the cardinal-elect, he says: "Receive the red hat, the emblem of the dignity of your cardinalate, whereby it is signified that you show yourself intrepid even unto death

and the shedding of blood for the exaltation of the Holy Faith" (Liguorian of July, 1945 and Catholic Digest of February, 1946). In a later secret consistory the symbolic ceremony of the closing and opening of the mouths of the new cardinals takes place. This is done in the presence of the Pope, who thereby obligates the cardinals to keep secret the affairs of their office and to give wise counsel to the Pope. Here too the Pope binds or hinges the cardinals to his person and to unswerving fidelity to the Church of Rome, come what may. No secret oath of any secret society can be more binding, and both are unscriptural.

Special privileges are granted to the cardinals. They may hear confessions at any place. They may absolve from all sins not reserved for the Pope himself. They may grant an indulgence of 300 days, they may celebrate solemn mass at sea and pontifical mass in any cathedral church outside of Rome. Their chief privilege however is to participate in the election of a new pope, an exclusive right reserved to the college of cardinals, whether they be cardinal bishops, deacons or priests. Tradition has already restricted this privilege. The Papal Secretary is chosen by the Pope as the personal choice and promising candidate for the papal throne. This was the case with the present Pope and seems to be the case with the future pope, Cardinal Spellman. The hints and papal distinctions were too plain.

When Pope Sixtus V set the number of cardinals at seventy, he called attention to the choice of the seventy elders by Moses. Each later pope reserved this right for himself anew. We are reminded that the Jewish Sanhedrin of seventy elders also was an imitation of the institution of Moses. In our opinion the comparison with the Sanhedrin is more appropriate. The Sanhedrin supported the government and the decrees of the High Priest. Is this not the function of the college of cardinals to support the Roman Pontiff? Caiphas and his clan became guilty of the condemnation and crucifixion of Jesus. Was it not Dostojewski who said in his portrayal of the Great Inquisitor that if Christ would come again and have to stand before a High Court of Inquisition, that they would crucify Him anew? It seemed expedient to the Jewish Sanhedrin to get rid of Jesus. It does not seem expedient to the Papal High Court to get rid of Jesus outwardly, but they practically annul His perfect atonement for our sin by the sacrilege of the Mass, and also annul justification through faith alone by their religion of good works and infused grace. For them the words of Holy Writ found Hebrews 10:14 are not true: "For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." From whatever angle you may look at the Church of Rome, you cannot escape seeing in it the Church of the Antichrist (2 Thess. 2).

Rome always tries to create the impression as though its teachings and institutions date back to the earliest times of the Christian Church. In the creation of the college of cardinals we look in vain for a Scriptural basis and for vestiges in the early church. Scripture has been superseded by tradition, and tradition again finds its climax and anticlimax in the

dogma of the infallibility of the Pope. Every cardinal, bishop, and priest must subscribe to this blasphemous dogma. The characteristic of Rome is not constancy, but an ever increasing development away from Christ and from the Bible. When we observe the machinations and the recent pompous display of the Papacy, we are reminded of the words of Christ (Matth. 23:5f.): "But all their works they do to be seen by men: they make broad their phylacteries and enlarge the borders of their garments and love the uppermost rooms at feasts and the chief seats in the synagogues and greetings in the markets and to be called of men: Rabbi. But be ye not called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your Father here on earth (Holy Father!), for one is your Father, who is in heaven." Draw your own conclusion.

H. A. KOCH.

Chicago's Mayor Kelly and Cardinal Stritch. — Mayor Kelly of Chicago chose the "Form" of receiving Cardinal Stritch, after his return from the Vatican City, by kneeling to kiss the Cardinal's ring. This subservient attitude of a secular servant of one of the largest cities of America called forth a letter of protest from Bishop J. Ralph Magee, Resident Methodist Bishop of the Chicago area, which was released to the press, and reads as follows in the *Religious News Service* of March 8, 1946: "I am writing as an American with long American antecedents to protest as un-American your FORM of reception of Cardinal Stritch. You had a perfect right to greet him as mayor for all Chicago. You, with all the citizens of Chicago, honor his recognition in your Church. But when you bowed before him and kissed his ring when you were acting in the capacity of mayor you were indicating the subservience of the civil government to the church.

"This violates our American tradition of the separation of church and state. You have taken a long step toward widening any breach that may exist between the Roman Catholic and Protestant citizenry. I protest this with all the vigor of my American sense of right. You owe the Protestant citizens an apology for thus overstepping your rights as our mayor. I am sending this to the press to protest publicly this un-American act on your part. I am, Sir,

"Very truly yours,

"J. RALPH MAGEE,

"*Bishop of the Methodist Church.*"

Bishop Magee could have also added in his letter to Mayor Kelly: "When you bowed before him and kissed his ring you were not only indicating the subservience of the civil government to the Church but to the Pope as the head of the Church and of all civil governments on earth." If only our public servants would go back far enough in history and learn from others, for instance from the Elector

John Frederick of Saxony as spokesman for the Lutheran confederates, that the Pope has arrogated to himself and has assumed a power which is "neither more nor less than abominable tyranny," and that the Pope cares "neither for Scripture nor for law and justice, and merely wishes to be their judge and lord" (*Concordia Triglotta*, p. 49). Would that they also might learn that the elevation of four American archbishops, "to become 'princes of the Roman Catholic Church'," is but a part of a "long-range program of the Church of Rome to capture America" (*The Lutheran Outlook*, March, 1946, p. 72) by reading what Luther has to say in *An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility* on the creation of cardinals: "What is the use in Christendom of those people who are called cardinals? I shall tell you. Italy and Germany have many rich monasteries, foundations, benefices, and livings. No better way has been discovered to bring all these to Rome than by creating cardinals and giving them the bishoprics, monasteries, and prelacies, and so overthrowing the worship of God. . . . Now that Italy is sucked dry, they come into Germany, and begin oh, so gently. But let us beware, or Germany will soon become like Italy. Already we have some cardinals. . . . Antichrist must take the treasures of the earth, as it was prophesied. So it goes on." Yes, so it goes on, "and the more powerful the influence of Rome becomes in the political arena of our country, the more we see public officials cater to the favors of Rome and kiss the ring of papal legates at public church functions (only at church functions? — Ed.), the more we must all be on the alert," *The Lutheran Beacon* (March, 1946, p. 44) warns us, "to safeguard the rights accorded to all our citizens, regardless of religious affiliations, by the fundamental law of our land."

P. PETERS.

Final Step to World Council. — The meeting of the Provisional Committee of The World Council of Churches was the final step before the actual formation of the World Council, which will rank as an international body representing major non-Roman denominations in six continents. Attended by leading Protestant and Orthodox representatives, the meeting was called upon to ratify the many decisions which have been taken by Provisional Committee members at gatherings in Geneva, London, and New York since the first meeting of the group at Utrecht, Holland, in 1938, when preliminary outlines for the international body were drawn up. At the present time the Council represents 92 Protestant and Orthodox Communions in 33 countries. Latest Churches to become members are the Waldensian Church in Italy, the Evangelical Church of Austria, the Evangelical Church of Germany, and the Lutheran Church of Norway. The hope has been expressed by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of The World Council, that "the Japanese Churches will follow soon". Yet he adds "it is not necessary, nor even desirable, to have the largest possible membership. On the contrary, the admission

of a great number of very small or unstable Churches or sects would do more harm than good" (*The Lutheran Outlook*, March, 1946). A "message", which was drafted by a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Hendrik Kraemer, of the Dutch Reformed Church, bears the testimony "that in this first meeting after the war we have met and worked together as one brotherhood in a spiritual unity in Christ which transcended our differences." This "brotherhood", however, "is still in process of evolving", as Professor Carl E. Schneider of Eden Seminary in the winter-issue, 1946, of *Christendom* informs us and adds: "Will it succumb to the sociological pressures of our day and become just another alliance, or federation of churches, intent merely to insure united action in matters of common interest, however important these may be? Or, with sights raised above these historicisms, will it espouse the spiritual concept of the Church as grounded in the New Testament and, if need be, in defiance of all canons of historical continuity and political expedience, turn its face from Wittenberg, Geneva, or Canterbury toward Jerusalem for the redemption of the world?" (p. 34). In other words, the lofty aim of *The World Council of Churches* is apparently that of a new theology and of a new church transcending all the differences of doctrines taught heretofore by Protestant and Orthodox churches. P. PETERS.

Uniat Church of the Ukraine. — The Uniat churches of western Ukraine, after 350 years of affiliation with Roman Catholicism, have renounced allegiance to the Vatican and have decided "to return to the bosom of our grandfather, the Holy Russian Orthodox Church," the *Milwaukee Journal* of March 18, 1946, reports. This Union of orthodox churches with the Holy See goes back to the artful policy of the Jesuit Possevino, who induced a portion of the clergy with Michael Rahosa, the Metropolitan of Kiev at their head, to submit to the pope (Synod of Brzesc 1596). That this union was forced upon the orthodox churches more or less, at a time when Russia had just carried on an unsuccessful war with Poland, is an historical fact. That it was a means of breaking up "the tribe unity and belief unity of the east" is the claim of the 216 delegates of the church assembly held at Lvov, in a letter to Stalin. Now that these Uniat churches are in a region which is included in the Soviet Ukraine, it is almost to be regarded as a matter of course that they have separated themselves from "proud, power-loving Rome" and have returned to the lap of the mother church. The preamble to this separatistic movement was undoubtedly of a very political nature. At least the *Catholic National Almanac* 1946 has the following report to make on it: "In Carpatho-Russia, the easternmost section of Czechoslovakia, as in that part of Poland also incorporated into the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, every effort was made to alienate the Eastern Catholics from the Holy See. A Sponsoring Committee for the Incorporation of Greek Catholics into the Orthodox Church, made up of three apostate priests, was delegated

to administer the Church there, in the 'absence' of the bishops, who had been arrested. Two bishops were reported to have died in a Soviet prison. At least 70 churches of the Eastern Rite had been seized and assigned, with all their properties, to the Orthodox Church. Out of approximately 2,700 Ukrainian Catholic priests only forty-two were reported to have followed the injunction to join the Orthodox Church. The Catholic clergy of Lvov addressed a letter to the Council of People's Commissars of the U. S. S. R., demanding for themselves and their people freedom of conscience and religious worship 'to which we are entitled under the Soviet laws.' But the averred reconstitution of the Russian Orthodox Church, of itself a political maneuver, was no guarantee of freedom of religion in the Soviets."

Was the Roman Catholic Church, we must ask, a guarantee of freedom of religion, when the Union was effected with these Eastern churches in conformity with an agreement that their "old ancestral usages" would be respected by Rome? Were not the forms of worship latinized through the influence of the Roman monks, who simply entered the convents belonging to the Union? And did not all those churches that refused to enter that connection sink under the temptations and persecutions to which they were subjected? While we do not doubt that the majority of Roman priests are remaining loyal to the "Holy See" and that they must endure imprisonment and even death, yet we do not want to overlook that the persecution, which they are undergoing, is also a result of Rome's policy in the past, which did not refrain from persecuting all "heretics", including the Lutherans. Still less can we overlook the fact that the Jesuit Possevino, in 1581, sought to persuade the Czar, Ivan IV, to place the Lutherans of Russia under a ban. Now history is repeating itself, in a reverse order, to the detriment of the Roman Catholic Church, over 10,000,000 Catholics having come under the direct rule of the Soviet.

P. PETERS.

"Baptist Relief Policy." — The *Watchman-Examiner* of March 21, 1946, devotes much space to a debate of the Baptist relief policy. While there is no difference of opinion among Baptists, according to an editorial of this issue, as to the dire need which exists in Europe and Asia and as to the duty to sacrifice in order that the distress may be mitigated, there is a diversity of conviction on the policy of bringing relief to the needy. Should it be done through interdenominational agencies or through their own denominational agency? Rev. J. W. Weenink, president of the Baptist Union of Holland, started the debate in the February 14, 1946, issue of the *Watchman-Examiner* by exposing the strong prejudice with which Baptists are treated by representatives of the State Church in Europe, the oppression under which many of them have to live, and the bigotry with which they are regarded. Since most of this comes from State Church influence rather than from secular

authorities, the question naturally arises among Baptists whether these conditions should not considerably affect their relief policies and have a controlling influence over all their associations with state churchmen.

A "statement" by the executive secretary of the Northern Baptist Convention World Relief Committee in the March 21, 1946, issue of the *Watchman-Examiner* divulges how predominantly relief work has been done by the Baptists through interdenominational agencies, such as the American Friends Service Committee, the Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction, the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A., and others. While "interdenominational cooperation is an essential requirement in some areas and at certain times", the editorial admits, still it warns, "we must not forget that we have among our policy makers strong proponents of interchurch or organic-church union", that "these brethren have enjoyed a perfect field day in these perilous times in which we have had to do our relief work interdenominationally or not at all. . . . And so it is that the State Church group, to whom Baptist minorities are like a sliver in the finger, are to be made the means of distributing our philanthropy. With this policy we definitely disagree, and we believe that if European Baptists were to be allowed to have their say they, too, would disagree." The *Watchman-Examiner* then goes on to say that by having "followed such a strange course," Baptists "have strengthened State Churches and have made the inferiority complex of their Baptist minorities all the keener," and then exclaims: "Think of what could have taken place had we sent the Baptist World Alliance enough funds and enough personnel to have regathered the scattered Baptist units, relieved their distresses, and then used them as the channels of our distribution to all needy without discrimination." The writer of the editorial realizes that he is exposing himself thereby to the accusation of being "terribly 'sectarian,'" but does not fail to point out that the American Friends' Service Committee makes no apology for its name, that the few Quakers in Europe are distributing relief under the name of their sect, that Lutherans are doing likewise, and that the Roman Catholic Church is making the most it can out of the distribution of relief. The *Watchman-Examiner*, however, is encouraged by the fact that a statement from Northern Baptist Leaders reveals that in the future "American Baptist relief and material aid policies are cleared through a North American Committee of the Baptist World Alliance" and that "administration of relief in Baptist areas not assigned to other Baptist bodies by comity agreement will be cleared through the Baptist World Alliance."

Past history will bear out the charges of the *Watchman-Examiner* concerning the status of Free Church minorities in Europe. In countries, where State churches alone are given church-status by their respective governments, Free Churches, whether Lutheran or Reformed, will be exposed to strong prejudice. If they are also affiliated with and subsidized by American Free Churches, they will be regarded still more as an exotic plant by the leaders and members of the People's Church. The prewar

experience of pastors and brethren of the Ev. Lutheran Free Church of Germany and of Poland certainly tallies with that of the Free Church Baptists. And now we are being informed by the *Watchman-Examiner* that postwar experiences are not any different. While all this should not act as a restraint on our relief work, it does force us to keep well in mind, on the one hand, that our relief work in Europe should be done through our brethren in the faith as soon as this is at all possible, in order also to undergird their church and mission work in a land of State churches; on the other hand, that we are not to lose sight of the fact that our relief for war-sufferers of all nationalities and creeds is purely a work of charity which does not and must not entail any unionistic aims and entanglements.

P. PETERS.

Büchertisch

Prayer Fellowship, by Theodore Graebner. Concordia Publishing House, Missouri. Price: 15 cents.

A review of this pamphlet on Prayer Fellowship really calls for two things, a discussion of the topic itself, and an investigation of certain statements made by the author concerning our Wisconsin Synod and its Seminary. We have thought it best to take up the former in a separate article (page 144) of this issue), thus enabling us to confine this review to the second question.

Opposing the principle that joint prayer is possible only when there is agreement in faith and profession, Dr. Graebner writes as follows:

"A strict application of this principle would mean that we could never, during the past thirty years, have opened a meeting with representatives of the Wisconsin Synod with prayer. We have now for almost a generation acknowledged sharp differences in the doctrine of the ministry and the Church. In official papers the theory has been set forth that 'days' in Genesis may signify 'periods.' Chaplaincies have been condemned as a violation of the separation of Church and State, as unionistic, as a denial of the doctrine of the call. Boy Scouts have been condemned as deistic and unionistic."

With the exception of the last item this is the same list of indictments which, with considerable elaboration, were made by Dr. Graebner at the 1944 convention of the Synodical Conference in Cleveland. The occasion was the floor discussion which followed that part of the convention essay which happens to appear in this number of the *Quartalschrift*. At that time Dr. Graebner's purpose was to demonstrate that the American Lutheran Church is really as close or closer to Missouri than its sister synod. The answer given by your reviewer at that time was about as follows.

A. Ministry and the Church: It is true that this doctrine was the subject of much discussion between the faculties of St. Louis and Wauwatosa-Thiensville. But an agreement was reached in 1932 and published in the papers of the several synods (the "Thiensville Theses"). Discussions were resumed about in 1942 when it had become clear that one clause in this agreement was not being understood in the same sense by the two faculties.

B. "Days" in Creation: Dr. Graebner bases his charge on certain statements in the *Quartalschrift*. I am well aware of those statements, but I speak from close personal knowledge when I say that no one at our Seminary teaches the theory of "periods" in creation. The statements in question refer to a problem in exegesis.

C. Chaplaincies: Wisconsin has done no more than to decide its own policy on this issue according to the information which was at its disposal. We find ourselves in complete agreement with the established teachings of our sister synod on the separation of Church and State, on unionism, and on the doctrine of the call. We deplore that we have differed in the application of these doctrines and principles.

In view of this history it strikes us as passing strange that Dr. Graebner should choose to repeat and broadcast these charges without at least setting the record straight on the first count and, in the second matter, without so much as a word of inquiry to, or consultation with a colleague whose doctrinal soundness he is impugning. In other matters which have been under discussion during these last years Dr. Graebner has been quick to invoke the Eighth Commandment. May we remind him?

As far as the general trend of his argument is concerned, we are well aware that Dr. Graebner cites these instances in support of his new position on prayer fellowship, implying that such differences do not constitute a valid hindrance to joint prayer. But we also know — even as Dr. Graebner knows — that there is a large conservative element in our sister synods which does not take these matters so lightly, in whose eyes it would be a serious matter if these charges were permitted to stand. It is because we agree with these conservative brethren, value their good opinion very highly, and are ready to do everything possible to preserve the existing fellowship, that we feel constrained to resist a procedure which would drive a wedge between us.

We submit that in publishing this latest booklet Dr. Graebner has rendered a distinct disservice to the cause of unity within our Synodical Conference.

E. REIM.

Paying the Ransom. A series of Lenten sermons by Walter E. Hohenstein and Victor A. W. Mennicke. 125 pages, 5¼×7¼. Gray cloth. Price, \$1.25. Concordia Publishing House, Saint Louis, Mo.

According to our conception of the term "series", this booklet contains not one, but two series of Lenten addresses. The first series, by Pastor Hohenstein, is entitled: *The Cross For Victory*, and contains sermons on

the following themes: 1. The Cross for Victory over a Guilty Conscience. — 2. The Cross for Victory, over Self-Will. — 3. The Cross for Victory over Pride. — 4. The Cross for Victory over Selfishness. — 5. The Cross for Victory over Worry. — 6. The Cross for Victory over Forgetfulness. — 7. The Cross for Victory over the Fear of Death.

The second series, by Pastor Mennicke, carries the title: *In The Hour Of Trial*, and the seven topics are: 1. Unconditional Surrender. — 2. Disappointing Disciples. — 3. An Angel of Mercy. — 4. The Power of Darkness. — 5 The Kiss of Betrayal. — 6. A Misguided Ally. — 7. The Lonely Heart.

For pastors who are forever seeking new "approaches" to the Passion Story this new series of headings may have considerable appeal. Is this gristmill which has been grinding out a stream of Lenten outlines, series, themes, and topics over a period of several generations perhaps becoming a hindrance to sound preaching? Is it not perhaps time that we shut our eyes tightly to the kaleidoscopic appearance of new "approaches" and humbly ask the Holy Spirit to do the "approaching" Himself through the living Word? One begins to wonder uneasily, how many Joseph's coats one can fit to a sacred text before one becomes too blinded by the colorful array to the genuine message of the text.

In passing these thoughts on to our readers we would not want them to think that we are pointing to the above series of topics as being particularly objectionable. They are no worse and no better than many others. But they are a case in point. Look at the first theme. The text for it is Psalm 40, 12. How can genuine exegesis find in this text a clear exposition of the fact that the Cross provides a victory over a guilty conscience? Or, ask yourself how you would bring home to your congregation that the Cross provides victory over pride by rightly expounding John 18, 37, 38. Or, what role does the Holy Ghost assign to the Cross in the double text, 2 Tim. 2:8 and Matt. 26:75? Could you truthfully say that Paul and Matthew are there carrying out the thought that the Cross is for victory over forgetfulness? And would you say you were dealing fairly with the inspired words of Paul when you abbreviate 2 Tim. 2:8 as follows: Remember . . . Jesus Christ? Your own verdict in the matter will, we believe, support our contention that it is high time to watch our step in seeking new "approaches" for our Lenten texts.

Unfortunately the second series doesn't improve matters. First of all, the seven headings are *not* themes, but topics. Since such excellent homileticians as Dr. Fritz and Dr. Lenski have long ago pointed out the dangers and faults of topics used in place of themes, we feel it unnecessary to discuss the matter any further here.

Secondly, we consider the choice of topics unfortunate. Does it not cheapen the Gospel and misdirect our Christians' thoughts to speak of "Unconditional Surrender" in connection with our Savior's prayer, Luke 22:41, 42, to refer to the angel who ministered unto Jesus as the Angel of Mercy (war nurses), or to apply to our Lord Jesus Christ a

phrase from a popular song and call Him The Lonely Heart? All of which is just another example of how dangerously we walk when we keep on seeking new and striking Lenten outlines for itching ears.

A. SCHALLER.

The Problem of Pain, by C. S. Lewis, M. A. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1945. Price: \$1.50.

A study of this book will undoubtedly convince every reader that the author in places succeeds in giving very appropriate expression to the truth of sin and repentance. For example: "Sin of its very nature breeds sin by strengthening sinful habit and weakening the conscience" (p. 104) or: "Error and sin both have this property that the deeper they are the less their victim suspects their existence, they are mortal evil" (p. 80). No less do we find impressive words in this little book of 145 pages on repentance and on the manner in which we can overcome sin. For instance: "But mere time does nothing either to the fact or to the guilt of a sin. The guilt is washed out not by time but by repentance and the blood of Christ" (p. 49) or: "After a sin you must not only, if possible, remove the temptation, you must also go back and repent the sin itself . . . whereas every uncorrected error and unrepented sin is, in its own right, a fountain of fresh error and fresh sin following on to the end of time" (p. 104).

The author, C. S. Lewis, Fellow of Magdalene College, Oxford, emphasizes in his Preface that this book is "the work of a layman and an amateur" (VIII). Still it presupposes no small amount of theological and philosophical knowledge on the part of the reader, which he will have to bring into play in order to discern wherein he must agree and disagree with the author. Where the writer, for instance, speaks pointedly of "the gravitation away from God" and "the journey homeward to habitual self" as "a product of the Fall", he draws a picture of the Fall which clearly betrays evolutionistic leanings (pp. 64ff.) and raises the question of the author's Scripturalism. Our condition after the Fall is explained by "the fact that we are members of a spoiled species" and that we are not "morally responsible for the rebellion of a remote ancestor" (p. 73). Writing as a layman of the Church of England the author expressly states that he does not want to be "novel or unorthodox" and that he has "tried to assume nothing that is not professed by all baptised and communicating Christians". This certainly gives us, as Lutheran readers, a further incentive to carefully compare his confession and teachings with the Scriptures and our orthodox Lutheran theology.

P. PETERS.

* * * *

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.

Volume 43

July, 1946

Number 3

The Natural Knowledge of God and Civic Righteousness

The problem that has been troubling church circles of late does not revolve on the question whether there is a natural knowledge of God or not, and whether we must grant that man is capable of practicing civic righteousness. It is conceded by all concerned that man has a knowledge of God outside of God's revelation of Himself in the Scriptures. It is granted also that this natural knowledge is not an illusion, a fond dream or a nightmare as the case may be, but it agrees to the facts and is true as far as it goes. Likewise it is conceded that natural man can lead a respectable and honorable life, observing all ordinances of local and federal government, as well as the common rules of decency. We may also grant that man is capable of finding pleasure in leading such a life, not only demanding it of others.

Moreover, the problem is not whether such natural knowledge and righteousness is capable of development. It is taken for granted that God Himself implanted a concept of Himself in the hearts of men and gave them their conscience to bear witness to them about their relation to Him as their God, and of their accountability to Him for their conduct over against His inscribed law. It is understood that this inborn knowledge can be deepened and widened by a study of nature and of history, and conscience can be trained to react with greater readiness and precision. So can also the will be strengthened to produce a more vigorous civic righteousness.—It is, of course, a fact too well established by experience that the natural knowledge of God can be dulled by neglect, and conscience may be blunted.

The question for us to consider is, what is the value of the natural knowledge of God with reference to the Gospel message? Does it help or hinder the creation of faith? And what is the relation of civic righteousness, not only to the righteousness of justification that avails before God, but also to Christian sanctification? Specifically, can the church incorporate the forces of the natural knowledge and of the inborn or cultivated consciousness of our obligation to our God in her program of child training and Christian character building?

In looking for an answer to our question we naturally turn to St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans first, because there he speaks in express words about the knowledge of God and the working of righteousness as found in natural man, in the Gentiles who were uninfluenced by the oral and written revelation of Himself which God had granted to the Jews. Paul takes up this matter in chap. 1, 19.

In order to grasp his meaning more readily, and to feel the weight of his argument more keenly, it will be well not to neglect the context. Hence we shall first spend some time on what precedes v. 19. There are particularly two things which demand our attention. Paul, having never been in Rome before, introduces himself to the Roman congregation and speaks at length on his office and the nature of his work. Secondly, Paul in a very formal way announces the theme of his epistle, in the course of which he will also discuss the question concerning the natural knowledge of God and of civic righteousness.

I.

Who is Paul, and what is the nature of his work? Why does he mention civic righteousness in connection with his work? Is his work of such a nature that it is benefited by the natural knowledge of God? And can he profitably integrate the cultivation of civic righteousness in the work outlined for him by God?

Paul introduces himself as a *doulos Christou Jesou*. We mark the word *doulos*, which vividly describes the relation of Paul to Christ Jesus. In a general way it denotes that Paul is working for Jesus. However, this term stresses a certain aspect of that relation. It does not stress the work as such, work in so far as

it is opposed to inactivity, to idleness or rest. If Paul had desired to stress that aspect, the fact that his relation to Christ involved toil and labor, he would have used the term *hypēretēs*. On their first mission journey Paul and Barnabas had John Marcus for a *hypēretēs* (Acts 13, 5). In 1 Cor. 4, 1, Paul calls himself and Apollos *hypēretai* of Christ. In Rom. 1, 1, he uses a different word to describe his relation to Christ.

Again, by calling himself *doulos* he does not stress the fact that his work is benefiting the kingdom of Christ, that he is rendering a service in the interest of Christ. If that had been his aim he would have used the word *diakonos*. He often calls himself a *diakonos*—of God, of Christ, of the New Testament; a man to whom the *diakonia* has been entrusted, the *diakonia* of righteousness, of reconciliation, *diakonia* meaning about as much as administration. In Rom. 1, 1, however, he does not stress this aspect of his relation to Christ. He calls himself *doulos*.

Doulos is the direct opposite of *eleutheros*. If any one stands in the relation of a *doulos* to some one else, he has no judgment of his own, nor any will of his own. He must in every respect resign himself to the judgment and the will of his master. His duty is simply to take orders and to carry them out to the letter.—The word *doulos* (and *douleia*) does not necessarily connote burdensome labor, or unpleasant labor, as does, e.g., our English word to “slave” for some one. Nor does it even imply that the *doulos* does his work unwillingly, or merely for fear of punishment. In 1 Cor. 9, Paul stresses the fact that he is doing his difficult work most willingly; and Peter warns the bishops against performing the duties of their office either “by constraint” or “for filthy lucre.” All of this is beside the mark in ascertaining the meaning of *doulos*. The only point of importance is that the *doulos* is determined in his work, not by his own judgment or desire, but only and completely by that of his master.—That the stress of the concept *doulos* lies on the obedience which a *doulos* renders is readily seen from the fact that St. Paul, on given occasions, explains the one term by the other, or substitutes the one for the other. In our Epistle, chap. 6, 16, he uses the expression to yield ourselves “*doulous* to obey,” or more literally, to “present ourselves as *doulous* for obedience.” In the same verse he declares: “*douloi*

you are to him whom you obey." In v. 17 he thanks God that the Romans were *douloi* of sin, but have become obedient to the form of doctrine which was delivered unto them.—When speaking of Christ's state of exinanition, Phil. 2, 7, 8, Paul explains the *morphē doulou* by saying that Jesus "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

A little digression will be pardoned. It may help to shed some light on our point.—A passage that is disturbing many minds and hearts today is Rom. 16, 17, 18. We shall for the present concentrate all our attention on the remark that certain people are serving their own belly, not our Lord Jesus Christ. *Douleousin* means: they take their orders. When in our English language we call them belly-servers, this really creates a wrong impression because of the different connotation. Paul does not insinuate in the least that the division makers and "scandal" mongers are trying to gratify their carnal lusts. What he wants to say is that, their "good words and fair speeches" notwithstanding, they are taking their orders, not from our Savior, but from their own egotistic interests. He does not even say that they do so deliberately, or are at all aware of it. He states their servitude to their belly as a bare fact.—By the way, with this charge Paul does not read them out of the church. He uses the word *toioutoi*, which both generalizes and specifies. He is not limiting his remarks to some special group of errorists, e.g., the Judaizers, but includes all who cause division and offenses. On the other hand, he strictly limits his judgment to just this part of their conduct. In so far as they are such, namely people engaged in causing division and offenses, they act in the employ of their own flesh. In general, they may still be Christians, however encumbered with a vicious infection. We may translate: They serve not fully our Lord Jesus, but in a certain respect their own belly. For a similar use of "not—but" compare Phil. 2, 21, where Paul in speaking of his own chosen assistants complains: "All seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's."

Back to our text.

If Paul is a *doulos*, then his own person, his natural endowments, his education, his social standing, etc., count for very little; the only thing that counts is whose *doulos* he is, from whom he

takes his orders. Paul calls himself a *doulos* of Christ Jesus. If the Romans understand Christ Jesus, then they will know the nature of Paul's work. If they realize that Christ Jesus came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life as a ransom for many; if they realize that Christ Jesus came, to save sinners, all sinners, whether they be high or low, scoundrels or respectable in the sight of men; if they realize that He came, not to call the righteous to repentance, but sinners: then they will also know what the work is that Paul is doing, and the spirit in which he is doing it. For he is a *doulos Christou Jesou*.

This is of importance for our question. Whatever use Christ Jesus has in His work of redemption for the natural knowledge of God and for civic righteousness, just so much importance must every *doulos* of His ascribe to these factors also. We shall not start an investigation now, we only mark this point to help us understand Paul's approach to the question in the body of his letter.

Next Paul calls himself *klētos apostolos aphōrismenos eis euangelion Theou*. We must not separate the various elements of this phrase, but take the whole as belonging together and expressing a single concept: God's called apostle confined to His Gospel.

The basic element in this compound concept is that of an apostle. An apostle in the general sense is an authorized representative. Like Paul in the present case, so Jesus also placed an apostle and a *doulos* in parallel, Jh. 13, 16: "The servant (*doulos*) is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent (*apostolos*) greater than he that sent him." Men that were delegated to minister unto Paul are called the apostles of those churches, e.g., Epaphroditus, Phil. 2, 25; likewise men that were delegated to deliver the great collection to Jerusalem with Paul, 2 Cor, 8, 23. Even Christ is called, not only our Highpriest, but He whom we confess as God's Apostle to us, Heb. 3, 1.

This name was then applied specifically to those men whom Jesus chose to carry His Gospel into all the world. It will suffice to refer to Lc. 6, 13, where it is recorded that Jesus chose twelve of His disciples, "whom also He named apostles." Then in a looser way other messengers of the Gospel were also called apostles. Cf. Acts 14, 4, where Barnabas is so called together

with Paul. To his opponents in Corinth Paul once ironically gave the title of superfine (*hyper lian*) apostles (2 Cor. 12, 11).

When Paul in our text calls himself an apostle he wants to be understood, as always when he calls himself so, in the technical sense, as belonging to the same class with the Twelve. He emphasized this idea in several places in different ways. He combined with it the concept of a herald (*kēryx*) in 1 Tim. 2, 7; 2 Tim. 1, 11. Over against the Corinthians he emphasized his apostleship by pointing not only to signs and wonders as his credentials, 2 Cor. 12, 12, but to the Corinthians themselves as being living monuments to his effective apostle's work done in their midst, 1 Cor. 9, 1. 2. When both his apostolic office and apostolic authority were questioned in Galatia, he stressed the fact that he had his apostleship neither of men, nor by the mediation of any man, but by Jesus Christ Himself and God, Gal. 1, 1. Since in Rome Paul's apostleship was not questioned, he appeals to his office merely to set forth the nature of his work. He is not coming to them for his own purpose, nor with his own philosophy. He is an apostle, an authorized agent of some one else, whose work he is carrying out.

This fact he elucidates further by speaking of himself as a "called apostle." He did not apply for the position, he did not volunteer, but an unsolicited call came to him and made him an apostle. His own personal plans would never have made him one. They lay in the very opposite direction. He was bent, not on building up the church of Christ, but on pulling it down and destroying it. Then that majestic event, terrifying yet soul-refreshing, overtook him near Damascus. There a call came to him to accept the very Jesus whom he was persecuting as his only Savior, and to turn about and henceforth proclaim the Gospel with the same determination with which he had hitherto endeavored to wreck it. That call made him a Christian and an apostle. *Klētos apostolos*.

Yes, he is an authorized agent of God and Christ, and as such he has received very specific instructions. He is *aphōrismenos*, set aside, "earmarked." His work is circumscribed, confined, limited, restricted: *eis euangelion*. His assignment is as wide and as narrow as the Gospel. Whatever the Gospel includes is

included in Paul's program; and whatever is foreign to the Gospel, must be absolutely kept out of his work.

Just as in the first phrase, servant of Christ Jesus, the genitive is the important point, so in the second the restriction to the Gospel is the decisive concept. It will be well, therefore, to call to mind some of the characteristics peculiar to the Gospel. When describing the Gospel in First Corinthians Paul applied to it the word of the prophet: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." This holds not only in case of man in general, who may be uneducated, but for the very "princes" among men, viz., those who have developed to the highest degree possible their native abilities, including their natural knowledge of God and their civic righteousness. That all their brilliant achievements in the field of philosophy have not brought them one step nearer to a proper evaluation of Christ and His Gospel, they evinced by the fact that they "crucified the Lord of glory." It ever remains true, as Paul concludes, that "the natural man—no matter how highly he develops his natural knowledge of God and cultivates his civic righteousness—receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Jesus' judgment stands, that the things of the Gospel are "hidden from the wise and prudent." The Psalmist of old painted a correct picture of the situation when he said that the very kings and rulers among the people are the ones who band themselves together against the Lord and against His Anointed.

Paul wanted the Romans to understand, when he introduced himself as a *doulos* of Christ Jesus and as an apostle set apart for the Gospel, that he was coming to them not as an educator aiming to develop something which they already possessed by nature in embryonic form, not even as a reformer, aiming to lead people back from abuses to a purer form of worship; but that he represented a cause which is utterly foreign to natural man and which natural man cannot but hate and oppose as subversive of all moral and religious life.

The thoughts which Paul thus briefly set forth by calling himself a *doulos* of Christ Jesus and an apostle confined to the

Gospel, he enlarges somewhat in his following remarks, in which he reverses the order, beginning this time with the Gospel, "which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

It will not be necessary for our immediate purpose to enter into a detailed study of all contained in these words; it will be sufficient to mark in a general way what Paul says and what he omits to say about the Gospel. In three points he bases his own Gospel work on the Old Testament. His Gospel is the very thing which God *promised* afore; God's promise was given by the instrumentality of His *prophets*; His promise is laid down in holy *Scriptures*.

The difference between the Old Testament and the New is precisely that of promise and fulfillment, and whatever is immediately implied in these terms, e.g., a difference in the degree of clearness, in the number of details, etc. The difference is not one of narrowness and bigotry on the one hand, and liberality and broadmindedness on the other, or something like that. No, as far as content is concerned, or basic principles, and the like, the two coincide completely. *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus in Novo patet*. Paul preaches exactly the Gospel which God promised afore, without additions, or subtractions, or alterations.

The second point is that Paul's Gospel, in the form of Old Testament promises, was conveyed by God to man through the instrumentality of His prophets. He chose His prophets, trained His prophets, and spoke by the mouth of His prophets. Were there not other wise men in the world, and learned, who by their philosophy discovered valuable truths and made them accessible to men? Think of Aristotle's book on Ethics, and the works of other philosophers along these lines. No, God could not use them. In fact, they were the very ones who led the people away from God, and their philosophy ran directly counter to God's promise. Paul's Gospel is limited to what the prophets say; they are his only source of information.

The third point narrows the matter down still more. The promises God gave by the mouth of His prophets are contained in the holy Scriptures. The writings left behind by the prophets are holy writings, because the prophets were not their real authors.

No book of human origin deserves the name holy. The writings of the prophets are holy. No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. The prophecy came not in old time by the will of men, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The writings of the Old Testament prophets were in a class by themselves: they were holy writings, majestic and awe-inspiring, because they were given by inspiration of God. In them, and in them alone, did Paul find the Gospel which God promised by the prophets, and which Paul now was called to proclaim.

Paul, in the introduction of himself to the Romans, next returns to Jesus Christ, who is the heart of the Gospel in every respect. He describes Him in these words: "Which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared (ordained) to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."

To the most casual reader it must be evident that Paul is here referring to the two states of Christ, the state of exinanition and the state of exaltation. Since these are not as such a part of our present investigation, it must suffice to refer to Phil. 2, 6-11, for a general commentary. We mark merely a few of the details.

Paul takes note of the fact that the human nature of Christ was derived from the line of David. This at once calls to mind all the promises of the Old Testament concerning the Son of David, particularly 2 Sam. 7.—"Declared" (*horisthentos*) is the simple verb of which Paul had used a compound when he described himself as being "separated" (*aphōrismenos*) unto the Gospel. A word like "ordained" would express the idea better than "declared" (King James version). He was ordained with "power," highly exalted, as Paul says in Phil. 2. This was done in accordance with His "spirit of holiness," in which He rendered a perfect obedience to God, culminating in His death on the cross. Since His resurrection He now holds the exalted position as Son of God *with power* (this is the concept to be stressed), so that every knee must bow before Him and every tongue confess Him to be Christ the Lord.

Does this Jesus Christ receive any support in His work from the natural knowledge of God and from civic righteousness even

in their most highly developed forms, either in His humiliation or in His exaltation? Or was Peter right when he declared, at the risk of his life, that there is none other name under heaven given whereby we must be saved? And was old Simeon right when he spoke of the Child as being set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; when he called Him a sign which shall be spoken against, not by the ignorant only, but by the very leaders of the people, the most learned and the most pious? Was the Psalmist right when he called Him the head stone of the corner, but one whom the very builders would reject?

The Gospel, with Jesus Christ as its very heart, is most exclusive. Mix in a little of man's own knowledge, ability, or effort, and at once it is turned into another Gospel which is not another.

Very emphatically Paul concludes the introduction of himself by resuming a thought he had expressed in the beginning, only now holding up the apostleship which he had been called to administer as a gift of grace by Christ Jesus to *His church*, both to him that administers it and to the Romans who are served by it: "By whom we (i.e., the writer and the readers together) have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all nations for his name." "Obedience to the faith," *hypakoē pisteōs*, is the obedience which consists in faith, *Glaubensgehorsam*. And all this "for his name." The NAME of Jesus Christ, the complete revelation by which we know and apprehend Him, is the only thing that counts in connection with the grace and apostleship which the church received for establishing the obedience of faith among the nations. If the natural knowledge of God and civic righteousness are a part of the *Name*, of the revelation of Jesus Christ, then may, then must a cultivation of civic righteousness be incorporated in the work of the church for creating and developing and preserving faith in the world in general, and among its own members in particular. But if the name of Jesus really is a name "all other names above," then we would be violating His wondrous name by adulterating it with this foreign element.

This concludes Paul's introduction of himself to the Romans. The words are brief, yet each one is filled to the brim with powerful thoughts concerning the all-sufficiency and the intolerant exclusiveness of Christ and His Gospel.—The following remarks

about Paul's plans to visit Rome have no direct bearing on our question. We may omit them, and now take up a brief discussion of the theme of his letter.

II.

Paul prefaces his theme by drawing attention to the fact that through the call which God gave him he is a debtor, he is bound by some obligation, to both Greek and barbarian, to both wise or educated and unwise, uneducated, and therefore is ready to proclaim the glad tidings of the Gospel also to them in Rome. The two classes which Paul here mentions as constituting the group of people to whom he is in debt are not essentially different from each other, they are for all practical purposes the same, and the two sets of terms he uses are mutually explanatory. When Paul speaks of Greeks he has in mind people who can boast of Greek culture, and when he speaks of barbarians he means those upon whom the Greeks looked down as being uneducated.

We had occasion to refer to the highly developed Greek philosophy before, in which they clarified and elevated the concepts of their natural knowledge of God and the precepts of their inscribed law, to a high degree. To Paul with his Gospel message this makes absolutely no difference. The most thorough and devout philosopher had need of precisely the same Gospel as the most uncultured and backward barbarian. No group was any closer to the kingdom of heaven which Paul was proclaiming, nor was either group farther removed from it than was the other. What a vast difference between a highly cultured Greek, whose achievements in many respects stand unsurpassed to this day, and an illiterate, superstitious barbarian! Yet as far as the Gospel is concerned Paul connects them with a *te-kai*, counting them as undistinguishably in the same class, with not a shade of difference.

The Gospel—what is it all about? Paul says that he is not ashamed of the Gospel. It was the year 58 A.D. when he wrote these words. It may have been about 20 years after that eventful day on the road to Damascus. For approximately 20 years he had, with interruptions, been proclaiming the Gospel, spending the last ten years exclusively in mission work in Galatia, in Greece, in Asia. After this long period of intensive Gospel work he says, on

the basis of his experience, I am not ashamed. Meaning: the Gospel has proven its worth in every case and under all circumstances, so that I have full confidence in its efficacy.

If we look for a commentary on these words of Paul the best place to which to turn will be Second Corinthians, a letter written not long before Romans. Men had come to Corinth who tried to belittle the work and importance of Paul. In his epistle he takes up the gauntlet and with telling blows vindicates his Gospel work and utterly routs the attack of his opponents. Read chapters 10ff. We cannot go into details now, but merely take up two points of Paul's defense. In the first place, to serve as a minister of Christ does not mean an easy, care-free life, there is no glamor connected with it, nor any display of human bravado (ch. 11, 23-33). Yet, in the second place, in spite of all the personal indignities which Paul underwent in his work, the Gospel always came out victorious. "The weapons of our warfare (against the idolatry in the Gentile world) are not carnal (weak), but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds, casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (ch. 10, 4. 5). If the Corinthians wish to know the power of Paul's Gospel, all they have to do is to look at themselves and at the things in their own midst. "If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's"—where did he get it? who brought him to Christ?—"let him of himself think this again, that, as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's" (v. 7).

In chap. 2, he accordingly compares his work as a missionary to one grand triumphal procession, with a grand array of flowers and garlands, that to the victors spells life, but certain death to the enemy. "Thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savor of his knowledge by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved and in them that perish: to the one we are the savor of death unto death, and to the other the savor of life unto life" (v. 14-16).

Such has been Paul's experience with the Gospel. Ashamed of the Gospel? Ready to discard it for something better? Ready to drop some of its truths? Or ready to supplement it in order

to increase its efficiency? Paul trusts the Gospel, and is convinced that any addition to it cannot but ruin it.

When it comes to dealing with the cultured Greek, Paul proclaims the Gospel to him; and when it comes to counseling an illiterate barbarian, Paul again resorts to the Gospel. If Paul should come to our conference, attend our services, visit our schools, inspect our seminary, what would he look for? By what standard would he gauge our work? He would concentrate on one thing: Do we strictly apply ourselves to the Gospel? Are we confident that the Gospel will do the work? Do we perhaps show traces of being ashamed of the Gospel by trying to make it more attractive or more palatable to the people, by supplementing it with other material, or re-enforcing it with other educational programs?

Paul's words stand like a rock: I am not ashamed of the Gospel.

His reason he states in these words: "For it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." The emphatic position in this sentence is held by the word *power*, *God's power*. If that is the nature of the Gospel, then why hesitate? God's power is perfect, is complete. God needs no help, no assistance, no co-operation. God spoke the word, and the universe came forth out of nothing. God speaks the word of the Gospel, and a sinner's dead heart is reborn to spiritual life; unwilling, madly resisting people are changed into people that are all willingness. Whether we think of the irresistible power of God's omnipotence, or of the sweet and suasive power of His love, who would dare try to add anything to it? That would be nothing short of sacrilege.

Paul is here speaking of God's power unto *salvation*. The redemptive work of Christ is presupposed. Christ's vicarious living and death have been performed. His triumphant resurrection has proclaimed the complete atonement for the guilt of the world, the absolution of Christ from all His sins, which were our sins, His justification, that is, our justification. In His resurrection Christ shouted out His complete victory over all our foes, over death, the devil, and hell. All this has been achieved, and now the Gospel is God's power unto salvation, His power for offering

and conveying and sealing the rich blessings of Christ's work to a world of sinners.

Redemption is complete. No sinner is asked to contribute the least toward the payment of his guilt. But what are God's terms? What conditions does He stipulate, which must be met before a sinner can hope to enjoy the fruits of Christ's redemption? Paul says, "to every one that believeth." What does it mean to believe? What is faith? A detailed investigation would carry us too far afield at present; we must be content to summarize briefly. When Jesus was approached by the people of Capernaum with the question: "What shall we do that we might work the works of God?" He answered: "This is the work of God—this is the work which God demands and which pleases Him—that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." In the course of the conversation He called Himself the bread from heaven, and defined faith as eating that bread. Faith is like eating, it means to take and to enjoy. If you want to call eating a work, a condition, a term, then you may also call faith by those names. Our fathers were right when they called faith the *organon leptikon*. It produces nothing, it merits nothing, it merely appropriates the blessing which God prepared for us. (We shall come back to these words of Jesus again a little later.)—Thus by adding "to every one that believeth," Paul does not limit the power of God in the Gospel, he does not lay down a condition, perhaps a very easy one, nevertheless a condition which the sinner on his part must fulfill, rather, he furnishes a foil which sets off the power of the Gospel in an all the more brighter light. The Gospel feeds the bread of life to a hungry soul.

In the following phrase we must correct the translation a little before we feel its force. The King James version reads: "to the Jew first and also to the Greek." This translation separates Jews and Greeks and puts them on different levels, while Paul combines them with a *te-kai* and applies the modifier "first" to both parties: first of all to both Jew and Greek. Here we have the cultured Greek again, and united with him as belonging to the same class we find the Jew. While the Greek cultivated natural ethics, the Jew had the advantage of possessing the written Law of God. But as far as salvation is concerned, they both belong into

the same class. There is only one way unto salvation open for both, and that is the way of faith. They can be saved only if the Gospel conveys to them salvation as a gift of God and they accept it in faith.

How much do their efforts help them in this matter, namely that they have seriously tried to produce a righteousness of their own by living in accordance with their light, the one endeavoring to live up to God's commandments in His written Law, the other struggling along as best he could with his natural understanding which he developed as far as was possible for him with philosophy? How much do their efforts help them? Not one bit. Paul even says *prōton*, first of all, both Jew and Greek. Jews and Greeks head the list of people that must submit to faith, and that need God's power in the Gospel if they are to be saved. They must learn to forget about the righteousness which they have built up for themselves, yes, they must learn to consider it as but "dung" in order to obtain the righteousness of the Gospel.

This leads us directly to the very heart of the matter. It is in the last analysis the problem of righteousness, a righteousness which will pass the test of God, which God will accept as adequate and will declare so in His judgment. It is the question of justification, which Paul now states very succinctly in the following verse: "For therein (in the Gospel) is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith."

What is the righteousness of God? Luther, though not translating literally, nevertheless renders the terms correctly when he says: *die Gerechtigkeit, die vor Gott gilt*. *Dikaiosynē* is not righteousness as such, but a righteousness so declared by a judge.

A brief study of the various words expressing righteousness will be necessary. We may begin with the verb *dikaioō*. It denotes the opposite of *katadikazō*, to condemn, cf. Mt. 12, 37. It is used for finding excuses, cf. Lc. 10, 29; 16, 15. Hence concerning the dealings of God with a sinner it denotes a declaratory act, pronouncing righteous.—The verbal noun in *-sis*, *dikaiōsis*, denotes the action as such, justifying, while the noun in *-ma*, *dikaiōma*, expresses a concrete result of the action, an act or state of righteousness, or a demand of righteousness. For the former cf. Rev. 19, 8; Rom. 5, 18; for the latter, Rom. 2, 26; 8, 4. As

the latter passage indicates, this term in the usage of Paul borders very closely on the idea of a declared righteousness, which seems to be the main thought e.g. in Rom. 5, 16. See particularly Rev. 15, 4, where both Luther and the King James version translate with *Urteile* and *judgments*, respectively. (Goodspeed says: *sentences*, and Menge has: *Gerichte*.)

The word most commonly used is the one in our text, *dikaiosynē*. Paul does not leave us in doubt about the meaning he attaches to it. He uses the word to denote a declared righteousness. He says that when God demonstrates His *dikaiosynē* two facts stand out in bold relief, namely, that He is just and a justifier of a man characterized by faith in Jesus (Rom. 3, 26), on the basis of which he concludes that "a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law" (v. 28). He then devotes the entire fourth chapter to elucidate the idea of *dikaiosynē*. He quotes from Ps. 32, where a number of terms expressing the idea of accounting are used in connection with righteousness, direct and figurative, positive and negative: "iniquities are forgiven"—"sins are covered"—"the Lord will not impute sin"—all of which Paul sums up in the one term: "God imputeth righteousness without works" (v. 6). For comparison refer to Phil. 3, 9, where Paul says that he desires to be found in Christ, not having an own *dikaiosynē*, one out of the law, but the righteousness by means of faith, the *dikaiosynē* from God on the basis of faith.

From this brief survey we already see that for attaining this *dikaiosynē* Paul completely eliminates and bars all our own works, which naturally would include all works of civic righteousness. He tersely declares, after a review of the efforts of both Jew and Greek, "There is no difference: for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (ch. 3, 22-24).

He says that the *dikaiosynē* of God is, and is revealed, *ek pisteōs eis pistin*; it is from beginning to end a matter of faith. He quotes from Habakkuk in support of his statement: "The just shall live by faith."

Paul always opposes faith to works. Works are productive labor, they produce values, they benefit some one and merit a reward. The nature of faith is to appropriate, to receive. Recall

what we considered above about a remark of Jesus, who once called faith a work, as in quotation marks, Jh. 6, 29. When the Jews asked Him: "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" He took up their expression "works," substituted the singular for their plural, and said: "This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." Faith in Jesus is the work of God, meaning, according to the connection with the foregoing, the work which God demands, which pleases Him, and is approved of Him. Jesus then explains that this work may be described as eating the true life-giving bread from heaven, which He is Himself. What kind of work would you call that, when a half-starved man sits down at a well-decked table to eat of the delicious nourishing food? What does he produce? What does he merit? A work like that, Jesus says, is faith. In the further course of the conversation He showed that faith is the work of God in still another sense. He said: "No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." Faith is a work of God because God Himself must produce it in our hearts.

The righteousness of God is a matter of faith, that God-created receptive attitude of the heart, from beginning to end.

This righteousness is "revealed" in the Gospel. In itself it is a mystery, completely hidden from the eyes and minds of men. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. . . . The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2. 9. 14). Natural man, no matter how amply you unfold his natural knowledge of God; natural man, no matter how highly you develop his civic righteousness, still cannot even receive the righteousness of God, nor contribute anything toward receiving it. The princes of this world were the very ones that crucified the Lord of glory. When the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing, they do so under the leadership of their kings and rulers, who take counsel together against the Lord and against His Anointed. When God presents Jesus as the chief corner stone for His temple, it is the very builders that reject Him. The righteousness of God is *revealed* in the Gospel. Outside of this light darkness covers

the earth and gross darkness the people, no matter how much they may boast of their enlightenment. All attempts to lift this darkness by anything that natural man can do with his natural knowledge and his self-made righteousness will only intensify it. What communion hath light with darkness? Light and darkness simply will not blend. Only God can call forth light out of darkness. In the Gospel is revealed the righteousness of God.

So Paul introduced himself to the Romans as a preacher confined to the Gospel, and he announced his theme as being the righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel. And in the emphasis with which he stated his case he has already indicated that he cannot assign any positive function to the natural knowledge of God and to civic righteousness in the program of the Gospel.

M.

Pastoral Table of Duties

VI. The Elders

1 Tim. 5, 17-21

In 1 Tim. 5, 17-21 Paul instructs Timothy about the elders of the congregations which were under his supervision.

Elders, *presbyteroi*. Acts 20, 17 and 28 make it clear that the elders were the pastors of the Christian congregations. In v. 17 we read: "And from Miletus he (Paul) sent to Ephesus and called (R. V. to him) the elders of the church." And in v. 28 Paul admonishes the elders: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers (R. V. *bishops*; in the Greek text *episkopous*) to feed the church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood." The same fact we learn from Tit. 1, 5 and 7. V. 5: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest . . . ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless." V. 7: "For a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God." So an elder was a bishop, a pastor. He was called an *elder* by reason of his age and dignity and a *bishop* by reason of his position as overseer of the congregation.

Let us take to heart Paul's instructions to Timothy regarding these elders, "for whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning," Rom. 15, 4, especially for *our* learning who hold this office. V. 17: "Let the elders, that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor, especially they (R. V. those) who labor in the word and doctrine (R. V. teaching)."

As Paul's representative in the congregations of Asia Minor Timothy had a large field of labor. Ephesus was its center, but it included all congregations in Asia Minor, which meant that there were many elders under Timothy's supervision. Members of these congregations were, in the main, heathen converts. To them elders, bishops, were something new. How should they treat these elders? 1 Tim. 5, 17-21 puts Paul's answer into Timothy's mouth.

"Let the elders, that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor." *Hoi kalōs proestōtes presbyteroi diplēs timēs axiousthōsan.* "Let" is implied in the imperative of the Greek verb.

Presbyteroi: Elders. A *presbyteros* could be an elder son, Luke 15, 25; or a person advanced in years. Sometimes the word is used in contrast to *neaniskos*, Acts 2, 17. or *neoterōs*, 1 Tim. 5, 1. The word is also used for forefathers, Hebr. 11, 2; Matth. 15, 2; Mark 7, 35. The Jews used it for some members of the Sanhedrin; Matth. 16, 21: "*The elders* and chief priests and scribes." In the early church it meant such as presided over the assemblies. See Acts 11, 30; 14, 23; 15, 6 and many others. Thayer. This last is the sense in which the word is used in 1 Tim. 5, 17, 19.

Axiousthōsan, to think meet, fit, right; to judge worthy; to deem deserving. Schierlitz: "Wuerdig halten." Let them be deemed deserving — by the Christians, of course, individually and collectively. Timothy should make it his business to see that the elders were so regarded.

The elders that rule well should be counted worthy of *diplēs timēs*, of double honor. It would take us too far afield to record what the exegetes, old and new, have put into these two words. Lenski says: "There is a diversity of views regarding the twofold honor: 1. Twofold — in greater measure; 2. it means double pay; 3. honor plus pay; 4. twice the pay of 60 year old widows, or of the deacons; 5. one honor as for brethren and another as to

superiors; 6. one honor because of age, another because of office." P. 691. This last is Hofmann's exegesis as quoted by Kretzmann: "Am einfachsten ist die Erklärung Hofmanns: 'Doppelter Ehre naemlich, weil schon dem Alter Ehre gebuehrt, zu welchem nun das wohlgefuehrte Amt hinzukommt.'" P. 159. Right.

Those who rule well, *hoi kalōs proestōtes*, should be counted worthy of double honor. *Proestōtes*, perfect participle of *proistēmi*: to set over, to be over, to superintend, preside over. 1 Thess. 5, 12. 13 Paul writes: "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you, (*proistamenous*) in the Lord and admonish you, and to esteem them very (R. V. exceeding) highly in love for their work's sake." See also Hebr. 13, 6. 14. — Those that rule *well*. "*Kalōs*: well, rightly, so that there shall be no room for blame; with verbs denoting a duty or office, which one fulfills well." Thayer.

"Rule well," that is the condition for double honor. What does Paul want to impress on Timothy with these words? Kretzmann takes for granted that *kalōs* refers to the position of the elder. "Ein Gegensatz ist wohl ausser Frage. Das *proistēmi* bezeichnet hier das Amt and das *kalōs* die Vorzueglichkeit desselben. Eine Umschreibung wuerde demnach etwa so lauten: Diejenigen, die sich in dem so vortrefflichen, herrlichen Amt der vorstehenden Aeltesten befinden." P. 158. Lenski claims that this position cannot be justified grammatically. "The participle means 'to stand at the head' of the congregation and covers the entire position and the work of the elders. They were indeed the congregation's head, and functioned as such. When this was excellently done, it deserved recognition and should not be taken as a mere matter of course." P. 691. "The idea that this adverb 'excellently' describes only the office itself as an excellent one, cannot be successfully defended; it modifies the attributive participle, the excellent presiding of these elders." P. 691.

Some elders in that day, too, took their office lightly. They did what had to be done, but their hearts were not in their work. They were not mindful that they are doing the Lord's work. Nor were they interested in the souls of men. Their work was their bread and butter. *Kalōs* did not fit them. They were not worthy of double honor. — Again, as happens in our day also, men got

into the ministry who were absolutely unfitted for that office. The elders in that day were taken from among the newly converted heathen. Some of them should never have been chosen. Paul knew this. Therefore his advice to Timothy: "Lay hands suddenly (R. V. hastily) on no man." 1 Tim. 5, 22. *Kalōs* did not fit such. They were not worthy of double honor. — But thank God, there were men — then as now — who were worthy of double honor. They knew the responsibilities of their office and met them. They worked as the Lord's stewards for the Lord, the church and the souls of men. Their one aim was to win sinners through Christ and for Christ. *Kalōs* fit them.

Especially they, Paul says, should be counted worthy for double honor "who labor in the word and doctrine (R. V. teaching)." *Malista hoi kopiōntes en logō kai didaskalia. Kopiōntes*, from *kopiao*, is an interesting word. In New Testament Greek it means to labor with wearisome effort, to toil. Sometimes it is used to describe hard manual labor, 2 Tim. 2, 6; Luke 5, 5 and elsewhere. Then it is used "of toilsome efforts of *teachers* in proclaiming and promoting the kingdom of God and Christ." Thayer. Schierlitz: "*Kopiao*: ermueden, arbeiten, sich abmuehen." In this sense Paul uses it of himself in 1 Cor. 16, 10: "But I labored (*ekopiasa*) more abundantly than they all." See also 1 Cor. 16, 16; 1 Thess. 5, 12; Rom. 16, 6. 12; Gal. 4, 11. — *Kopiao* is a sermon in itself.

Especially the elders who labor, toil, sich abmuehen, *Vulgata: laborant*, in the Word and teaching of the Word should be counted worthy of double honor. *Malista*: above all. We must assume, then, that there were elders who ruled and elders who worked in the Word and in teaching. *Malista* makes the latter stand out. In the *Vulgata malista* is translated with *maxime*.

All of them were elders. They who ruled certainly were not barred from preaching or teaching and vice versa. All of them were to be *didaktikoi*, apt to teach (3, 2), *lehrhaftig*. Their talents varied. The *proestōtes* excelled in ruling, in administration; the *kopiōntes en logo* in that phase of the work, and the *kopiōntes en didaskalia* in teaching. Paul's words make them who toiled with the Word stand out. How busy they must have been with the endless flow of catechumens! It took toil to teach those heathen

the doctrine of the Word and its way of life. — But the *kalōs* applied to both the rulers and the toilers in the Word.

The *kōpiōntes en logō* toiled in the Word, i. e. the Scriptures and nothing else. Science, philosophy, their own ideas and opinions were of no concern to them. In their work they used only the simple Word of God. They held fast to the faithful Word, das gewiss ist und lehren kann. They needed no other reason for working so than that such was their office and thus it was written. "Preach the word, be instant in season, out of season." "Preach the gospel"; "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." What is there beside the Word which is *the* truth? This Word is "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." It is "the incorruptible seed which liveth and abideth forever." Of what other thing could this be said: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." James 1, 18. "Being born again . . . by the word of God." 1 Pet. 1, 23. "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." 1 Cor. 4, 15. Only the Scriptures are able to make sinners wise unto salvation, 2 Tim. 3, 15. "Through thy precepts I get understanding." Ps. 119, 104. "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." Ps. 119, 105.

That's why the best elders were and the best pastors are the toilers in and with the Word. The Holy Ghost keeps pounding that one fact into our minds and hearts: Only the Word. He wants us to understand that nothing else will do in God's work. The whole Word. The Word in its truth and purity. The true and full doctrine of the Word; fundamental and nonfundamental.

Let the elders or pastors of a church edge away from this truth and Satan has that church sliding in the direction he desires. How true this is is evident in so many Protestant Churches which have been weaned away from the Word. Even the Lutheran Church, to a great extent, has cast aside the one doctrine on which all others depend, verbal and plenary inspiration of the Bible. Carelessness along this line has always led in the same direction: Toward unionism and salvation by works and toward social gospel. Therefore it is vitally important that we be reminded again and again of the fact that our office calls for one thing alone, namely that we work in the Word.

Basically there is no difference between working in the Word and in doctrine. In preaching or in teaching only the method is different. The purpose is the same. The same Word is used. In preaching we proclaim the Word, the Gospel of salvation by grace, to an assembly of people, be it small or large, Christian or unchristian, Jew or Gentile. In teaching we instruct people, be they young or old, one or many, in the doctrines of the Word. The objective of preaching or teaching is the salvation of sinners.

This work is toil. Every pastor who is heart and soul in his work knows that. But it is blessed work. Its rewards are rich, not necessarily in money but in happy satisfaction. No amount of money can equal the satisfaction which goes with being used by God in the work of His kingdom, with helping sinners to know their Savior and so come to salvation. No wonder Paul calls the ministry a "good work." 1 Tim. 3, 1. The ministry is the most underpaid profession only in respect to money. Its spiritual rewards to pastor and to congregation are immeasurable.

According to v. 18, however, remuneration is part of the honor of which Paul speaks. The honor due the pastor is not paid in full with nice words. The congregation which lets its pastor live in a hovel and forces him to fight for his existence can't make anyone believe that it honors him. Here, too, the word applies: "Let us not love in words, neither in tongues, but in deed and in truth." 1 John 3, 18. The most excellent and zealous worker in the Word has to eat. So does his family. He needs a house, clothing and shoes, furniture and books, — and a car. Word-honor will not fill the stomach, nor heat the house, nor buy gas. Word-honor is hollow mockery.

V. 18 reads: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn (R. V. when he treadeth out the corn)." And: "The laborer is worthy of his reward (R. V. hire)." This is God's Word, not Paul's philosophy. *Legei gar graphē.* "*Gar*, a conjunction . . . is properly a particle of *affirmation* and *conclusion*, denoting: *truly therefore, verily as the case stands.* . . . By the use of this particle either the reason and the cause of a foregoing statement is added, whence arises the *causal* or *argumentative* force of the particle, *for*, German, *denn.*" Thayer. *Gar* here shows that what Paul says in v. 18 is an argument for what he said

in v. 17. "For the Scripture saith." That settles it. Here God is telling His people what He demands of them for His servants. The first quotation is taken from Deut. 25, 4. Paul quotes these words twice in his letters. See also 1 Cor. 9, 9. And in 1 Cor. 9 he comments on them. V. 10: "Does God take care for the oxen? (R. V. is it for the oxen that God careth?) Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt this is written." And in v. 11 he draws this conclusion: "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap the carnal things?" In other words, if God cares for the ox, He also wants the bodily needs of His servants supplied. He will not be mocked in the persons of His servants.

The other quotation is taken from the New Testament: "The laborer is worthy of his hire." This Jesus said to the seventy when He sent them out to the people to say: "The kingdom of God is come nigh to you." He forbade them to carry a purse or scrip. When they entered a house they would say: "Peace be unto this house." If that greeting is accepted they should remain in that house, "eating and drinking such things as they give: for the laborer is worthy of his hire." In other words, they who hear the Gospel should take care of the bodily needs of them who preach it to them. That quotation is Luke 10, 7.

Matth. 10, 10: "For the workman is worthy of his meat." Jesus said these words to His apostles when He sent them to preach to the lost sheep of the house of Israel: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." He forbade them to take along gold, silver or brass in their purses, "for the workman is worthy of his meat."

Luke has: *Axios ho ergatēs misthou autou*. Matthew: *Axios gar ho ergatēs tēs trophēs autou*. *Misthos*: The dues paid for work; wages; hire. *Trophēs*: Food, nourishment. Thus, on two occasions, Christ pointed out that His servants are entitled to all they need to sustain their bodies.

It is not left to the individual Christian or congregation to decide if they would provide for their pastors and teachers and their families. God has made that decision in unmistakable language, and that in the Old and New Testaments. We marvel at the detailed laws God set down in the Torah to make provision for His servants and their families (high priests, priests and

Levites). They had to be provided with living quarters, cities, villages, land and food. Tithing and the sacrifices and the first fruits of field, orchard and animals provided the latter.

In the New Testament dispensation Christians are not under the Law of Moses. But they are under the law of love. God does not tell them how much they have to give to their pastors. But the love of Christ and the grace of God which gave them so much should constrain them to give willingly and richly. But isn't it a pity to note how little they who are receiving grace for grace frequently give to the support of their pastors? Christian congregations have even gone so far as to use salary as a club to make a pastor bow to their will or drive him out of their midst. And when we compare salary conditions as they exist in the different denominations we Lutherans must hang our heads in shame, because sectarian congregations, as a rule, take care of the financial needs of their pastors much more nobly. Doubly shameful, because Lutheran congregations usually receive so much more than others.

The Christian can not escape his responsibility in this matter, for God tells him frequently and clearly in the New Testament what He expects of him. So here in 1 Tim. 5, 18; also in Matth. 10, 10; Luke 10, 7; 1 Cor. 9, 7-14. Particularly in the passage from Corinthians God points out the Christian's duty to the Gospel-preacher. In v. 13 He says: "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live (R. V. eat) of the things of the temple?" Namely of the offerings, for "they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar (R. V. have their portion with the altar)." V. 14 He concludes: "Even so has the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." Gospel-work should bring remuneration. The pastor should never be forced to do extra work to make ends meet. — Then there is Gal. 6, 9: "Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teaches in all good things." And in the next verse the solemn warning: "Be not deceived, God is not mocked." That means: You cannot make a fool of God by making fools of His servants.

As overseer of the Asia Minor field Timothy had to look into these things. Were the elders who ruled well being accorded

double honor? Were the Christians supplying the needs? "Let the elders, etc.;" it was part of his duty to see this done. — Who would deny that this field of specialized labor is calling for work from visitors, district presidents and other officials? How many congregations need to be shaken up and brought to an understanding of what this means: "Let the elders who rule well be counted worthy of double honor." Anything less is mockery of God.

In v. 19 the apostle comes to a new point in his instructions to Timothy. "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before (R. V. except at the mouth of) two or three witnesses." First Timothy should see to it that the elders receive honor, then reward, then protection. That is what Paul wants here; anybody and everybody shall not be at liberty to smear the name of an elder by merely accusing him. But if an elder has been doing wrong, there is a way open for accusing him. Thus elder and congregation are protected. The accusations must, however, be brought to Timothy. It is his work to investigate them.

We know that ministers make good targets for faultfinders. It has always been so. Therefore Paul addresses this injunction to Timothy: "*Kata presbyterou katēgorian mē paradechou, ektos ei mē epi dyo ē triōn martyrōn.*

Katēgoria: Accusation, charge. *Paradechou*: Admit, i. e. not to reject, accept, receive. *Ektos ei mē*: Accept in case. Some accusations Timothy had to accept, but only such as could be witnessed to by two or three witnesses — or more, of course. — Thayer cites this passage under *epi*, A. I. 1. c: "Figurative, used of *that upon which anything rests* (like our *upon*), . . . resting on the declaration, etc., Matth. 18, 16; 2 Cor. 13, 1; more simply *epi martyrōn*, 1 Tim. 5, 19." P. 231. Such witnesses were not men who were present and witnessed the filing of the accusations. That is the stand of Wohlenberg. Lenski says: "Some think of . . . men who are simply present to hear what the accusation is, so that afterwards they can testify that this is indeed the accusation made." P. 694-695. But Lenski refutes this. Zorn says: "Eine Klage wider einen Aeltesten soll Timotheus nicht annehmen, als nur und allein in dem Fall, dass sie von zwei oder drei Zeugen bestaetigt wird." That is right. They are not witnesses to the accusations, but to the sins embodied in the accusations.

Ektos ei mē safeguards the faithful elder against slander and it safeguards the congregation against an elder who is guilty of living in sin. If an elder was guilty, accusation could be made against him, but Timothy was not to listen to an accuser who could not produce at least two or three witnesses to verify the truth of such accusation.

This injunction is still in force, *necessary and important*. It is the duty of district presidents and visitors particularly to apply it and keep it in force. Pastors need protection from slander and congregations need protection from pastors who persist in living in sin or giving offense.

Timothy had to listen to an accusation which had the necessary witnesses. He had to investigate it. And if the accused was found guilty after a thorough investigation, v. 20 tells Timothy what to do next: "Them that sin rebuke before (R. V. in the sight of) all, that others may also fear (R. V. that the rest may also be in fear)." Luther: "Die da suendigen, die strafe vor allen, auf dass sich auch die anderen fuerchten."

Before we take up v. 20 we should be clear on three points: 1. Paul is not speaking of an elder whose sin has made him unfit for the ministry and demands his deposition, according to 1 Tim. 3, 1-8 and Titus 1, 7. — 2. It must be a public sin, witnessed by two or three people — or more. — 3. The public rebuke must have as its aim to keep other elders from giving the same offense and to assure the congregation that the accused elder is penitent.

In the Greek text v. 20 reads: "*Tous hamartanontas enōpion pantōn elenche, hina kai hoi loipoi phobon echōsin.*" *Hamartanō*, "in general: Miss the mark, err, be mistaken, do or go wrong, wander from the path of uprightness and honor; in the New Testament: Wander from the law of God; sin." Thayer. Schierlitz: "Im Neuen Testament nur im moralischen Sinn gebrauchlich, also suendigen . . . , eine einzelne Tatsuende begehen gegen Jemand, an Jemand sich versuendigen." Participle present here denotes continuous action. The *hamartanontes* are such who have sinned and continue in their sin and have been found guilty.

Then, Paul says: *Elenche*. That means convict, refute, confute, generally with a suggestion of the shame of the person convicted. Thayer quotes Schmidt: "*Elenchein* hat eigentlich nicht

die Bedeutung 'tadeln, schmaehen, zurechtweisen,' welche ihm die Lexika zuschreiben, sondern bedeutet weiter nichts als ueberfuehren." *Elenche*, accordingly, does not mean scold, ausschimpfen, but convince and convict one of his sin. Timothy should probe the testimony, examine the witnesses and give the accused opportunity to defend himself. If the accused was found guilty he should convict him publicly. Timothy should be able to present him as one who himself was convinced and convicted of the justice of the verdict and has repented and promised to live and work according to the Word.

Winning the erring brother is *the* aim of all discipline.

The erring brother was to be reproved publicly, *enōpion pantōn*, before all, in the sight of all. Some say that 'all' includes only the elders of the congregations; others, the whole congregation. Lenski says: "They are to receive reproof 'in the presence of them all,' i. e. of all the elders of the congregation. This is not conceived as a special punishment to the sinning elder, but as a wholesome warning also for all his fellow elders, 'that also the rest may fear,' namely godly fear of sinning." P. 595-596. Wohlenberg says: "Wer sind diese 'alle', die Gemeindeglieder oder die andern des Aeltestenkollegiums? Wenn es weiter heisst: Damit auch die uebrigen Furcht haben, so ist es wohl klar, dass *hoi loipoi* nur die zu derselben Koerperschaft Gehoerenden sein koennen, wie die, welche suendigen, also Aelteste." Zorn firmly takes another view: "Die Aeltesten jedoch, die sich wirklich versuendigen, sei es, dass sie direkt gegen ihre Amtspflicht verstossen, oder sei es, dass sie durch ihren Wandel ein Aergernis geben, die soll Timotheus strafen vor allen. Vor welchen allen? Etliche Ausleger meinen: vor allen Aeltesten, weil sie es fuer zu beschaeumend halten, wenn Aelteste vor der ganzen Gemeinde gestraft werden. Andere Ausleger meinen vor der ganzen Gemeinde. Und dieser Auslegung stimmen wir auf das allerentschiedenste bei. Wenn ein Aeltester, der der Gemeinde vorsteht und die Gemeindeglieder lehrt, mahnt, straft, troestet, in seinem Amt gottwidrig handelt, oder durch seinen Wandel ein oeffentliches Aergernis gibt, so soll er ganz gewiss vor der ganzen Gemeinde gestraft werden." P. 99-100. *Hoi loipoi* are the other elders, but wouldn't they be reached too if the case were brought before the entire congregation?

Zorn's argumentation on this point is worth reading: "Wenn nun aber schon die oeffentlichen Versuendigungen und Aergernisse von Gemeindegliedern vor der Gemeinde gestraft und abgetan werden sollen und muessen, um eben nicht mehr Aergernisse zu sein, wie viel mehr die von Gemeindeaeltesten! Das ist doch klar! Nichts kann grundverkehrter, pfaeffischer und schaedlicher sein als das, dass man Gemeindeaelteste schonender behandeln will als Gemeindeglieder. Das allerbeste und segensreichste ist es aber, wenn ein Gemeindeaeltester, Diener am Wort, oder sonst Aeltester, der sich versuendigt hat, selbst frei und oeffentlich vor die Gemeinde tritt und ehrlich und demuetig sagt: Ich habe gesuendigt, ich bitte um Vergebung, ich will mich mit Gottes Hilfe bessern. Es wird ihn solches in seinem Amt nicht schaden, sondern er wird in dreifacher Ehre gehalten werden. Solches Strafen vor der Gemeinde soll aber den Zweck haben, dass auch die andern Aeltesten sich fuerchten, Furcht haben sich zu versuendigen. Und bei der Gemeinde wird solches gewiss auch gute Fruechte zeitigen."

Hina tauta phylaxēs, "that thou observe these things," shows that v. 21 also belongs to this section of chapter 5. And surely the words, "without preferring one before another," and "doing nothing by partiality," bear that out.

V. 21: "I charge thee before (R. V. in the sight of) God and the Lord (R. V. omits 'the Lord', as the words are not in the Greek text) Jesus Christ (R. V. has Christ Jesus) and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring (R. V. prejudice) one before the other (R. V. omits these words as they are not in the Greek text) doing nothing by partiality." Luther: "Ich bezeuge vor Gott und dem Herrn Jesu Christo und den auserwählten Engeln, dass du solches haltest ohne eigen Gutduenken und nichts tust nach Gunst."

Diamartyromai: To call God and men to witness; to testify, i. e. earnestly and religiously to charge. Schierlitz: "Eigentlich Gott und Menschen zu Zeugen anrufen; beschwoeren; nachher ueberhaupt bezeugen, dringend bitten, beschwoeren." Paul certainly chose a solemn word to rouse Timothy to consider earnestly v. 17-20. Some exegetes draw the conclusion that Paul was not quite sure that he could "have perfect confidence in the moral courage of Timothy." Had that been the case Paul would not

have chosen him for his responsible position. Lenski comments: "The Apostle moves in a sphere in which we should move more fully, namely 'in the sight of God and Christ and the angels.' To him the office of the holy ministry was one that was always administered and to be administered in the sight of God. As being in such an office, Timothy is to deal with its hearers. The verb does not mean 'I charge', but 'I earnestly testify', and does not apply as an affirmation to *what* is said, but applies to the *person* to whom something is said." P. 696-697.

Tōn eklektōn angelōn has caused many a headache among the exegetes. Lenski enumerates some of the commentaries on this phrase: "Simply to say that elect means 'holy' cannot satisfy, for surely then Paul would have written 'holy.' . . . It has been suggested that guardian angels appointed for the congregations are referred to. But the Scriptures know of no such special guardian angels. Some have thought of 'throne' angels, but while there are ranks among the angels, this word does not fit the word 'elect.' Finally, some think that in 3, 16 the apostles are called *angeloi*. . . . But 3, 16 does not refer to apostles but to angels. Who are the elect angels? It is plain that the angels who kept their own principality (Jude 6) are referred to." P. 697.

Paul so solemnly testifies *hina tauta phylaxēs*. *Tauta* refers to v. 17-20. Timothy should see to it that the elders 1. be counted worthy of double honor, 2. have their bodily needs supplied by the congregations; 3. be protected against slander; 4. be reproved publicly if guilty.

Phylaxēs. *Phylassō*: Guard, watch, preserve, care for, take care not to violate, observe (for instance the apostolic directions). Conf. Acts 11, 4. Thayer. Timothy should take care not to violate the apostolic directions of v. 17-20.

Then follow two warnings: 1. *Chōris prokrimatos*, without prejudice; 2. *mēden poiōn kata prosklisin*, doing nothing by partiality. Timothy should observe the apostolic directions in v. 17-20 *chōris prokrimatos*. *Chōris*: Apart from, aloof from; *without*. *Prokrima*; a hapax legomenon: An opinion formed before facts are known; a prejudgment; prejudice. Vulgata: Praejudicium. German: Vorurteil, ein vorgefasstes Urteil. Prejudices are easily formed. Like or dislike of a person involved, rumors heard about

a person, impressions of the character and temperament of a person, former incidents in his life, — all these tend to build prejudice. Beware of that, Paul warns.

“Doing nothing by partiality,” *mēden poiōn kata prosklisisin*. *Prosklisis*: another hapax legomenon: An inclination or proclivity of the mind; a joining of a party of one. Vulgata: In alteram partem declinando. German: Parteilichkeit. Luther: “Dass du nichts tust nach Gunst.” Impartiality alone could protect the elders and the congregations. And true impartiality is found only where a ‘Timothy’ acts in the sight of God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels.

How rich these five verses are in advice and instruction! The weal and woe of the church and its officers, of the servants of the Lord, are taken care of in them. Every word has to do with elders, bishops, pastors and teachers of the church. Every word concerns the men who are the stewards of God.

It’s all for us! First of all, for each pastor. *Kalōs proestōtes* is there for us. It makes us ask the question: Am I a pastor who “when the chief shepherd shall appear, shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away?” 1 Pet. 5, 4. And read the context! — Are we working in the Word and teaching? What an insolent question, you say. The point is, are we *kopiōntes*, toilers in the Word, who use up our strength in preaching and teaching and ministering? Or are we going through a routine? — How is our life? Is it an example to the believers? An offense? — Questions, yes, but questions which 1 Tim. 5, 17–20 hurls our way.

Another thought. In our church in our day we elect men who in their circles *must do* the same work which Timothy did in his day. We refer to the district presidents and the visitors. Their duties according to the Word of God, especially according to 1 Tim. 5, 17–21, must impress us with the fact that the best men we have are barely good enough for these offices. We must be guided in the selection of these officers by questions like these: Are they the best fitted for the office? Are they men who work and walk in the sight of God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels? Men who by character and temperament and piety are equipped to carry out God’s instructions? Do they have the gift of judgment? Do they appreciate the responsibility of the office? Though

their office is an honor, is that all they see in it? Will they look upon their office as a solemn obligation and trust? Will they do their work "without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality"?

In concluding this portion of this article I feel free to suggest that tremendous blessings could grow from an article on the theme: "The office of visitor in the light of 1 Tim. 5, 17-21". That office is a blessing for the visitor, the pastor, the congregation and the church at large as it is done in the spirit which Paul here impresses on Timothy.

W. BODAMER.

(To be concluded)

The Council of the Antichrist

The fact that the position of the Papacy within the Roman-Catholic Church was not more clearly defined by the Council of Trent is a cause of disappointment to modern Roman-Catholic writers. "It is," one of them declares, "a disappointment from the viewpoint of the universal Church . . . despite the fact that the Council succeeded in excluding the excesses of the Gallican-minded French prelates and the episcopalian-minded Spaniards, and that the decrees of the councils were submitted for papal approval." ¹⁾ Indeed, the Council of Trent did not enact a decree on the authority of the Pope, still less on his infallibility. This was reserved to the next Ecumenical Council, the Council of the Vatican, which defined especially in a solemn decree of the Fourth Session, July 18, 1870, the primacy and infallibility of the Pope. The Tridentine Council only declared in its Twenty-fifth Session "that all and singular the things which, under whatsoever clauses and words, have been ordained in this sacred Council, in the matter of reformation of morals and ecclesiastical discipline, have been so decreed, as that the authority of the Apostolic See both is, and is understood to be, untouched thereby." ²⁾ This is the only

¹⁾ The American Ecclesiastical Review, Vol. CXI, Dec. 1944, p. 427.

²⁾ The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, trsl. by the Rev. J. Waterworth, Chap. XXII, p. 277.

chapter that deals exclusively with the authority of the Pope, but does it in such a negative way that no conclusions can be drawn as to the scope of the Papal authority.

The Pope's legates were very much in favor of giving a clear-cut definition of the Pope's authority. Courayer in the Preface to his translation of Sarpi's *History of The Council of Trent* assures us that it certainly was not their fault that the primacy of the Pope was not decreed with "the most express wording."³) According to Sarpi himself it was in obedience to the Pope's prohibition to discuss his authority under no possible pretext that the legates refrained from touching this subject.⁴) The Pope in turn had every reason to prohibit a decisive vote on this matter because the Gallicanism and episcopalism of the French and Spanish bishops threatened to bring about a reformation within the Roman-Catholic Church which would have increased the authority of the resident bishops and decreased that of the Roman Pontiff. Yet the Pope could not prevent a discussion of this much disputed matter within the congregations of the Council.

In the congregation of the 13th of October, 1563, Guerrero, Archbishop of Granada, declared "that the pope was bishop in precisely the same manner as other bishops and that he and all other bishops were brethren."⁵) Bungener in his *History of the Council of Trent* has the Archbishop also declare "that the sole veritable inequality existing among them (bishops including the pope) is an inequality of jurisdiction, an ecclesiastical and human inequality."⁶) The passages that Guerrero quoted from a large number of writings of the Church Fathers, in which they treat the Roman bishop as "brother" and "colleague," need hardly be added here. Let it suffice to mention that the Gallicans in another congregation most strenuously denied that "the pope possessed all authority of Jesus Christ, notwithstanding all the limitations and

³) Paul Sarpius *Historie des Tridentinischen Concilii* mit des D. Courayer Anmerkungen hrsgb. von Friedrich Eberhard Rambach, § 26.

⁴) *Ibid.*, 2. Buch, p. 234.

⁵) *A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church* by the Rev. Edward H. Landon, New and Revised Ed. 1909, Vol. II, p. 220.

⁶) *History of the Council of Trent from the French* of L. F. Bungener (New York, 1855), p. 384.

explanations which were added to it.”⁷⁾ Upon this denial the Gallicans insisted very strenuously because of a chapter in which it was declared that the pope had authority to feed and govern the Universal Church. To this claim the Gallicans and Spanish bishops would by no means consent “alleging that the Church is the first tribunal under Christ and that even St. Peter himself was sent to the Church as to his judge by our Saviour, when He said to him, ‘tell it to the Church.’”⁸⁾ Despite these heated discussions and dissensions within the congregations the Pope’s prohibition to his legates carried the day. Still a straw-vote on the recognition of the Divine institution and jurisdiction of bishops, which always called forth the discussion on the authority of the Pope, resulted in at least 53 bishops out of 131 present voting in favor of recognizing the Episcopate as a Divine institution. Forty-nine bishops, many of whom also favored a recognition, had absented themselves. In order to bring things to an end, however, it was resolved to omit all notice of the institution of bishops and of the authority of the Pope.⁹⁾ Thus the “excesses” of the Gallicans and the Spanish bishops were excluded from the decrees. Nevertheless the Papal legates succeeded in weaving into the decrees of the Council statements affirming and portraying the “supreme power” of the Pope. It is the purpose of this article to present some of these statements to our readers and to show how the Pope ruled with supreme authority over the Council of Trent.

In Session VI the *Decree on Reformation* grants the Pope the title of God’s “own vicar on earth” and parallels his “provident vigilance” with “the mercy of our Lord and God” as a guarantee for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline.¹⁰⁾ As the vicar of God on earth the Pope alone is able to bring about a reformation of morals. When Clement VII in 1529 discussed with the Emperor and with his Chancellor, Gattinara, the advisability of convoking a council, the Pope insisted that he himself, as head of the Church, was the only guarantee for a correction of abuses

⁷⁾ Landon, Vol. II, p. 224.

⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 224.

⁹⁾ Ibid., pp. 226-7.

¹⁰⁾ Waterworth, p. 49.

within the Church.¹¹⁾ No less does Paul III in his *Decree on Reformation* through his legates presume the power, as God's vicar on earth, to restore ecclesiastical discipline.

It is quite in keeping with this presumption and usurpation on the part of the Pope that his power is spoken of as a "supreme power." This "supreme power" is delivered to the "Sovereign Pontiffs . . . in the universal Church." In virtue of this supreme power "the Sovereign Pontiffs . . . were deservedly able to reserve, for their special judgment, certain more grievous cases of crime"¹²⁾ and to "proceed against . . . non-resident prelates"¹³⁾. This "supreme power" of the Pope or, as it is also called, "the authority of his own supreme See,"¹⁴⁾ hardly needs a clearer definition than that contained in the words themselves. Still the far-reaching scope of this power becomes more apparent when studying it in its relationship to the Council itself.

Julius III in his *Bull for the Resumption of the Council of Trent* declared that it appertains to him as Sovereign Pontiff "to indict and direct General Councils," to "preside over the said Council" through his legates,¹⁵⁾ while Paul III at the close of the Council demanded "that the confirmation of all and singular the things which have therein been decreed and defined . . . be requested, in the name of this most Holy Synod, by the presidents, and the legates of the Apostolic See, from the most blessed Roman Pontiff."¹⁶⁾ In other words the Popes assume, as admitted and incontestable, the most contested of all the points in question, namely the supreme authority of convoking councils and of confirming their actions. This is "the third wall" of which Luther speaks in his *Open Letter to the Christian Nobility*, and argues that the Papists "have no basis in Scripture for their contention that it belongs to the pope alone to call a council or confirm

¹¹⁾ Compendium Seckendorffianum hrsgb. von G. E. Gründlern, II. Teil, p. 251.

¹²⁾ Waterworth, Sess. XIV, Chap. VII, p. 101.

¹³⁾ Ibid., Sess. VI, Chap. II, p. 51.

¹⁴⁾ Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁵⁾ Ibid., Sess. X, pp. 71-2.

¹⁶⁾ Ibid., Sess. XXV, p. 281.

its actions.”¹⁷⁾ Luther in principle did not deny the Pope the right to call a council. He only wanted “every faithful member of the whole body” of Christ to have this right to bring about “a truly free council, especially when necessity demands, and the pope is an offense to Christendom.”¹⁸⁾ Since, according to Luther, no one can do this so well as the temporal authorities, the more so since “they also are fellow-Christians, fellow-priests, ‘fellow-spirits,’ fellow-lords over all things,”¹⁹⁾ Luther concluded that the convocation of a General Council was the duty of the Emperor and the Christian Estates. Yet Luther did not regard the temporal authorities of his time as the only ones authorized to call a council. He asserts by way of comparison with a community, where a fire breaks out in the burgomaster’s house, that it is “the duty of every citizen to arouse and call the rest.”²⁰⁾ Should, however, the Pope prevent the calling of such a free council, called for the edification of the Church, he would prove himself to be Antichrist. Should he, in sheer wantonness, “pledge it, bind it, or take away its liberty,” he would be “the communion of the Antichrist and of the devil and have nothing at all of Christ except the name.”²¹⁾ Now the Popes did nothing less than to take away the liberty of the Council. They did not only authorize their legates in their respective bulls²²⁾ to open the convocations of the Council in their name with all that this implied, but even had them propose the things to be treated in the Sessions. For this purpose the words “proponentibus legatis ac praesidentibus” were inserted into the *Decree for Celebrating the Council* (Session XVII), which was passed in spite of the opposition of four Spanish bishops, who argued “that the clause being a novelty, ought not to be admitted, and that it was, moreover, injurious to the authority

¹⁷⁾ Works of Martin Luther, Philadelphia, 1916, Vol. II, p. 77.

¹⁸⁾ Ibid., p. 77.

¹⁹⁾ Ibid., p. 78.

²⁰⁾ Ibid., p. 78.

²¹⁾ Ibid., p. 79.

²²⁾ Waterworth, Bull of Indiction . . . , p. 4; Bull for the Resumption of the Council of Trent . . . , p. 71; Confirmation of the Council, p. 286.

of oecumenical councils.”²³) Adding insult to injury Pope Paul III authorized his legates in a special Breve, dated the 22nd of February 1545, to prorogue, remove, and dissolve the Council, whenever the interest of the Papacy demanded it. Thus the Popes made unrestricted use of their authority over the Council, the translation from Trent to Bologna in the Papal States being another case in point. All this was in direct contrast to the “Catholic verity” decreed by the Councils of Constance and Basle, “that a general council, lawfully called, can neither be dissolved, nor transferred, nor prorogued by the pope’s authority without the consent of the council itself.”²⁴)

Nevertheless, the Pope did pride himself with being “so favourable to the liberty of the Council, as even to have,” by letters written to his legates, “voluntarily left the said Council free to determine concerning matters *properly reserved to the Apostolic See.*” (Italics ours.) He even repeats this claim and says that “the sacred and holy Synod, with the most perfect liberty and diligence, treated of things touching the sacraments and other matters.”²⁵) All this is maintained in the Bull of Pius IV touching the Confirmation of the Ecumenical and General Council of Trent. This Bull, however, contains a thing quite unheard of even in the annals of papal despotism. It is nothing less than to forbid “patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and all other prelates . . . even though distinguished with the honour of the cardinalate, under the pain of excommunication, to presume, without authority, to publish, in any form, any commentaries, glosses, annotations, scholia, or any kind of interpretation whatsoever of the decrees of the said Council.” Not “even under the pretext of greater corroboration of the decrees, or the more perfect execution thereof, or under any other colour whatsoever,”²⁶) was this to be done. In other words, the Pope did not only reserve the power to confirm the code of the Council, but even published

²³) Landon, p. 207; cf. Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent by the Rev. H. J. Schroeder, O. P., St. Louis 1941, p. 124 (translation), p. 398 (text).

²⁴) Landon, Vol. II, pp. 87f.

²⁵) Waterworth, p. 286.

²⁶) Ibid., p. 288.

“a prohibition against studying its meaning . . . the last possible step that can be taken in the subjugation of the conscience and of thought.”²⁷⁾

Yet this prohibition is again but a negative expression of the Pope’s supreme authority over the Council. Its most positive expression is to be found in *Session XXV on Reformation*. While the Council of Basle declared it to be “Catholic verity that a general council has authority over the pope as well as all others,”²⁸⁾ the Council of Trent “as the holy Synod enjoins on patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and all others . . . that they promise and profess true obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff.”²⁹⁾ To this obedience they were bound by an oath. The oath which many Italian bishops had to swear ran thus: “I engage to preserve, to defend, to augment, to advance the rights, the honours, the privileges, and the authority of the holy church and of our Lord the pope; not to take part in any deliberation, any act, any transactions, in which there is set on foot, against our said Lord or the said church (*contra ipsum dominum nostrum vel eandem Rom. Ecclesiam*), any thing whatsoever contrary to, or to the prejudice of their rights, their honours, their position, and their authority.”³⁰⁾ The oaths sworn by the bishops of other countries comprised similar clauses incompatible with the liberty of members of a free Christian council.³¹⁾ At least the prelates, who alone were entitled to vote at the Council of Trent, were not free on those points under discussion on which the Pope had already pronounced a decision. How, therefore, could a reformation of doctrine and practise be brought about by bishops, who were not absolved from such an oath? This question was raised by Luther and the Lutherans and led to the demand that the bishops would have to be loosed first of all from obligations by oath to the Pope, before they, the Lutherans, could regard the Council a “free Christian Council.”

²⁷⁾ Bungener, pp. 533f.

²⁸⁾ Landon, Vol. II, p. 87.

²⁹⁾ Waterworth, Sess. XXV, On Reformation, Chap. II, p. 255.

³⁰⁾ Bungener, pp. 58f.

³¹⁾ Cf. Luther’s or Rhegius’ writing, *Why and How a Christian Council is to be a Free Council, to which Several Oaths of the Papists are Added*. 1537. St. Louis Ed., Vol. XVI, pp. 2109ff.

The Council of Trent, however, failed above all in being a "free council" by decreeing in the Fourth Session "the unwritten traditions . . . preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession."³²) These traditions, as Melanchthon carries out in a writing for the Convent at Frankfort (1546), are made "to confirm the power of the Pope."³³) Instead of obeying the authority of the Pope we are admonished by the Apostles, Melanchthon reminds us, to obey God above all things, who rules the Church by means of His Word and the Gospel as an eternal and incorruptible testimony of His Divine Will. This Gospel must be preached even if the *potestas ordinaria* forbids it or decrees traditions contrary to the doctrine of the Apostles. It is significant that the delegates of the Convent of Frankfort protested primarily against the usurped superiority, authority, and jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop, as also against the "cognition" and "knowledge" of the Council, wherever it does not agree with the Scriptures.³⁴) This was an attack on the arsenal of tradition, the stronghold of the Papacy. It was a demand that Rome "should lay down all pretensions to the primacy, that she should cease to be *the Church*, so as to be no more than *a church*, the sister, the fellow of those new churches, born but as yesterday according to her, and whose very existence, according to her, was no better than a permanent crime. In brief, it was to require that Rome should commence by embracing, if not the Reformation, at least the fundamental principle of the Reformation."³⁵) Rome did the very opposite. In the Bull of Pius IV on the *Confirmation of the Council* the Pope declared: "If anything therein (decrees of the Council) shall seem to anyone to have been expressed and ordained in an obscure manner, and it shall appear to stand in need on that account of an interpretation or decision, let him *Go up to the place which the Lord hath chosen* (Deut. XVII, 8); to wit, to the Apostolic See, the mistress of all the faithful, *whose authority the holy Synod also has so reverently acknowledged* (Italics ours). For, if any difficulties and controversies shall

³²) Waterworth, Sess. IV, p. 18.

³³) Compendium Seckendorffianum, IV. Teil, p. 367.

³⁴) Ibid., p. 369.

³⁵) Bungener, p. 29.

arise in regard of the said decrees, We reserve them to be by Us cleared up and decided, even as the holy Synod has Itself in like manner decreed." ³⁶⁾

The counterpart to the decree demanding "a profession of true obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff" is the anathema on those who refuse this obedience and declare their disobedience. Julian III in his *Bull for the Resumption of the Council of Trent*, into which he embodied the clauses and decrees contained in the letters of his predecessor, Paul III, threatened everyone, who should presume to infringe his will and decree with "the indignation of Almighty God, and of His blessed apostles, Peter and Paul." ³⁷⁾ Therefore the Council did not only enjoin bishops and archbishops to promise and profess true obedience, but to "express their detestation of and anathematize all the heresies that have been condemned by the sacred canons and general councils, and especially by this same Synod." ³⁸⁾ "The extirpating of heresies" stood forth as the first of two chief reasons for the assembling of the Council of Trent. "For the sake of which chiefly It is assembled" we read in *Session The Third*. Since Luther in his "Open Letter" had directed his attack against "the three walls" of the Romanists and especially against the supreme power of the Pope, he was regarded by the Council as the heresiarch of the heretics, whose "errors" certainly were the "principal errors" which the holy Synod "made it Its especial care to condemn and anathematize." ³⁹⁾ In the course of the proceedings of the Fifth Session the legates already had informed the Pope, as Sarpi informs us, that a remarkable unity of opinion existed among the fathers in contradicting and condemning the Lutheran doctrine, and even had sent a copy of the anathema which they had drawn up. ⁴⁰⁾ There is, of course, no direct mention made of Luther and the Lutherans in the decrees of the Council. No "heretic" is mentioned by name. The decrees either speak merely of "heretics," "innovators," "schismatics," whose errors are "preached up in

³⁶⁾ Waterworth, Sess. XXV, p. 288.

³⁷⁾ Ibid., Sess. X, p. 72.

³⁸⁾ Ibid., Sess. XXV, Chap. II, p. 255.

³⁹⁾ Ibid., Sess. XXV, p. 280.

⁴⁰⁾ Rambach, 2. Buch, p. 305.

opposition to the Catholic Church,"⁴¹⁾ or in a still more general way: "If any one saith that . . . let him be anathema."⁴²⁾ Still it was Luther who, in his writings and confessions, was ever present in the congregations to the fathers of the Council. Sentences extracted from his writings were first of all drawn up and then discussed by the prelates and doctors. As regards the doctrine of justification no less than 25 Sentences were listed and submitted in 55 congregations to the 45 members of the Council for examination. Already on the 18th of June, 1546, one day after the Fifth Session with its decree on Original Sin, the secretary of the congregation was authorized by the legates to place the subject of grace on the agenda. He read from a publication composed by Papal divines declaring that all of Luther's errors rested on "this unheard-of doctrine of justification by faith alone."⁴³⁾ Not till the following year, on the 13th day of the month of January, 1547, the *Decree on Justification* consisting of no less than 16 Chapters and 33 Canons headed by the Proem was celebrated in the Sixth Session. In this Session the Council of Trent had already accomplished its main purpose, that of extirpating heresies by "most strictly forbidding that any henceforth presume to believe, preach, or teach, otherwise than as by this present decree is defined and declared."⁴⁴⁾ The Seventh Session, the last but one prior to the translation of the Council to Bologna, was also celebrated for no other purpose than "for the completion of the salutary doctrine on Justification" and "in order to destroy the errors and to extirpate the heresies, which have appeared in these our days on the subject of the said most holy sacraments."⁴⁵⁾

A council thus desirous of extirpating Lutheran heresy certainly must have shown little desire to have Lutheran heretics appear in person at the Council. Indeed, it was only due to the insistence of the Emperor and of his ambassadors that a "safe-conduct" was given to the Protestants, "especially those of the Confession of Augsburg," in the Fifteenth Session, and that the

⁴¹⁾ Waterworth, Sess. VI, Chap. IX, p. 36.

⁴²⁾ Ibid., pp. 44, 173.

⁴³⁾ Rambach, p. 355.

⁴⁴⁾ Waterworth, Sess. VI, p. 30.

⁴⁵⁾ Ibid., Sess. VII, pp. 53f.

ambassadors of Lutheran princes finally gained a hearing in a General Congregation of the 24th of January 1552. This Congregation held its Session in the dwelling of the Papal Legate, Crescentius. It was attended by the German Electors, by all the bishops, and by the ambassadors of the Emperor and of King Ferdinand, who otherwise did not attend the sessions of the congregations. The Duke of Wuerttemberg's envoys were the first to appear before this congregation. They were followed immediately by the two ambassadors of Maurice, the Elector of Saxony, Wolf Koehler and Leonhard Badehorn. The latter saluted the bishops by the title of *Reverendissimi Amplissimique Patres et Domini* and in his address, most likely composed by Melancthon, insisted (1) on the Council being free and Christian, and that the Pope should be declared inferior to the Council; (2) on the doctrines being determined and decreed by the Scriptures; (3) on the Protestant divines having a deliberative voice at the Council; (4) on the decrees of the past sessions being reviewed; and finally (5) on the safe conduct being drawn up anew.⁴⁶⁾ This address was a strong protest against the supremacy of the Pope over the Council, the Church and the Scriptures. It contained demands which the Pope could not accept without ceasing to retain his supreme power over the Council,⁴⁷⁾ and to which the legates and bishops could not submit as long as they refrained from repeating and supporting the "Catholic verity" that the Council is superior to the Pope.⁴⁸⁾ The Papal legates and the bishops, in taking Badehorn's speech into deliberation, were facing two alternatives, either to embrace the principle of the Reformation, the supremacy of the Scriptures, and to let them alone have "vocem decisivam," or to accede to the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff and to let him have "vocem decisivam." The

⁴⁶⁾ Paul Sarpi's Geschichte des Konziliums von Trident ins Deutsche übersetzt von W. Winterer, 2. Bd., 2. Ab:lg., pp. 196ff; Bungener, p. 256.

⁴⁷⁾ According to Ranke, Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation, the Pope declared the addresses of the Protestants in the Congregation to be "extravagant und gottlos," and exclaimed: Unter dem Namen Missbrauch soll man uns das nicht angreifen, was kein Missbrauch ist; man soll unsere Autorität nicht antasten. 5. Bd., p. 84.

⁴⁸⁾ Landon, Vol. I, pp. 87-8.

Council chose the latter and therefore also refused the request of the Protestants to make the Pope a party to the "safe-conduct." Even in its revised form the safe-conduct did not contain the name of the Pope. The Pope had not submitted, even not 'from charity and compassion,' to receive and protect the Lutheran heretics by a safe-conduct. And the Council in its decree had only declared itself "ready . . . both to receive them kindly and to listen to them favourably, and trusting that they will come, not with the design of obstinately opposing the Catholic Faith, but of learning the truth, and that they will at last, as becomes those zealous for evangelical truth, acquiesce in the decrees and discipline of holy Mother Church." ⁴⁹⁾ Once more, in the third period of the Council, in the XVIII Session celebrated on the 18th of January, 1562, the bishops granted to the German Nation a "safe-conduct." This time the Protestants were called to defend their writings which had been placed on the Index. This Index had originally been drawn up under the eyes of Paul IV by the Inquisition of the Roman States. As such already it was "a monument of Papal despotism." Although this invitation granted them "to propose, speak, and treat of, examine and discuss any matters whatsoever together with the said Synod, and freely to present and set forth all whatsoever they may think fit," ⁵⁰⁾ still its final purpose was to "let them be moved and converted by this so charitable and salutary an admonition of their own mother; for as the holy Synod invites, so will It embrace them with all proofs of love." ⁵¹⁾ It is needless to say that the Protestant theologians, who only would have come to the Council with the Bible in their hands, had no intention of coming to recant writings based on the Bible truth. The outcome of this invitation was, on the one hand, the "Recusations-Schrift" of the Lutherans at the Council of Fulda in September of 1562, and on the other hand, the "Ten Rules" of the Romanists concerning prohibited books drawn up by bishops chosen by the Council of Trent and approved by Pope Pius. These "Ten Rules" contain the names of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin,

⁴⁹⁾ Waterworth, Sess., XV, p. 122.

⁵⁰⁾ Ibid., Sess. XVIII, p. 135.

⁵¹⁾ Ibid., p. 134.

Balthasar Friedberg, Schwenkfeld and others as those of heresiarchs, whose "books . . . are absolutely forbidden." ⁵²⁾

The augmenting of the Papal power and the consequent condemnation of heresies were in reality the two main results of the Council of Trent. Clement VII had foretold them in his meeting with Charles V at Bologna in 1529. According to Sarpi ⁵³⁾ he had pointed out to the Emperor that the authority of the Papacy had never been impaired by councils. On the contrary, councils had not only acknowledged the supreme power of the Pope, but the Popes had succeeded in increasing their power by these very councils. Clement VII also presented to the Emperor for consideration the foregone conclusion that the Lutheran "heretics" would be condemned by the council which the Emperor wanted the Pope to convoke. As just such an instrument the Council of Trent is being regarded and evaluated by modern Roman-Catholic writers. "The council," we are told, "was not trying to effect dogmatic progress but simply to formulate Catholic doctrine and defend it against recent attacks which were either revivals of ancient heresies or the assumption of frankly revolutionary positions." ⁵⁴⁾ Therefore the Council was summoned, according to another Romanist, in order to condemn the heresy of the heresiarch who made himself guilty of "an open and defiant revolt against the authority of the Church" and "an attempt to wrest from the Pope the power of convoking, presiding over (in person or through his legate or delegate) and of confirming a General and Ecumenical Council." ⁵⁵⁾ While these writers do not overlook that in tracing a program for Trent the Popes "always mention reform as one of the aims of the council," still they claim that the Popes themselves do not regard this as the foremost purpose. The Fifth Lateran Council (1512-1517) had also passed decrees, "which," we are informed, "if they had been carried out would have effected the needed reform." ⁵⁶⁾ How-

⁵²⁾ Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent by the Rev. H. J. Schroeder, O. P., St. Louis 1941, p. 273.

⁵³⁾ Rambach, I. Buch, p. 211f.

⁵⁴⁾ The American Ecclesiastical Review, Vol. CXI, p. 423.

⁵⁵⁾ Ibid., Vol. CX, p. 196.

⁵⁶⁾ Ibid., Vol. CXI, p. 426.

ever, "it was a point of the greatest importance," this writer continues, "that the Protestant position should be declared heterodox. From now on everyone would be perfectly sure what the mind of Rome was." ⁵⁷⁾

To Romanists it must, indeed, be a cause of great disappointment that the position of the papacy, the positive counterpart of the condemnation of heresy, was not more clearly defined by the Council of Trent. It even seems to make them blind to the fact that the Jesuit Lainez addressed the Council on the 20th of October, 1562, for two whole hours and laid down the principle that "the first and only foundation on which the Church has been built, in so far as it is a divine building, but destined to perpetuate itself on earth, is St. Peter," that "nothing is changed, nothing can be changed, in this primitive order: it is in the pope therefore," Lainez concluded, "that we have to look for the plenitude of power and jurisdiction," that "there is not, and there cannot be, anything infallible except in the pope." ⁵⁸⁾

Luther and the Lutheran Estates had no other alternative in view of the Council of Trent than to define the position of the Papacy as that of the Antichrist. The very fact that the Pope usurped the power either to prevent a council or to bind it and take away its liberty, to interpret the Scriptures by mere authority, gave Luther a Scriptural justification to speak of the decrees and canons of the Council as "heretical" and of the Pope as "Antichrist." ⁵⁹⁾ The Lutheran Estates in their *Recusations-Schrift* of 1546 also stated with so many words that the Council of Trent "did not deserve the name of a council" ⁶⁰⁾ because it is "contrary to the divine Word and to Christ Himself" ⁶¹⁾ and that there are no people on earth whose deeds and nature are more opposed to Christ our Lord and His doctrine "than the companions of the Roman Bishop and of his Council," and therefore are to be regarded as "the real, true Antichrist." ⁶²⁾ In short, to Luther

⁵⁷⁾ Ibid., p. 427.

⁵⁸⁾ Bungener, p. 391. Cf. W. Winterer, 4. Bd., 1. Abtlg., pp. 48ff.

⁵⁹⁾ Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II, p. 79.

⁶⁰⁾ Luthers Sämmtl. Schriften, St. Louis, Bd. XVII, p. 935.

⁶¹⁾ Ibid., p. 937.

⁶²⁾ Ibid., p. 941.

and the Lutheran Estates it was quite clear "what the mind of Rome was," long before the Council ever convened. Therefore they endeavored to make it clear to "future generations" also, that the Council of Trent was nothing less than the Council of the Antichrist.

P. PETERS.

A Brief Summary of an Exegetical Study on the Length of the Days of Creation

The following facts and claims which may be advanced in support of the contention that the "yom" of creation may not be literal "yom" or day were considered:

A) The word "yom" is used in three different meanings in Gen. 1 and 2:

- 1) In the meaning of a half day (1, 5a);
 - 2) In the meaning of a full creation day (1, 5b);
 - 3) In the meaning of the time of creation in general (2, 4).
- If a meaning other than the literal is found in 1, 5a and 2, 4, then the creation "yom" of 1, 5b may also not be a literal day.

B) The creation "yom" is not described as consisting of light and darkness; but as coming to its termination as "it became evening and it became morning," signifying the ending of one and the beginning of another "yom." Evening (erebh) and morning (boqer) may here be used in a transferred sense indicating the "evening" or end of one period of time, and the "dawn" or beginning of another.

C) Perhaps Gen. 1, 1-3 describes an indeterminate period of time preceding the first day of light and darkness. If so, then the first creation "yom" mentioned in 1, 5b is an undefined period of time, and the same would hold true of the following days.

D) Gen. 2, 1-3 does not say that the seventh day was ended. The usual closing formula "it became evening and it became morning" is not employed here. This may lead to the conclusion that the seventh day includes the period beginning with the termi-

nation of the work of creation and reaching to the end of the world. If the seventh day should be such a longer period of time, the six preceding days must also be properly conceived to be periods, since these "days" are co-ordinated in Ex. 20, 11a and Ex. 31, 17. Heb. 4, 4 and 9-10 seems indirectly to support this claim.

The evaluation of these points was as follows:

Of A) In 1, 5a and 2, 4 the context indicates that the literal sense of "yom" must be departed from. It also indicates exactly the other meaning intended. This is not the case in 1, 5b where the "yom" of the creation is mentioned. We must, therefore, abide by the literal sense. If the literal sense were not intended, "olam" could have been used.

Of B) Nothing forces us to depart from the common use for "evening" and "dawn" of "erebh" and "boker." The dusk of evening merges into night, and night terminates with the dawning of a new day. Thus "erebh" and "boker" are the terminations of the two halves of a day in the ordinary sense of the word, and in the creation story describe the passing of a literal day.

Of C) Exodus 20, 11 and 31, 17 clearly state that everything was made within the period of six days, leaving no room for a period of time preceding the first day. Nor can anything be adduced to show that any day preceding the fourth, differed in length from the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh, which were 24 hour days, since they were measured by the heavenly bodies.

Of D) At best this argument could only be an argument from silence; but since there is a very evident and natural explanation for the absence of the closing formula, it cannot be used as an argument at all. Each of the preceding six days was a creative day. On each of them a definite portion of the work of creation was begun and ended. Mention of the ending of the six creation days indicated not only the completion of each day itself, but also the completion of the portion of creative work undertaken with the beginning of each day. The seventh day was different from the preceding six. It was not a creative day. On it no creative work was begun and ended. Nothing was ended on that day except the day itself. God's rest, begun on that day, did not end

with it. The blessings with which the day is filled did not end with it. For all these reasons it is most natural that no mention should be made of the ending of the day itself. In fact, it would seem strange if the ending of this day were mentioned.

Besides, the fact that Ex. 20, 11 and 31, 17 coordinate all seven days leaves no room for assuming the seventh day to be a period. For since points A, B, and C indicate the preceding six days to be literal days, the seventh must also be considered to be a literal day.

Nor does Heb. 4, 4 and 9-10 have any bearing on the question of the length of the seventh day. True, God's rest, begun on the seventh day, still continues. But we cannot conclude, that because the rest continues, the day on which it began must also continue. The same pertains to the blessings with which God filled this day. The fact that they are still in force being restored to us in Christ, does not say that the day and the blessings are of equal duration. Otherwise we could also reason that the day on which a peace treaty is signed, must necessarily be of the same duration as the blessings resulting from the peace that was made on that day.

Thus understood, Gen. 2, 3 loses none of its comforting power. It speaks of abiding blessings, intended for man and dedicated to man with the day itself. The day passed but the blessings were to endure, to be enjoyed in the complete harmony of man and God, with its resultant rest, contentment, peace, and happiness for man. These blessings were spoiled by sin, which disrupted the blissful communion of God with man; but what was lost by the fall was to be restored in Christ. The Mosaic Sabbath (a temporary shadow) drew its meaning from the day upon which God ceased His creative work to cause His blessings to flow continuously upon all mankind. It reminded of these blessings and their loss and foreshadowed their restoration in Christ — a restoration which is ours now in faith and which we shall fully enjoy when according to Heb. 4, 9 we shall enter into God's never ending rest. Thus nothing in Heb. 4, 4 and 9-10 indicates that the seventh day has not ended, nor is a departure from the literal sense of "yom" necessary to give this passage its meaning.

As evident, this study leads to the conclusion that the creation days are literal days, and that the same is true also of the seventh day.¹⁾

OTTO J. ECKERT.

¹⁾ For further study of Genesis 2, 3 our readers will undoubtedly welcome the following references to our Synodical literature: Synodalbericht der Missouri Synode, Michigan Distrikt 1889, p. 68; Theological Monthly, Vol. 4, 1924: "The Length of a Creation Day" by Prof. Paul Kretzmann; Lehre und Wehre, Bd. 22 (1876), p. 150: "Das Hexaemeron im Verhältnis zur Geologie" von P. Eirich; A. B. in Theological Quarterly, Vol. 9, p. 171; C. M. Zorn, "The Whole Christian Doctrine in Genesis 1-5"; Synodalbericht der Missourisynode, Minnesota Distrikt, 1888, p. 22: Referat von Pastor C. Ross; Synodalbericht der Missourisynode, Südl. Distrikt, 1912, p. 43: Referat von Prof. R. Pieper; Die Epistel an die Hebräer von C. M. Zorn, p. 14; Quartalschrift, Jahrgang 23, pp. 267ff.: "The Sabbath" by Professor J. Meyer. Luther's and Melanchthon's interpretations of "the seventh day" should not be overlooked: St. L. Ausgabe I, p. 99; III, p. 56, Par. 6; Annot. Phil. Mel. In Genesisin. — The Editorial Staff.

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

† Dr. M. Willkomm. † — The Ev. Lutheran Free Church of Germany has suffered a grievous loss in the death of Dr. Karl Martin Willkomm on the 1st of June, 1946. While its ranks have been thinned by the enlistment and the captivity and even the death of a number of its pastors, still the loss of its outstanding theologian in a time when very far-reaching discussions are being carried on with the other Free Churches of Germany will be deeply felt by our brethren overseas and by those of us, who are aware of the valuable service which Dr. Willkomm by the grace of God has rendered the Free Church and the Synodical Conference. As members of the Wisconsin Synod we will not fail to recall and to remember that Dr. Willkomm has been the theological teacher of all the pastors of our Poland Mission.

Born in India, January 23, 1876, he came to Germany when his sainted father, the Rev. Dr. O. Willkomm, severed his connections with the Leipzig Mission and the Saxon state church for confessional reasons and was called to serve congregations in Germany belonging to the Saxon Free Church, of which he later became president. In Niederplanitz, Saxony, our Dr. Willkomm attended the parish school and then the local Gymnasium, from which he graduated with high honors. He then came to America to receive his theological training at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis. In 1898 he was ordained and installed as assistant pastor in Planitz. From 1905—1919 he served the Free Church congregation of Muelhausen in Alsace and then succeeded his father as pastor of St. John's congregation in Planitz. As President of the Free Church of Saxony a. o. St. Dr. Willkomm on the 15th of November, 1922, dedicated the Seminary buildings at Berlin-Zehlendorf to the service of the Triune God and on October 2, 1923, was called as Director of this theological seminary. Here he served the Church for twenty-two years as professor of Dogmatics and Church History, as editor of the church-paper, *Die Evgl.-Luther. Freikirche*, and of the theological journal, *Schrift und Bekenntnis*, and finally as author of various writings, especially on our Lutheran Confessions (Conf. April number, 1946, of the *Quartalschrift*, p. 148). June 7, 1934, the Faculty of Concordia Seminary conferred on its alumnus the honorary title of Doctor of Theology. The last and certainly not the least valuable service which Dr. Willkomm rendered the Free Church, for which he had so often entered the lists against attacks of the state churches, was to write his comments on the theses which formed the basis of the discussions carried on with the Breslau Free Church. In a letter written to the undersigned on April 29, 1946, he mentions that he and his wife had left the Hindenburg Hospital in Kleinmachnow, where the Lord had granted them, to use his own words, "eine Zuflucht fuer den Winter," and had returned to their former dwelling in one of the bombed buildings on the Seminary

grounds, and then adds: "Students have not yet arrived; still we hope that some will come again." Untiring in his labors for the Free Church and its theological school he had cherished the hope of beginning a new semester and of welcoming the first post-war students, although he would have had to do it in great bodily weakness, of which he speaks in his letter, and in the midst of the ruins which World War II had wrought. His Lord willed otherwise. Suffering for years from a heart-ailment Dr. Willkomm died of a stroke. His work was done in the ecclesia militans and the ecclesia pressa when his Lord thus called him home. "Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them" (Rev. 14, 13). R. i. p.

P. PETERS.

What Modernism Will Do to a Church. — The Northern Baptists held their largest convention in many years in Grand Rapids about the time of the recent railroad strike, May 21-26. There were over 4,400 registered delegates.

Some of the matters on which the convention deliberated and adopted favorable resolutions were, according to a correspondence in the *Christian Century*: collective bargaining; full employment; minimum wage; responsible protection from health and accident hazards; fullest cooperation in interdenominational affairs; equalization of the rate of release of conscientious objectors from work camps with army demobilization; amnesty for imprisoned objectors; recall of the President's personal ambassador to the Vatican; civilian control of atomic energy. The convention denounced peacetime conscription and war as a method of settling international disputes. — Here we have, presented without blushing, a comprehensive program of the social gospel.

The convention discussed also confessional matters. There was a fierce struggle between fundamentalists and liberals, both during the convention and in an "energetic pre-convention campaign." We are interested chiefly in one point of disagreement. A motion was introduced by a delegate from Arizona "that the convention forbid boards to employ secretaries or missionaries who refuse to affirm 'as true and trustworthy . . . the record of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ as stated in Matth. 1 and Luke 1 and 2, . . . the record of the resurrection of Jesus Christ as stated in Matth. 28, Mark 16, Luke 24, and John 20 and 21, . . . the record of the miracles of Jesus as given in the Gospel.'" The motion further demanded that they "be required to affirm 'that the New Testament is inspired of God in all its contents and that the acceptance of its historical facts, revelation, teachings and doctrines is obligatory in Christian faith and practice'."

This motion was defeated because, as one pastor put it, it "committed the denomination to 'creedalism'." When a pastor said in support of the

motion that "a vote for this resolution is a vote for the New Testament and a vote against it is a vote against the New Testament," his remarks caused "rumblings of dissent" from the audience; but when he declared that "a vote against it is a vote against our Lord Jesus Christ who purchased us with His own blood," he was greeted with boos from the floor.

A substitute motion was finally carried by a large majority: "We reaffirm our faith in the New Testament as the divinely inspired record and therefore a trustworthy, authoritative and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. We rededicate ourselves to Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior and call our entire denomination to the common task of sharing the whole Gospel with the whole world."

If it were not for the background against which these words must be viewed, they might be greeted as a fine confession. As it is, they must put us on our guard over against pronouncements coming from church leaders who as such show an excessive interest in social and civil affairs. Moreover, "the words were good," remarks *Christian Life*, "but no one had to sign them."

M.

Doctrinal Discussions of Lutheran Free Churches in Germany. —

The *Lutheraner* of May 14, 1946, brought the first report on the conferences held by the two largest Lutheran Free Churches in Germany, the Lutheran Free Church in Prussia, known as the Breslau Free Church, and the Ev.-Luth. Free Church of Germany, formerly the Free Church of Saxony a. o. States. This report, sent by President P. H. Petersen, Berlin-Steglitz, and dated March 3, 1946, spoke of favorable progress made by the two Free Churches in their deliberations, stating that agreement had been reached in the doctrines of Inspiration, Predestination, and of the Church and the Ministry, and that discussions on Chiliasm, Conversion of the Jews, and the Antichrist were to follow. The *Lutheraner* of June 11, 1946, further informs us that letters written on the 20th and the 24th of April by Chaplain B. L. Danner, who also attended these conferences, and by President Petersen, contained further information and also the theses and documents forming the basis and the result of these discussions and conferences. All this is borne out by Dr. M. Willkomm, deceased, and President Petersen in letters written to the undersigned on the 29th of April and the 17th of May, 1946. Dr. Willkomm wrote: "We have had doctrinal discussions with the "Breslauer" which have progressed favorably and which will be continued, also with other Free Churches in Hannover and Hesse." Rev. Petersen's remarks read: "Here in Berlin we have had several conferences and have been able to determine that we agree more or less in all points of the Lutheran doctrine. Certainly, difficulties will undoubtedly yet have to be overcome. But it is our earnest desire to bring about a union of the Free Churches into one United Lutheran Free Church."

These are indeed favorable and gratifying reports, which give promise of a strong Lutheran Free Church in Germany. We can only pray that, God willing, such a Free Church united in a Scripturally well-founded union of doctrine and practice, may be the result of these discussions and may bring about a spread of orthodox Lutheranism in the land of the Reformation.

P. PETERS.

World Relief. — The relief work which the churches of America and of Europe are doing for European and Asiatic war sufferers has undoubtedly never been equalled before. *War Relief Services* — *National Catholic Welfare Conference* reports through its chairman, Samuel Cardinal Stritch, that during the past three years more than \$70,000,000 in relief and welfare have been administered in 47 countries in Europe and the Far East. Last December *War Relief Service* collected, processed, and shipped abroad 24,640,000 cans of food. A similar campaign launched May 12 was expected to raise 25,000,000 cans of food. *Lutheran World Relief* reached its original goal of 2,000,000 pounds of clothing in April, while its Action-Goals for 1946-47 amount to \$10,000,000 to be raised by eight Lutheran Synods, of which the United Lutheran Church has by far the greatest confirmed membership of 1,236,172 with a goal of \$4,972,482.12; the Danish Lutheran Church the smallest number of confirmed members with a goal of \$56,463.62. The *Missouri Synod* alone has raised or allocated no less than \$912,118.49, and is daily adding to this amount. The *Ev. Luth. Church of Australia* is co-operating with our sister-synod in relief work in Europe and Asia having contributed to date (June 4, 1946) \$15,000. Among the Reformed Churches the *Seventh-day Adventist Church* has launched a nation-wide relief program to send food to Europe and Asia. In addition to appropriations already made by this denomination, the 3,500 Adventist churches in our country hoped to raise \$500,000 for a famine relief fund on May 4. The food program supplements a clothing relief drive. An allocation of \$250,000 for famine relief was made by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. at its monthly meeting in May, while an additional \$450,000 had previously been donated for relief purposes. To date (May 9, 1946) the *War Relief Commission of the National Association of Evangelicals* has sent \$654,000 worth of relief to Europe. Our Wisconsin Synod *Committee on Relief for War-Sufferers* reports on June 22 that 165 congregations shipped 93,256 pounds of clothing and contributed a total of \$60,000.00 since its appeal to all our congregations several months ago.

Of all European cities the food situation seems to be most critical in Vienna, where the majority of the people is living on 800 or 900 calories daily. Here the *Friends* have eight representatives distributing food mostly to adolescents and to 9,000 children under six years of age. The *Quakers*

provided large quantities of clothing and also distributed food to 3,000 children who are in camps awaiting deportation to Germany. *War Relief Services* has also announced the arrival in Austria of its first shipment of relief goods amounting to more than a million pounds valued at \$353,909. In Hungary the food situation seems to be hardly less critical. Hungarian pastors are living on the equivalent of one American dollar a month. Lutheran congregations in Hungary have received 10,000 Swiss francs (about \$2,500) through Dr. Sylvester C. Michelfelder. The money was contributed by Lutherans in the United States. Hungarian Lutherans also have received food, medicine, and clothing donated by Swedish congregations. A German relief committee has been established in the Russian zone composed of church agencies and secular groups. Forty-three tons of sugar purchased with funds provided by the Missouri Synod have been prepared for shipment from Basel. Leaders of the *German Caritas*, Roman Catholic charitable organization, sent 1,000,000 marks for relief work into the Russian occupation zone. Deportations have caused a "terrific problem" for the churches in Germany, Dr. Otto Iserland, director of the *Office for Relief of Postwar Germany in Geneva*, declared, and cited as an example the fact that many Catholics are going into the northern areas of Germany where there have been few Catholics and where churches are now being hard pressed to provide for the refugees.

In view of the transportation difficulties and of the large number and the large amount of these shipments the question can readily be answered whether all the goods sent actually reach the people for whom they are intended. They do not, sad to say. There are transportation difficulties and military restrictions to cope with, which undoubtedly have resulted in food supplies, particularly vegetables, being destroyed in some European countries. There are the small groups of Free Church members in Europe, both of Reformed and Lutheran churches, to whom no representation has been extended. President H. P. Petersen of the Ev. Luth. Free Church in Germany informs the undersigned in a letter written May 17: "Because of all kinds of untoward events the administration of relief does not yet seem to function as it should. We here in Berlin have as yet not received any food or clothing." Since then the *Hilfswerk*, relief agency of the Evangelical Church, the only Protestant relief agency recognized by the occupational authorities, has extended its representation to Free Churches. (Conf. R. N. S. 5, 14, 1946.) *The Lutheran Witness* of June 4, 1946, speaks of Rev. H. Petersen and Mr. John Schneider, treasurer of the Freikirche, as members of the *Deutsche Hilfswerk*. In all other countries of Europe the Missouri Synod is sending its material to representatives of *Lutheran Relief Committees*, in China and India the work is done under the direct supervision of its own missionaries. As a result our brethren have the assurance that the great bulk of their relief endeavors is serving the purpose for which they are giving. No less do the other Protestant bodies and the Roman Catholic agencies have this assurance,

having received acknowledgment of relief sent not only from their representatives but from the respective government or from the military authorities. Large as these shipments and collections have been in the past the churches of America are bending every effort "to assure greater collections and also wider distribution of food on the basis of need, regardless of race, nationality or creed."

P. PETERS.

Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel, 1945. — The first post-war theological journal to reach our shores from Europe is the bi-mensual magazine, *Theologische Zeitschrift*, published by the Theological Faculty of the University of Basel, Switzerland. It is being edited by Professor Dr. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, a former professor of the University of Bonn, who for many years had been editor of the *Theologische Blätter*. Members of the editorial committee are Professor Ernst Staehelin, Professor Walter Baumgartner, and Professor Oscar Cullmann, formerly of the University of Strassburg. The first three issues of this periodical appeared in 1945. Three issues of 1946 are at hand. The "Inhaltsangabe" of the previous issues cover all aspects of theology, philosophy, and comparative religion such as: Zu den vier Reichen von Daniel, Auferstehung des Fleisches oder des Leibes?, Ueber Notbauten theologischer Fakultäten und christlicher Hochschulen seit der Reformation, Kulturelle Leistungen der Sumerer und ihre Nachwirkungen im alten Orient, Alte und neue Wege des Humanismus, Ursprung und Anfänge des slawophilen Messianismus in Russland, together with "Miszellen", for inst. alttestamentliche Wortforschung, and "Notizen und Glossen." While it undoubtedly is saying too much that "for many years to come the Th. Z. will be the only theological magazine in the German language," still it promises to become a "truly international magazine." The Notizen und Glossen offer American readers the much needed information about events in both the Protestant and Roman-Catholic camps of Central Europe. We do not want to withhold some of these interesting facts from our readers and therefore list the following from the January-February, March-April, and May-June issues of 1946:

The Publishing House J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, is again publishing the *Theologische Rundschau* and the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*. The Roman-Catholic firm, Herder, Freiburg i. Br., has announced that the *Stimmen der Zeit*, a well-known theological journal edited by Jesuits, will put in its appearance in April, 1946. A monthly, *Die Wandlung*, which, to judge by its name and the two articles listed may be compared with "Zeitwende" published after World War I, is being edited in Heidelberg, publishers Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag. Interesting in this connection is the report that to date (end of January, 1946) the editors of the *Theologische Zeitschrift* have received no review copies of theological periodicals from Holland, Great Britain, and only one, *Theology Today*, from America. Since May the *Journal of Theological Studies* from Great Britain and the *Harvard Theological Review* from America have reached their desk.

The "Personalmeldungen" contain the following facts of interest: Professor G. Kittel of Tübingen, who was the editor-in-chief of the *Neutestamentliches Wörterbuch* and after the annexation of Austria professor in Wien, has not only been forced to resign, but is a prisoner in the American Zone of Occupation. Professor P. Althaus, the well-known professor of systematic theology at Erlangen, is not any longer Rektor of the University. Professor Karl Barth, the most outstanding Reformed theologian of our day, is delivering "Gastvorlesungen" at Bonn during the summer-semester. He was to have lectured at Berlin, January 2, 1946, and a large gathering of students was expectantly awaiting his coming. The Rektor of the Berlin University, Dr. Stroux, however, had to inform the audience that because of "ungünstiger Verkehrsverhältnisse" the professor could not hold his lecture. He was to speak on *The Evangelical Church in Germany*. Dr. H. Sasse, Erlangen, has become the successor of Professor K. Preuss in Church History. W. Künneth, who since 1932 had been Director of the Apologetische Zentrale in Berlin and author of the book "Antwort auf den Mythos," has been appointed "Honorarprofessor" by the University of Erlangen.

In addition to these "Personalmeldungen" a sketch of the history of some of the universities and theological faculties during the war-period is briefly recorded. We are informed that on the 30th of November, 1943, the University of Oslo was closed. Twenty-five professors and 1,200 students were imprisoned. Of these 700 were transported to Germany, among them the Old Testament scholar, S. Mowinckle. At present there is a great influx of students to this University. Also the so-called "Gemeindefakultät" in Oslo, which is independent of the University and represents a more conservative trend in theology, has again begun its course of studies. No less than 228 students and 23 candidates have matriculated. Four professors and a number of readers and lecturers are conducting the courses. The Faculty in Montpellier is a theological school of the same order as the Gemeindefakultät in Oslo. The characteristic of this school, which is also independent of the University, is said to be "la communauté." Here the students experience the benefits of dormitory-life with daily chapel-services conducted alternately by one of the students. The students form groups in order to carry on a study of the Bible in common. Lectures for three hours every morning and advanced classes for specialized studies are the order of the day. The aim of this Faculty is not so much to educate the students to be "theologians," but rather to be "pastors" and "missionaries." Therefore the students are called upon to preach in their second year. Their first sermon, called *apokalypse*, is delivered in the presence of the whole student-body. The other sermons are heard and criticised by the classmates and the respective professor. At present sixty students including three women are studying at this seminary. Mention can also be made of the Hus-Faculty in Prague, Czecho-Slovakia. It

was forced to close its doors in December of 1939 and was replaced by the Czecho-Slovakian Church. The number of theological students at May of 1945 the Hus-Faculty was reopened. It is divided into two Sections: The older and enlarged Evangelical Section and the Section for the Czecho-Slovakian Church. The number of theological students attending this University runs up to 240, of which 130 belong to the Evangelical Section, 110 to the Czecho-Slovakian Section. The University of Bonn has no more than 100 students, being outdistanced by the Theologische Schule in Wuppertal, which has a refectory for its students and which as a "Kirchliche Hochschule" is enjoying the patronage of the church authorities. The University of Giessen, founded May 19, 1607, by Landgrave Louis V of Hessen-Darmstadt, has been closed. Only 40,000 of the 750,000 volumes of the University Library have escaped the ravages of World War II. This closing of the *Ludoviciana* appears to be final.

The deaths of two church-historians are recorded, that of Walter Köhler (born 1870), professor at Giessen, Zürich, and Heidelberg since 1929, who wrote works on the Reformation Period, especially on Zwingli, and that of Eberhard Vischer (born 1865), who was professor of Ancient and Medieval Church History in Basel since 1907.

P. PETERS.

More About the Unearthed Burial Urns. — In the October, 1945, number of the *Quartalschrift* we quoted a *Religious News Service* report on "eleven early Christian burial urns . . . discovered in a cave on the Jerusalem-Bethlehem road" containing "an historical confirmation of the trial and crucifixion of Christ" and "lamentations by Jewish disciples on the passion and death of Christ" (p. 283). Many American and British newspapers brought similar and even more fantastic reports including a statement to the effect that the "Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic inscriptions may have been carved only a few days after Calvary." At the same time warnings of experts, not to draw hasty conclusions, were voiced and also printed by the newspapers, one of which we added to the report of the R. N. S. (p. 284). Thanks to *The Biblical Archaeologist* we can now present an account of experts to our readers taken from a dependable report by a correspondent of the British Broadcasting Corporation, who was granted an interview with Professor Sukenik of the Hebrew University at Jerusalem and with Mr. Robert Hamilton, Director of the Palestinian Government Department of Antiquities. According to this report "we are dealing . . . with the discovery of a square funerary chamber hewn in the soft limestone rock of the country-side and provided with eleven *loculi*, or burial recesses, each containing an ossuary. 'A number of these ossuaries were inscribed in Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek with the names of the deceased, such common Jewish names as Miriam, Simeon and Matthew'. 'One of the ossuaries bore on each of its four sides a cross drawn in charcoal', and 'on one side of the ossuary marked with the crosses there

was scratched the name Jesus in Greek letters, followed by a word which in ancient Greek is used as an exclamation of sorrow'. From the pottery in the tomb and from the character of the script used in the *graffiti* it was concluded that the burials were made not later than 70 A. D."

Taking this account of the experts at its face value, there still remains "a cross drawn in charcoal" on one of the ossuaries together with "the name Jesus in Greek letters, followed by a word which in ancient Greek is used as an exclamation of sorrow," which "can of course, be nothing else," as *The Biblical Archaeologist* (February, 1946) tells us, "than the word *ouai* 'woe', or 'alas', which is commonly found on ancient funerary inscriptions in the Near East" (p. 17). Do not these facts, we ask, justify the conclusion that we are dealing with a find of "Christian burial urns," picturing "the trial and crucifixion of Christ" and "lamentations by Jewish disciples on the passion and death of Christ?" Dr. Carl H. Kraeling of the Yale Divinity School, whom we have been quoting from *The Biblical Archaeologist*, asserts that every one of these conclusions is unfounded with the possible exception of the first one. Whether "the people whose names were associated on the ossuaries with crosses were Christians" is evaluated by him as "the only real question raised by the find." As to the other conclusions, however, they are proven by him to be beside the mark. The name Jesus on an ossuary together with the sign of the cross, he points out, has been found as far back as 1873 in Jewish sarcophagi on the "mount of Offence" near Bethany. Besides containing the names Salome, Judah, Simeon son of Jesus, Martha, Eleazar (Lazarus), and Salampson, the Greek inscriptions also provide the name Jesus and Maria. The name Jesus appears no less than three times, twice with a cross. Since the combination of the name of Jesus with a cross alongside appears twice, however, the conclusion that these ossuaries have something to do with Jesus of Nazareth and his crucifixion must be ruled out. With it "the lamentations by Jewish disciples on the passion and death of Christ" are also ruled out.

Again in 1931 an ossuary was discovered with an Aramaic *graffito* "Jesus son of Joseph" without the accompanying cross. While the combination of Jesus and Joseph "appears as a most striking coincidence, the evidence from the ossuaries indicates," however, "that Jesus (O. T. Joshua) was one of the most common names, as was also the name of Joseph" and that "we shall never know whether this or any other ossuary bearing the name Jesus ever had anything to do with Jesus of Nazareth because ossuaries so inscribed are already too numerous" (p. 19).

But the sign of the cross, many a reader will say, certainly justifies the conclusion that these burial urns were those of Christians. Whether their names represent persons whom we know from the Gospel stories or not, yet the fact that their names appear with a cross should characterize them as Christians. But even in view of such a significant sign on the ossuaries *The Biblical Archaeologist* warns us not to be too hasty in draw-

ing even this conclusion. The writer, Dr. Kraeling, remains doubtful whether the "crosses in the form of a plus sign (Latin cross) found in Palestine had a Christian significance." "One could of course imagine," he writes, "that crude crosses written in charcoal served merely to distinguish ossuaries and burials of one family from those of another sharing the same tomb. Again it would be possible to suppose that the crosses had apotropaic significance, being intended to guard the bones against evil demonic powers that might disturb the repose of the deceased." At this juncture Dr. Kraeling points to the funerary and dedicatory inscriptions of Palmyra, where crosses appear in "contexts that are relatively pagan," while "crosses in demonstrably Christian contexts are relatively late." Does this latter fact, however, support the theory of New Testament scholars, as Dr. Kraeling seems to imply, that the Jewish Christians of Palestine "did not make the death of Jesus on the cross as central a fact in their interpretation of his significance as Paul did, for instance?" We know that the Judaizers did not do this, but they were not only to be found in Palestine, but also in Asia Minor, Greece and Rome. Nonetheless, the significance of the crosses on the ossuaries remains a problem to the archaeologists and it is therefore good news to hear that Professor Sukenik, "the world's greatest authority on Jewish ossuaries," is preparing a full study of all the Jewish ossuaries. Whether he succeeds in clearing up all difficulties and in being able to answer all pertinent questions remains to be seen.

P. PETERS.

Empty Vessels in Palestinian Tombs. — Pottery vessels holding food and drink which the dead were thought to need in the after-life are found in rich abundance in every Egyptian and Canaanite tomb. The Jericho tomb, dating c. 2500 B. C., contained some 800 pottery vessels, as *The Biblical Archaeologist* (February, 1945) informs us. These vessels and other implements, which the deceased were to use in after-life, are evidence of a very materialistic view of life after death. Are these materialistic evidences also to be found in Hebrew tombs? Did the Israelites also adhere to this custom when burying their dead? What answer is archaeology able to give us to these our questions? In asking these questions we must, in order to avoid confusion and even error, distinguish between the Israelite after the flesh and the Israelite after the Spirit. Any archaeological evidence for the "belief" of the unbelieving Israelite will naturally be on a level with the archaeological evidence which we have of the Egyptian or Canaanite belief in immortality. If such evidence for belief in immortality is found in Palestinian tombs, it is but evidence of the Israelite's departure from the faith of his fathers and a sign of his having fallen back into the religion of his heathen neighbors. But are such vessels holding food and drink to be found in Palestinian graves?

Professor Ovid R. Sellers of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, writing in *The Biblical Archaeologist* (February, 1945) on *Israel's Belief in Immortality*, answers thus: "Hebrew graves, like Canaanite graves, contain vessels and implements which presumably were to be used by the deceased in the after life" (p. 15). If Professor Sellers' presumption is correct, then we simply have an evidence of Israelites patterning their burial customs to those of their very nearest neighbors. But Professor Sellers' assumption is apparently not the last word of the archaeologists on this subject. Professor G. Ernest Wright in the same number of *The Biblical Archaeologist* calls our attention in his *Additional Remarks On Ancient Burial Customs* (p. 17) to the interesting fact "that in the hundreds of Palestinian tombs which have been excavated, not a single remnant of food or drink has been found in the vessels," at least so far as this noted archaeologist has been able to determine. From this absence of food and drink in the vessels Professor Wright concludes: "This situation indicates that the dominant view of the after-life was not as materialistic as it was in Egypt."

The American Journal of Archaeology (July-September, 1945) commenting on these interesting articles of *The Biblical Archaeologist* adds that the same can be said concerning "the references to the hereafter in the Old Testament, . . . when compared with the numerous and elaborate references in Egyptian literature," that the very nature of these references is a proof of a "more sober approach to the whole subject," that "the Israelite was content to affirm his belief in a life beyond without indulging in futile and base speculation as to what the nature of that life might be" (p. 364).

While these findings and observations on the part of archaeologists, in as far as they are factual, must conform to God's inspired Word and to the revealed truth which was Israel's heritage, yet they are of the greatest importance from an archaeological point of view and must be considered, even if only negative in their nature, as one of the greatest finds in archaeology. In other words, even the empty vessels in Palestinian tombs must testify to the great truth concerning Israel's non-materialistic view of life after death.

P. PETERS.

Büchertisch

The History of Christian Doctrine by E. H. Klotsche, A. M., Ph. D., D.D., Professor at Western Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebraska, and the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary at Maywood, Illinois. — Last Chapter by Prof. J. Theodore Mueller, Th. D., Ph. D. — XVI plus 349 pages, 6×9. Blue cloth with gold title on front cover and backbone. Price: \$3.00. — The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa.

As the number of pages indicates, this is a rather brief presentation of a subject on which many volumes could easily be written — so vast is the material involved, and so wide is the territory covered by the author. Yet, Dr. Klotsche, who died "in the midst of reading his manuscript for publication" nine years ago, eight before his book was offered to the public, in spite of the limitation of space, comprehensively presents and evaluates the rich material in an easy and attractive style. The book can be highly recommended to every pastor. He will find in it a simple yet thorough survey of the development of doctrine in all its phases from the beginning of the church to the present day.

The entire history is divided into three periods, as follows: I. "Origination and Development of Doctrine in the Patristic Age." — II. "Development of Doctrine in the Middle Ages." — III. "Development and Fixation of Doctrine through the Reformation and Counter-Reformation." The material is presented in thirty chapters, allotted to the three periods in the following groups: 1-10; 11-16; 17-30. A table of "Contents," covering more than nine pages, materially aids the reader in a quick orientation. — The "History" proper is preceded by an "Introduction," in which some necessary definitions are given (e. g., the distinction between *doctrine* and *dogma*) and both the Gentile and the Jewish background of early Christianity, and the early Christian proclamation are briefly sketched.

We are sorry to say that the beauty of the book is marred somewhat by a number of inconsistencies in spelling and numerous typographical errors generally.

M.

Scouting in the Light of Scripture. By a committee appointed by the Pastoral Conference of Milwaukee of the Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. 16 pages, 5×7½. Price: 15c; doz., \$1.50; hundred, \$10.00. — Northwestern Publishing House.

Concerning the origin of this tract we find the following statement in the Introduction: "This brief treatise on Scouting was prepared by a committee appointed by the Pastoral Conference of Milwaukee. . . . The committee originally submitted this treatise under the heading, 'Theses on Scouting in the Lutheran Church.' The theses were adopted by the Conference, and the committee was asked to publish them."

Following is the table of contents: PREAMBLE: Our Lord's Instruction, "Try the Spirits." — I. The Secular Elements in Scouting. — II. Scouting's Intrusion upon the Field of Religion. — III. Scouting's Perversion of Fundamental Scripture Truths. — IV. The Lord's Injunction and Plea, "Be Ye Separate."

Pastors and teachers will find this treatise a commendable refresher course on the burning issue of Scoutism. It might be well to keep in mind the closing words of the introduction which tell us that "this pamphlet has been prepared for study and not for light reading. 'The signs of the times' call for earnest study and prayer."

A. SCHALLER.

Scouting in the Light of Holy Scripture. By Erhard C. Pankow. Essay adopted by, and published at the request of, the Milwaukee City Pastoral Conference (Wisconsin Synod). 32 pages, 5½×8. Paper covers. Price: 25c; doz., \$2.40; hundred, \$16.00. — Northwestern Publishing House.

In spite of the similarity in the title, this is not a duplicate of the other treatise discussed in this number. While the treatise referred to emphasizes the fact that it was not prepared for light reading, but for study, and brings the facts concerning Scoutism in a very concentrated fashion, this essay brings quite a good deal of historical material and quotations from Scout literature. Pastor Pankow has rendered the Church a valuable service by publishing this exhaustive study of the Scout movement. Its distribution among the members of our congregations and frequent discussions based upon it by our pastors and teachers will bring home to our people the importance of evaluating the Scout movement according to the Scriptures and showing forth its dangers to the Church.

The sub-title reads: *The Boy Scouts of America*, and the contents are summed up under three main headings as follows: I. *History and Organization*. The origin of Scouting; Scouting comes to America; Organization; the long-span program of Scouting; support of the movement; aim and purpose of Scouting. — II. *Scouting in the Light of Holy Scripture*. Scouting brings into its program the element of religion; Scouting, in its statements and pronouncements on matters that pertain to religion, confuses and perverts the clear teaching of the Holy Word of God on the subject of: A. "God"; B. "Duty to God"; C. "Church"; D. Moral righteousness, the means whereby it is to be effected and the motives from which it is to flow. — III. *Scouting in the Lutheran Church*. Implications of membership; conclusion; the Scriptural stand over against Scouting.

It adds to the value of this essay that the writer compiled his data from authoritative sources in Scout literature, using only the latest editions of the publications listed in the bibliography.

A. SCHALLER.

The Spirit of Lent. By Theodore Heimarck. 162 pages. Green cloth. Title in silver on front and backbone. Price: \$1.50. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis.

Another series of Lenten discourses. In order to give our readers a hint concerning the contents, we shall first bring the chapter headings: 1. The Judgment in the Lord's Supper. — 2. On Hindering God. — 3. The Song in Lent. — 4. Jesus and Our Scheme of Things. — 5. The Garden in Lent. — 6. Free, for What? — 7. The Tears in Lent. — 8. Self-Sacrifice in Lent. — 9. Lent and Self-Examination. — 10. Lenten Memories. — 11. The Lenten Cross in Our Today.

We earnestly invite our pastors to read this book, but to read it critically. They will find in it much that may displease them. On the other hand they will find it thought-provoking, written in a captivating style, for the author also makes some excellent and very wholesome observations.

Unfortunately the series gets off to a bad start, as anyone of us can gather from the topic. The discourse is based on 1 Cor. 11:29. That in itself is a danger signal. We deny any preacher the right to say concerning the Lord's Supper that "here as nowhere else, we stand with fear and trembling before the revelation of the frightful penalty of sin, exposed so shockingly in the suffering and dying Lamb of God." Why "here as nowhere else"? Why not speak of fear and trembling and judgment in connection with John 3, 16? The word *edoken* in the latter passage includes everything which is indicated by the body and the blood of our Lord in the Holy Supper. The frightful error made in this as in so many sermons on Holy Communion rests on the false premise that the offering in the Lord's Supper is essentially different from the offering made in the "comfortable word" of the Gospel. Nothing is farther from the truth! Christ's words, "Take, eat, this is my body given for you; take, drink, this is my blood shed for the remission of sins", are purest Gospel. How dare His called servants presume to becloud its precious comfort with threats of judgment and drive His saints to fear and trembling? Let every preacher who speaks in this wise challenge our dear Savior for not even hinting at the supposed peril which threatened His disciples whenever they prepared to celebrate His Supper. This common error rests on a superficial interpretation of the above text. Let those who propose to preach on it be fair with God's Word and study the entire context beginning at verse 17. If they do this prayerfully, they will very likely decide not to use verse 29 as a text for a confessional address. True, the receiving of Christ's sacred body and blood brings judgment upon the unbeliever. So does the unbeliever's refusal to accept the preaching of the Gospel. Yet no evangelical preacher would think of coupling that threat of judgment with the proclamation of "God so loved the world", or with "Come unto me, all ye that labor". How, then, can we dare to do this when we invite "the church of God, them that are sanctified with Christ Jesus, called to be

saints" to eat and drink of Christ's body and blood, those sublime tokens of His pardoning mercy, those precious pledges of our eternal inheritance?

There are other objectionable features in these sermons, but lack of space prevents us from discussing them here. We leave them to the discerning power of those who will read the book. But we wish to point also to some of the excellencies hinted at in the beginning. We rejoice over the fact that the author takes occasion again and again to point out how utterly unable we are to produce of ourselves anything which might meet with God's approval. We quote from the discourse in chapter four, on a double text from Luke 7, "Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. — And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven." Here are the quotations: "Somewhere in our very being is a twist that honors the 'selfmade' man and disdains the life of grace. Is anything more discouraging than a full realization of the fact that after those hundreds of years of preaching about 'grace alone', people still feebly define Christianity as 'doing the best one can'?" — "Jesus can make only that good which is willing to confess that it is no good. Jesus is the help of the helpless, the physician of the sick, the bringer of life to the dead. 'Other refuge have I none', we sing so sentimentally, and yet no one ever really understands it until he has tried every other refuge. Goodness is not something we gain. It is a gift of God in Christ. Our gifts of love wait the day when we will recognize this, the day when we see in Him the only hope left, the day when we understand better the offense and the stumblingblock of the Cross." . . . "All our good works and all our prides of life that we had figured on lugging into His presence as the purchase price of eternal approval, all these look tawdry and cheap at the foot of the Cross. Our whole scheme of things goes awry when the Lord of Life stretches out His loving hands of healing and forgiving."

What child of God can help but delight in words such as these?

A. SCHALLER.

Breakfast Table Autocrat. The Life Story of Henry Parsons Crowell by Richard Ellsworth Day. Moody Press, Chicago, 1946. Price: \$3.00.

Anyone who wants to gain a closer acquaintance with the history of the Moody Bible Institute and with the work and life of the President of the Board of this Institute, Henry Parsons Crowell, "whose industrial skill made possible its present giant stature," should read this biography.

P. PETERS.

* * * *

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.

Volume 43

October, 1946

Number 4

OPENING ADDRESS

based on

1 Tim. 3, 1: If a man desire the office of a bishop,
he desireth a good work.

Delivered in the Seminary Chapel at Thiensville on
September 17, 1946.

Dear Young Friends:

Our text speaks about men who aspire to the bishop's office. The very fact that you are present here as enrolled students of our Seminary indicates that you also are seeking the bishop's office, the holy Ministry. Our school offers no other courses than such as may help a man in doing a minister's work. Let me, then, this morning point out to you some practical implications of striving for the Ministry. Let each one ask himself the question:

Are You Truly Desiring A Bishop's Office?

To facilitate self-examination and to enable every one to find the correct answer, let us approach the main question from three different angles.

I.

Do you realize that a bishop's is an excellent work?

A "good work," says our English Bible. Paul did not use the word *agathos*, but *kalos*, which means a "fine work," a "noble task"; or as Luther translated: *ein koestliches Werk*.

The work of the Ministry is not merely useful to men, helping them in various ways. It is much more than that, it is noble, it is excellent in character.

In its effects it compares favorably with any other work that may be mentioned. Consider just a few.

The work of government certainly is beneficial. Government protects us in life and limb, protects our family and property, our good name and reputation, protects us in the pursuit of happiness. It develops and regulates communication by mail, by wire, by radio; transportation by land, by water, by air. It encourages agriculture and industry. It provides sanitation and education. It raises the standard of living, not only economically, but ethically. It discourages vice and fosters civic righteousness. Certainly, all beneficial activities.

Or, think of the work of a physician and surgeon. He relieves pain, heals wounds, cures diseases, saves lives. Certainly, most beneficial. And also noble: for in doing his work a physician must sacrifice his comfort; and often he saves a life at the risk of his own.

Or, think of the social workers, who relieve misery, spread valuable information on hygiene and other subjects, curb vice and clean up moral cesspools. Who would deny that they are doing beneficial work?

Yet all of these works deal only with life here on earth. They benefit our bodies and the natural life of our souls. They do not help the spirit.

What is it that our spirit needs? It needs above all the assurance of reconciliation with God. Our sins separate between us and our God. They bring down God's wrath upon us. What a terrible state when a heart realizes this rupture! There is no rest nor peace. There is no joy nor hope. There is fear and despair, a terrible waiting of the impending doom. . . . God is our life. To be separated from God spells nothing short of eternal death.

Here the pastor's work sets in. He is to comfort the people, proclaim liberty to the captive, new life to the dying. He is to inject hope into the despairing heart. Whether he preaches a formal sermon from the pulpit, or whether he privately counsels an individual on his deathbed, his aim is always to assure his hearers of their reconciliation to God.

His entire work is centered in this one thing: Jesus Christ, and Him crucified for the sins of the world.

This is indeed a most excellent work, although it is not so regarded by the world. Paul's experience is repeated over and over in our time, who said that he preached Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness. The world does not want to be reminded of its sin. It does not want to be disturbed by the thought of death and eternity. Men are trying to forget. They may be vociferous in demanding that a pastor should devote his efforts to improvements here on earth. They do not object when he denounces vice, and demands a cleaning up; but they do resent his preaching about sin and about the only salvation in Christ.

There lurks temptation for the pastor in this attitude of the world, not only that he might adapt his message to the whims of the people, but that he lose sight of the singular excellency of his work.

You, my dear friends, who are here to prepare for the Ministry, whether you are just entering our school, or are returning for a new year of work, are you truly desiring a bishop's office? Do you realize that a bishop's is a most excellent work? the most noble work on earth?

II.

Ask yourself a second question:

**Do you give evidence that you really
desire this work?**

There are some who look upon a pastor's office as a "job," as just another way of earning an honest living. They reason: there are congregations that want pastors, just as there are banks that want clerks, or business houses that want salesmen. There are many professions in organized society, and the Ministry is one of them.

If any man conducts his Ministry in this spirit, or prepares for the Ministry in this spirit, he is not truly desiring a bishop's office. He is merely looking for a position and the

income that it provides. He may be very active in his work, and he may appear successful, yet his desire is not really for the bishop's office, but for something that is connected with it outwardly.

The desire for a bishop's office springs from an altogether different source. Jesus emphasized it when He reinstated Peter. Three times He asked him: Dost thou love Me? Ask yourself this question, therefore: Do you intend to do your studying, particularly the studying of your Bible, because your heart is hungry for Jesus? Only if you yourself realize what agony it means to be without Jesus, and that only in Jesus can true consolation be found, and if you are doing your work first of all so that your own heart may be established by grace, only then can you, with real resolve, desire a bishop's office.

You will give evidence of it by the zeal with which you apply yourself to your work. The spiritual troubles of the souls, for which you are to furnish relief in your pastor's office, though essentially one, are innumerable in form and appearance. From your own experience you know that your personal troubles do not come in the same guise every day. — You are desiring a bishop's office? Are you manifesting your desire by faithfully, strenuously preparing yourself to face any eventuality? to help souls in their manifold afflictions?

God gave us His Bible. The Bible deals with but one problem, the problem of sin, and offers but one solution, the grace of God in Christ. But the Bible holds up this problem of sin in many different ways, and indicates the proper diagnosis in every case, and also shows the many different ways of applying the remedy. The Bible can never be exhausted. No matter how intensively you search, and how long you persevere, you will always find something new that had escaped your notice before.

If you, then, truly desire a bishop's office, you will manifest it by tireless efforts in studying your Bible. There are other subjects to be studied for a bishop's office, but, important though they may be, they have no independent value, they are of value only in so far as they lead into a wider and deeper understanding of the Bible.

Moreover, desiring a bishop's office means sacrifice. There are many things in ordinary life, comforts and conveniences, that a pastor must be ready to forego. If he insists on having them, he would thereby indicate that his desire for the bishop's office is not genuine, at least not quite pure and unadulterated. There are also numerous harmless pleasures which a Christian in the ordinary walks of life may indulge, but from which, because of the weakness of some, a pastor must refrain, in order not to hamper his work by giving offence to some weak conscience.

This applies also to students preparing for the Ministry. Are you ready to deny yourself things that the world in general enjoys? Or do you insist on an unrestricted use of your Christian liberty? and this, no matter who may be offended? And do you highhandedly demand: let the offended brother prove that what you did is a sin? Paul was ready to forego the use of many rights and privileges in the interest of the weak, in order to save some everywhere.

III.

Are you truly desiring a bishop's office? Ask yourself a third question:

Are you ready to receive the work as a gift from God?

Remember, it is God's work. Everything, yes, everything that pertains to this work down to the minutest detail, is of God and belongs to God. Consider some of these things.

There is first of all the foundation on which a bishop's work rests. That is the redemption won by Christ. The task to redeem a lost and condemned world was assigned to Him alone. He, the eternal Son of God, took upon Himself human nature with all its infirmities. The Word was made flesh. The God-Man was the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, because the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all, and made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made in Him the righteousness of God.

The Savior performed this work alone without any assistance from anybody. He fulfilled the Law for us, He

suffered the penalty. He alone. Not only did His disciples sleep when His great struggle began in Gethsemane, and then deserted Him, but when the conflict reached its height on Calvary, He was forsaken by God Himself and hung there during the fiercest part of His battle in dismal solitude.

"It is finished," He exclaimed in triumph. He had finished it, He alone. Now it is finished. Nobody can add anything to it. It is His work entirely.

If it were not for the redemption of Christ there would be no bishop's office. It rests on His work. He established the office for us with His own blood.

The work of the Ministry is performed by means of the Word. Human wisdom can add nothing to it. In fact, as soon as human philosophy is mixed with the Word in any form, the Gospel is changed into another which is not another. The Gospel, and the Gospel alone, is the power of God unto salvation. Our Ministry is dependent on the Gospel. If it were not for the Gospel there would be no bishop's office.

Still more. The time when the Gospel is to be preached in a certain place, and the place itself where it shall be preached, are all in the hands of God. We have no choice in the matter. God must open the door for us, just as He opens the hearts to receive His Word.

Do you consider this? Are you ready to go when God calls you? and wherever He may send you? The bishop's office which you desire is a gift from God.

It is so in another sense. You who are desiring a bishop's office are not your own. Not only did God create you body and soul; not only did He endow you with the natural gifts, both of body and mind, that are necessary for performing this work: you are bought with a price, and the Holy Spirit taught you to call Jesus your Lord. Also the special training which you are receiving in preparation for the Ministry, and the special ability which you may develop, they are all from the Holy Ghost, who divides to every one according as He wills.

When you aspire to a bishop's office you are not giving something to God. You may think that you are offering your

services; but really, you are offering God nothing but what He first gave you. Your ability to serve in a bishop's office is a gift from God.

There are also different forms of service connected with the bishop's office: there are pastors, assistant pastors, itinerant pastors, missionaries, professors, teachers in parochial schools, and so on. Furthermore, God may call for different lengths of time. There are certain forms of work which require a definite period of time, others an indefinite period. The choice is not yours. Are you willing, whatever work God may assign to you, to accept it as a gift out of His hand? Just as you are willing to wait till He calls you, and to go wherever He sends you?

You may feel that you do not properly measure up to all of the requirements. Do not therefore be discouraged. No man is perfect. Even Paul admitted that he had not yet attained. On the other hand, do not relent in your efforts nor in your prayers for progress, as Paul also, forgetting what was behind, kept on pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. God's grace is sufficient, and it is ready for you.

May God bless both you and us in our endeavors during the coming year.

M.

CALVINISM: ITS ESSENCE AND ITS MENACING IMPACT UPON AMERICAN LUTHERAN DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE

Essay delivered by the Rev. E. Arnold Sitz at the Fifteenth Biennial Convention of the Southeastern Wisconsin District assembled at Thiensville, Wisconsin, June 24-27, 1946

Our subject covers a tremendously wide field. Its handling therefore sets the task of sifting out the essentials and calls for drastic condensation. Moreover, closer study has brought the conviction that, alongside Calvin, Zwingli has exerted a greater influence on Reformed theology and practice than he is generally credited with. Much that is found on the pages of history under the title of Calvinism really should be denominated Zwinglian. This holds true in eminent degree of the Reformed churches in America, using the term "Reformed" to cover all Protestantism in this country outside the Lutheran. True enough, since the terms "Calvinist" and "Calvinism" were invented by Heshusius and Westphal they have stood in Lutheran nomenclature as being quite identical with the term "Reformed." Nonetheless, in order to be exact in our terms we ask the privilege of widening out the term "Calvinism" in our title to a degree actually covering the whole Reformed household. It should then read something like this: THE REFORMED SYSTEM: ITS ESSENCE AND ITS MENACING IMPACT UPON AMERICAN LUTHERAN DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.*

* After measuring the scope of our topic the conviction grew that it had been unwise to accept the assignment. Not only that years are required for gathering and ordering material, and a busy pastorate in a resort city forbids it, but that the material itself in the form of an adequate theological and historical library was lacking. Like many another pastor's collection of books, mine takes its character largely from its deficiencies. I borrowed a classic from the library of Pastor F. Uplegger, however. It was Schneckenburger's "Vergleichende Darstellung des lutherischen und reformierten Lehrbegriffs." While it has always been accepted as the last word

Permit an important remark before we launch out into the body of the essay. It is that true Calvinism must be credited with a more Scriptural, more sober-minded, and more fundamental position than is generally done in Lutheran circles. In reading their confessions, in following the argument say of leading Scotch divines, one cannot but underwrite their position in many of the essentials, as one could not but be sympathetic toward the direction in late years in this country called the Westminster movement, of which men like Machen and McCartney were exponents. They contended better for the truth than those who are usually called "Fundamentalists" in the United States, for the latter too often vitiate their witness by their vagaries, for instance their general bent toward a gross millennialism.

on its subject, it has certain lacks. Aside from its involved style, Schneckenburger draws on later Lutheran and Reformed dogmaticians as his sources, scarcely mentioning the prime movers, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, and excluding almost entirely the confessional writings of their respective communions. As a result his approach to Lutheran doctrine is not only often oblique, but occasionally in error, notably in the case of the Lutheran doctrine on election. Again Schneckenburger's bent lies toward the philosophy of religion. He fails therefore throughout to relate any of the teachings he discusses to the revealed Word of God, but confines his criticism of certain positions to logical or philosophical grounds. A third lack is his apparent ignorance of, at any rate his silence, shared by Lutheran theologians generally, on English and Scotch theology, to say nothing of American trends. Nevertheless, Schneckenburger's book offers a valuable study in comparisons.

Within the past two months a welcome windfall dropped into my lap. A friend of mine, Dr. Wm. Magill Schultz, who comes from a long line of doctors, and whose family tree roots in the Schwenkfeldianer of Luther's time, made me the recipient of a considerable library of books, which included besides Hodge's and Shedd's Systematic Theologies the rare and coveted three-volume "Creeds of Christendom" by Schaff. Even so the handicaps proved so formidable that it had been wise a year ago to have thrown in the sponge with the explanation that what I might have to write would not only prove fragmentary, but also lacking in proper documentation. As it is, it will have to be passed largely as the flawed crystallization of desultory reading during thirty years, coupled with such personal observations as one makes in going to and fro in one's small world, and walking up and down in it.

I. Luther; Zwingli; Calvin

No movement, no new direction, radical change, or revolution can be understood in the abstract or absolute. These phenomena can be grasped only in concomitance with the persons, life, thinking, capacities, and characteristics of the principals, men who at once are the expression and the leaders of the new movements of their times. It would be impossible to know Lutheranism without knowing Luther's times, his life, and writings. Neither can one master the leading thoughts of Protestantism, nor understand what is going forward in the Protestant churches of today in America without a fair knowledge of the early reformers, Luther (1483-1546), Zwingli (1484-1531), and Calvin (1509-1564).

It would not be possible within the compass of this treatise to give even a short biographical sketch of these principal actors; but a thumbnail comparison must be attempted. For both positive and negative qualities in leaders and movements have a way of working their way throughout the history of the movement. Take the classic example of the Episcopal Church. The three streams that rose at the beginning of its history from the Anglo-Catholic high church fountain of Henry VIII, from the Lutheran low church spring in the reign of Edward VI, and the broad church pool, surcharged with Presbyterianism under Elizabeth, have flowed together in the streambed of Episcopalianism, like the braided flow in some of our western river-beds, for four centuries and will flow thus with periodic diversions into the Roman Catholic Church, mirroring again the reaction of bloody Mary, till the end of its existence.

So let us begin with Luther. As we know, his was a deep consciousness of sin; it was a matter of conscience before God. In a long and agonizing search for peace he found it finally in the Gospel of free forgiveness in Christ. Supreme to him was Christ; no authority could rise for him above that of the Holy Scriptures. As he himself said, "Ein Wort Gottes kann mir die ganze Welt zu enge machen." Luther's whole experience with sin, with forgiveness, with the hope of eternal life was rooted in a conscience acutely sensitive to the Word

of God. If, as one of our prominent Lutheran theologians has said, "Christianity is an experience," Martin Luther eminently exemplifies that truth. His necessity drove him into Scripture. By experience he learned that nothing else could afford him any relief, help, or cure but the Gospel. In it, and out of it, he lived and moved and had his being. Principle and action welled up from it. This explains why Luther revolutionized the modern world. It also discloses why Luther lived the freest and happiest of all the reformers, while at once he was the most conservative and non-compromising of all in the matter of doctrine. In short, Luther's work as a reformer sprang from his intense personal experience, grew out of the soil of divine revelation into a sturdy movement, and progressively bore the fruit of conservative Scriptural theology. Luther's faith supplies the answer to the cry of the jailor of Philippi, "What shall I do to be saved?", while his theology reflects the adequate Scripture replication to the cardinal question of Jesus, "What think ye of Christ?"

When we turn to Zwingli we see a different portrait. Unlike Luther, who though he came in intimate contact with humanism at Erfurt did not himself embrace it, Zwingli took that system to his bosom. It was from this standpoint he launched out into religious reform. It was natural then for him to weave into his scheme the powerful urge to rescue republican freedom in Switzerland from encroachment on the part of the House of Savoy and the Roman Catholic Church. While Zwingli made Scripture the object of study, his humanist approach made way for an authority in spiritual things alongside of, and in its application superior to, the Bible: human reason. In consequence, because Scriptural authority was not supreme with him, he not only paved the way for theological error, but frankly courted compromise for political ends. Lacking Luther's deep sense of sin and personal helplessness, as well as Luther's steadfast trust in God's Word and power, Zwingli was always restlessly casting about for political allies, willing to accept such at the expense of religious concession. Not only that he was ready to subscribe the 15 Lutheran Articles at Marburg, with one exception, for

the sake of political alliance with the Lutheran party, but he intrigued with the persecutor of the French Protestants, the thoroughly Catholic and dissolute Francis the First. The difference between Luther and Zwingli has been aptly set forth by their famous statues: that of Luther at Worms shows him holding only the Bible, while Zwingli's statue at Zurich holds the Bible in one hand, a sword in the other.

The Frenchman, John Calvin, stemmed from a Roman Catholic family in Noyon, closely connected with the church. Already at twelve Calvin possessed a benefice at the cathedral, though he never was ordained a priest, like Luther, Zwingli, and Knox. An elder brother entered the priesthood and died, a libertine and an infidel, the same year that Calvin published his famous "Institutes of the Christian Religion" and so proclaimed his theology to the world. Calvin also, like Zwingli, first became critical of, then alienated from, Catholicism through humanistic influence. Coupled with the humanistic came the ideas of reform. In consequence of a bold speech he had written, then a young man of 24, for the rector of the Sorbonne, which the latter delivered on All Saints Day 1533, both he and the rector, Cop, had to flee from Paris and from France. Driven by persecution and exile into the Scriptures, he began to unfold his activity as a reformer at Strassburg with Bucer; at Basel, where he studied under Capito and published his "Institutes"; and in his first sojourn in Geneva with Farel. Banished from that city because of his attempt to introduce strict church discipline bordering on the ascetic, he returned to Strassburg, during which three years he formed an intimate connection with Melancthon, whose Lutheranism suffered deterioration in consequence. For the *Augustana Variata* dates from the time of these meetings. So close was the relationship between these two men that in his declining days Melancthon repeatedly expressed the desire to lay his dying head upon the breast of Calvin.

From Strassburg Calvin was recalled to Geneva. Against the Catholic cardinal, Sadolet, about to return the city to the Catholic fold, Calvin composed his brilliant "Letter to Sadolet," upon which Geneva recalled him. He now carried through

the complete reform of the city, remaining there till his death in 1564 at the comparatively early age of 55. He unfolded and rigidly enforced a strict ecclesiastical discipline and policy that, far from confining itself to the church as such, reached out by means of a theocratical government into the homes and the private lives of the Genevese, invoking the secular arm of government in a manner paralleling the pattern of the Inquisition. It is known chiefly for the execution of the anti-trinitarian Servetus, usually considered the blackest blot on Calvin's reputation. Less well-known is the fact that within four years 58 were burned at the stake, 76 were exiled; and in 1545 during the raging of a pestilence 43 women were burned as witches; and Geneva was a city a little larger than Watertown, Wisconsin.

Both Luther and Calvin were Augustinian in theology, but with a difference. Luther's Augustinianism was modified and corrected by his attachment and fidelity to Scripture; Calvin's, on the other hand, following the line of strict logic and dialectics, of which science and art he was a master, and which in turn mastered his theological thinking, developed Augustine's predestinarianism to the ultimate. He set the absolute decree of salvation of the elect, accompanying it by the absolute decree of the reprobate to damnation, acknowledged by Calvin himself to be a "decretum horribile."

Following out of predestinarianism came the logical, though unscriptural, denial of universal grace. If God predestined certain to salvation, the rest to damnation, one could only conclude that God was not in earnest in proclaiming propitiation in Christ for the sins of the world (I. John 2, 2, 4, 14), general justification of all men (Rom. 5, 18, 19), nor His earnest desire that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved. Calvin taught that Christ died only for the elect. Consistently he also taught that baptism was effectual only with the elect; with others it was but an empty form. In the Lord's Supper only the elect — and the elect only truly believe; those of whom Jesus says "for a while they believe" never really did believe — receive the body and blood

of Jesus in spiritual fashion; to the others nothing is given, nor received.

Calvin's teaching on Holy Communion was not as radical as Zwingli's, who made of it a manipulation of empty symbols, with bread and wine here, Jesus in human body sitting locally in heaven, and the connecting link between Him and the Lord's Supper being the Holy Spirit. (Heidelberger Katechismus, Frage 76.) Influenced probably by his contact with Bucer, Capito, and Melancthon, Calvin taught a real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, qualifying it, however, by the term "spiritual," confining its receiving to the elect, and defining it, not as an essential, but as merely a dynamic presence, a thing *toto caelo* different from what the Formula of Concord on the basis of Luther describes as a spiritual mode of presence: "die unbegreifliche, geistliche Weise, da er keinen Raum nimmt oder gibe. . . . Solcher Weise hat er gebraucht, da er aus verschlossenem Grabe fuhr, und durch verschlossene Tuer kam, und im Brot und Wein im Abendmahl." Sol. Decl. VII, Par. 100.

Which brings us to the Person of Christ. Calvin adopted the view of Zwingli that Christ's human nature was confined to His human body, and that the body of Christ was locally circumscribed. When Christ ascended into heaven as a human being, He sat down at the right hand of God as such, and there He is. Hence it is impossible for Him to be present body and blood in Lord's Supper. The deciding factor in Calvin's view is again logic and reasonable conclusion. The undeniable fact that Scripture ascribes to Jesus Christ, the Man, the attributes of God is dismissed with the remark that it is the wont of Scripture to speak that way.

Here lies the chief fault of Calvin's approach to doctrine. He operated with logic and human reason. Now Luther, contrary to the impression one might gain by listening to the speech of some of his followers, did not disparage reason, but looked upon it as a high gift of God. But he rightly confined its use to the things that come under its sway: matters down on the ground of every-day life. He criticised severely any attempt of reason to soar into the metaphysical and then

applied the tar-brush with his characterization "die kluge Frau Huldah, die Vernunft." He insisted that in Scripture reason was to be employed only in the formal details of grammatical and syntactical construction, the mechanics of expression; the understanding must be spiritual. And since Luther in his childlike faith lived in and out of Scripture, he was more given to joyfully witnessing to what he found there. Calvin, on the other hand, while more clipped and precise than the comprehensive and occasionally repetitive Luther in his exegetical works — because of which the former is often erroneously judged the better exegete — is addicted to the bent for systematizing, for logical arrangement, so that doctrine too often suffers distortion in being forced into logical and systematic form.

It is in the formal approach that we find roughly the chief differences among the early reformers. Zwingli often found his "facts" outside of Scripture, developed his premises from these "facts", and then intruded his conclusions upon Scripture. Calvin, more careful, usually found his premises in Scripture, but believed it legitimate to draw hard and fast conclusions from these premises, conclusions which are not found in the Word of God. This principle of Calvin's found express statement in the Westminster Confession in the words, "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture." (As Luther would say, "Da liegt die Gift.") And this is the channel our later Lutheran dogmaticians in their bent for systemization did not always succeed in avoiding. Witness their conclusion clothed in the phrase 'intuitu fidei'. Luther found facts, premises, and conclusion in Scripture. If Holy Writ offered premises from which according to logic a certain conclusion must follow, Luther still searched the Word for the conclusion. And if he found it not, he left it unconcluded. To Calvin this was intolerable. His sense of the logical drove him to force himself through, though in doing so he tore the page of Scripture. That is why Luther could preach undisturbed to the

human reason illogical and contradictory Scriptural doctrines, of universal grace, particular predestination, temporary faith, and the personal responsibility of the finally condemned. It is one of the bright jewels in the crown of the Synodical Conference that by the grace of God it took the lead among the Lutheran bodies of America toward the proper principle Luther followed. As one has put it, "Da lernt man wieder die Schrift lesen und rein sich von Gottes Gedanken leiten, statt den Begriffskonstruktionen die Herrschaft zu lassen."

We conclude this section of our treatise with a swift columnar comparison, or contrast, as you will, of the three chief reformers. Luther, of German peasant stock, was a strong-willed, passionate man of the people, withal ein gemuetlicher Deutscher. Zwingli, of middle-class origin, temperate, measured, was by education a humanist, by nature a Swiss republican, with a strong political turn of radical coloring. Calvin, whose family belonged to the higher French professional class, by education also a humanist, proved iron-willed, of ascetic character, French to the core in intellectualism, and in his addiction to the formal. Luther's conversion was an agonizing, slow, experiential progress toward peace through forgiveness of sins in Christ; Zwingli's came about by humanistic interest and political process; while Calvin's sudden conversion popped from a will intellectually convinced and determined to confess it before the world. With Luther religion was Herzens- und Gewissenssache; with Zwingli largely Vernunftsache; with Calvin predominately Willenssache. Luther honored Scripture with a childlike obedience; Zwingli set up a dual authority of Scripture and reason; Calvin subjected Scripture to the legalism of logic. Luther made earnest with God's command concerning Christ: "Hear ye Him." Zwingli however was ready to compromise with the Word for political advantage; Calvin yielded to system. Luther, controlled by supremacy of doctrine, remained conservative in his practical application of reform, retaining that which had no taint of corruption and was not forbidden; Zwingli radically purged all usages not commanded in Scripture, going to the length of violence in his iconoclasm; Calvin

organized worship on the plane of cold austerity. Luther came down like a thunderstorm upon his opponents, his lightning hitting them with sledge-hammer blow; Zwingli attacked with discrimination, confidently relying on his common sense and the superiority of a reasonable approach; Calvin wielded the sharp rapier of irony, French wit, scorn, and contempt. Luther married on principle and in witness to his faith and founded a Christian family and home; Zwingli married to legitimize an unsavory connection; Calvin married Idelette de Buren, a widow with three children, as it impresses one, largely on the basis of convenience. Even in death they remained in character: Luther's death-bed is marked by his earnest concern for his salvation, for the Gospel he had preached, and the welfare of the church, then he quietly dies in his sleep; Zwingli dies on the field of battle; Calvin calls all his learned friends together to his death-bed and counsels and directs them till his last breath.

Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin were both the product and the leaders of their religious movements. Their tenets have spread abroad each among peoples and nations whose racial characteristics run consonant to theirs: Luther's among the German and Scandinavian folk; Zwingli's among the Swiss, and, more than generally credited, among the Americans; Calvin's among the French, English, and Scotch. And while it is true that Calvin approached closer to Luther in doctrine, in principle he stood not with Luther but with Zwingli. Calvin strikes the dominant in the Zwinglian-Calvinistic chord, which we group under the name 'Reformed.'

II. Comparison of Lutheran and Reformed Creeds

Every religious group in the course of time sets up a formal statement of its stand in doctrine and practice, be it because the necessity is felt to affirm its convictions generally, or to fortify its position against its opponents, or to settle controversy within its own ranks. Even those bodies, who like the Disciples of Christ, commonly called the Christian Church, pride themselves on being 'creedless', nonetheless do have a definite creed, a fact that is manifest from their having estab-

lished their own denomination on doctrinal and practical grounds.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church enjoys a tremendous advantage in regard to published creedal statements in that it has but one generally acknowledged set, gathered together in the Book of Concord. This fact should seem to have furthered unity in the Lutheran family. Instead we find that the emphasis on fidelity to doctrine and purity of practice, coupled with a dash of inherent particularism, has wrought an opposite phenomenon: a splitting up into Landeskirchen, synods, etc. Yet look where you will, you will find no other like the Book of Concord. In content it presents a Scriptural declaration of an essential, vital, and lively faith, fresh from the heart. It makes no effort to cover the field of theology, neither does it in general attempt to reduce its faith to comprehensive and definitive dogmatic statement. It takes verbal inspiration, for instance, for granted, hence makes no formal assertion concerning it, or even of the Bible as being the Word of God.

The Book contains nine symbols, of which the most important historically in its connection is the Augsburg Confession. At its reading in 1530 it made a remarkable impression, not least of which was on the Catholic princes. When the devout Catholic Duke William of Bavaria chided Dr. Eck for having misrepresented to him the Lutheran doctrine, Eck countered that he could refute the Augustana from the Church Fathers, but not from the Scriptures. Duke William retorted, "So hoere ich denn, dass die Lutherischen in der Schrift sitzen, und wir daneben!" The Augustana is the most ecumenical of the strictly Lutheran confessional writings, having received in its later variant form the signatures of Farel, Beza, the Elector of the Palatinate, and even of Calvin himself. It is an instrument whose influence has reached far beyond the Lutheran Church. A positive spirit is exhibited without being provocative. It states clearly the Scriptural and Lutheran stand in well-turned, not to say polished periods.

As the Epitome of the Formula of Concord has its *Solida Declaratio*, so the Augsburg Confession has its *Apology*, a

document that caused consternation among the writers of the Catholic Confutation. The best commentary on Luther's Large, and especially his Small Catechism, is the use they have been put to in the Church. But the portion of our Book of Concord that has, it seems to me, never commanded the attention and respect it deserves is the Smalcald Articles. In them Luther has given some of the most telling definitions of doctrine to be found anywhere, written in a dogmatic-historical vein and couched in his inimitably trenchant style, unique in creedal literature. Some of Luther's spirit even spilled over into Melancthon's appendix on the "Power and Primacy of the Pope." It is probably because of their narrative style that the Articles have not received the attention they deserve; for men look for definition, rather than for historical development of dogma in a creedal statement. Some may go even so far as to say that the Formula of Concord here shows the beginnings of an attempt intellectually to master and define the mysteries comprehensible only to faith; if you will, the earliest marks of a Lutheran bent toward scholasticism. Nevertheless, there is displayed solid workmanship on the part of its chief author, Martin Chemnitz.

When we move onto the Reformed field we find it swarming with creeds, often several flowering on the same stem. Time will permit us but to name some of the more than thirty. They divide generally into two directions: the Zwinglian and Calvinistic, with the latter in the ascendancy. Unlike the Lutheran Church, which rounded out its confessional production within the sixteenth century, in the remarkably short period of the fifty years from 1530 to 1580, the Reformed continued to produce creedal statements from the 16th well into the 19th century. The multiplicity of creeds and the two-century period required for gestation and birth spring from the radical spirit inherent in Reformed thinking. Nevertheless there appears an unexpected general agreement both in form and content. Both the Zwinglian and the Calvinistic creeds favor the theological approach, that is, they begin with the article on God, following up with an article on Scripture, and the article on predestination. The Lutheran approach, on the other hand,

favors the anthropological, that is, it begins with the state of man in sin, and advances to the soteriological, ending up in the doctrine of the sacraments and predestination. This is highly significant, reflecting deep-rooted and natural characteristics of both reformers and the churches they founded. Luther came to faith through a long conflict and under a profound sense of sin; both Zwingli and Calvin came by the humanistic and philosophic avenue, which affects the detached attitude and also exhibits a primary interest in first causes, in this case, God. The Lutheran creeds fix their emphasis on the sinner saved by grace for eternal life; the Reformed on the sovereign God whose will and word save the elect.

Of the Zwinglian creeds we name the chief: "The Sixty-seven Articles, or Conclusions of 1523"; "The Ten Theses of Bern", 1526; "The Confession of Faith to Kaiser Karl V"; "The Exposition of the Christian Faith to King Francis I". These are the ones Zwingli himself wrote. Zwinglian in character, but with a Lutheran tinge, are the First Confession of Basel, 1534, the Second of Basel, identical with the First Helvetic Confession, so-called because it is the first general confession of the Swiss Reformed churches. It was followed in 1566 by the famous Heidelberg Catechism, the work of Olevian and Ursinus. The last and best of the Zwinglian group proved the Second Helvetic Confession, called the *Confessio Helvetica Posterior*. It was written by Heinrich Bullinger, the friend and successor of Zwingli at Zurich.

From these documents we can extract the distinctly Zwinglian doctrines. These confessions accept the Bible as God's Word, the absolute authority in all matters of faith and practice. Excellent beginning, indeed. But it was at once vitiated by the introduction of a second authority that laid a charge of dynamite under the word "absolute". That second authority was the humanistic principle of reasonableness. This false authority from the very beginning set up a ferment that increasingly has brought on disintegration in the Reformed churches.

These creeds also teach predestination: an unconditional election to salvation. Included in them a clause was to be

found which not only made sin an object of the foreknowledge of God, but of fore-ordination as well. We have then a full-blown supra-lapsarianism. Although nowhere near as crass as Calvin taught it, nonetheless more than just a hint at election to reprobation was given in the words, "Reprobi vero, qui sunt extra Christum."

Of original sin the Zwinglian confessions taught that it was a positive and inherited evil, transmitted from Adam. In this they were more conservative than Zwingli himself, who looked upon original sin as a *lack* of something good, "ein Bresten", a breach, as he put it. Yet even the First Helvetic Confession in 1536, five years after Zwingli's death, declares in Art. VIII: "Die Erbsuende . . . hat das ganze menschliche Geschlecht so durchdrungen, und hat es so verwuestet und vergiftet, dass dem Menschen . . . niemand als Gott durch Christum helfen . . . konnte, und was in ihm Gutes uebrig geblieben ist, das wird durch taegliche Maengel und Gebrechen (praesten) fuer und fuer geschwaecht, so dass es noch aerger wird." According to this there still remains in natural man some degree of good alongside of original sin, but this good is impotent and subject to wearing down. The conservatism found in the Zwinglian creeds was largely brought about through the influence of Lutheran doctrine via Strassburg, as well as to some degree through Genevan teachings.

In our own day, however, this sloughing off of Scriptural teaching on original sin has triumphed throughout almost the whole of Reformed Christianity, partly by way of Arminianism, as it was adopted by the Wesleys. Here in America the doctrine of original sin is scarcely mentioned; if it is, usually by way of disparagement of the dark scholasticism out of which it originated, as they say. Many fail to realize that it was the Scriptural teaching of the vigorous Reformers, Luther at the head.

But the question arises, "How often is original sin mentioned in Lutheran sermons in America? When did you last hear it? And if you preached it yourself, was it with a certain sense of apology?" It is here, I believe, we may find one of the sharpest blows Reformed influence has dealt American

Lutheranism. Compare the weight Christ puts on the matter, to say nothing of St. Paul, and then scale our pulpit by it.

In the matter of conversion Zwinglian confessional writings plainly teach a cooperation by man. They say, "Regeneratos in boni electione et operatione, non tantum agere passive, sed active. Aguntur enim a Deo, ut agunt ipsi, quod agunt." (That is, to quote Schaff, "In regeneration and conversion men are not merely passive, but also active. They are moved by the Spirit of God to do of themselves what they do.") This attitude was taken expressly against the teaching of Luther, who spoke of a stock and a stone in connection with the bondage of the will. This vagary also found its way to America, but this time through Melancthon and the later dogmatians. It was boldly stated by Prof. Schmidt in the *Gnadenwahlstreit*, his phrase being about "das Verhalten des Menschen in der Bekehrung als ausschlaggebend." Wherever still there remains a desire to save souls in the Reformed churches, there is now almost universally a shallow conception of free will in men by which they can dispose themselves to accept or reject Christ. Hence the revival tactics of personal work, that is, for folks to pass through a crowd at a revival meeting, urging individuals to accept Christ. It may be said, "No great danger resides in this for us." They that say so may well look to their complacency, for revivalism has already begun to raise its head among Lutherans, the child of a reaction against dogmatic orthodoxy, that is, the child of pietism. Have you heard of the Minneapolis Bible School? Have you read its "Banner"?

A very great fissure was opened between Lutheran and Reformed theology in the teaching concerning the Person of Christ. In these creeds they say, "We do not teach that the divine nature of Christ did suffer, nor that the human nature of Christ is everywhere present." Yet they claim to accept 'believingly and reverently the doctrine of *communicatio idiomatum* from Scripture as employed by the ancient church.' But their explanation of the *communicatio* takes a queer circuit when they say it takes place in the following manner: the human nature in Christ communicated to His Person the

human properties, the divine to His Person the divine properties. This sets up a species of triangle in Christ; or rather, it sets His Person apart from both human and divine nature in Him. One may ask, "Was not Christ's divine nature before His coming into the flesh His Person? Is it not akin then to saying that the divine nature in Christ communicated to itself the divine attributes?" We have here the product of an attempt intellectually to master the mystery of the God-man. The fact of the matter is that the divine and human natures of Christ now constitute the Person of Christ.

The Heidelberg Catechism takes a different circuit. To the question, when it speaks of Christ's ascension into heaven, "Ist denn Christus nicht bei uns bis ans Ende der Welt? Antwort: Christus ist wahrer Mensch and wahrer Gott: nach seiner menschlichen Natur ist er jetzt nicht auf Erden; aber nach seiner Gottheit, Majestaet, Gnade und Geist weicht er nimmer von uns. Frage 48: Werden aber auf diese Weise die zwei Naturen in Christo nicht voneinander getrennt, so die Menschheit nicht ueberall ist, da die Gottheit ist? Antwort: Mit nichten; denn weil die Gottheit unbegreiflich und allenthalben gegenwaertig ist, so muss folgen, dass sie wohl ausserhalb ihrer angenommenen Menschheit, und dennoch nichts desto weniger auch in derselben ist, und persoendlich mit ihr vereiniget bleibt." A definite and fine-sounding explanation that explains little, if anything, and but raises new questions.

But the reasoning of Calvinism appeals to the Lutheran reason as well. Not a few of our lay folk, when they hear it, lend a sympathetic and understanding ear to the teaching that lets the ascending Christ, in the same flesh in which He died, go to a definite place, suffering a local confinement of His human body. As the Heidelberg Catechism says, "Nach seiner menschlichen Natur ist Christus nicht mehr auf Erden."

It is noteworthy to see how the Reformers and their followings unanimously rejected the idea of a millennium and gave expression to their rejection in the contemptuous phrase of its being a "Jewish dream." Whence then did the millennial idea become so prominent an article of faith in present-day

Reformed circles? No doubt that the opposition of the Zwinglian and Calvinistic creeds to chiliasm sprang from their abhorrence for the fanaticism of the Anabaptists, whose extreme radicalism repelled every sober-minded Christian of the times. The millennial idea, however, is not as foreign to the Reformed mind as may be thought, to read their creeds. For it has been shown that they would establish the kingdom of God on earth, as both Zwingli in his political machinations, and Calvin in his polity at Geneva, sought to do. Now that the abhorrence of the Anabaptist has fallen away, chiliasm has become an increasingly generally accepted doctrine, be it in the form of post-millennial insistence that the world is getting better and better — a rather desperate hope in the face of the happenings of the past quarter century; but it explains partly why the Methodist Church, whose hope is post-millennial, so frantically teams up with every new betterment movement: race relations, temperance, slum clearance, social improvement, a program comprehensively expressed in Roosevelt's four freedoms — a world getting better and better till Christ Himself will be happy to come and reign over it for a thousand years; be it the premillennial theory that the world will wax worse and worse, till Jesus will come to change it and to reign in a kingdom of peace on earth in glory and honor for a thousand years. The premillennial bent runs generally among the fundamentalists.

Now strange to say, this "Jewish dream" has found its way into Lutheran circles in America. Its shadow has been cast in Iowa Synod sanctuaries, as well as in the Augustana Synod; and the Minneapolis Lutheran Bible Institute taught it in its classes, devoting a whole year's issue of its magazine, "The Bible Banner", to a series of articles on the Millennium in defense of its teaching. The Reformed likewise rejected the speculation that ultimately all the godless would be saved, proof that this vagary had already then lifted its head and is not a later invention of American Congregationalism.

One must acknowledge in the Second Helvetic Confession the generally clear statements on law and gospel, though in practice there remained much mixture of the two. Faith,

however, is defined as being "a most firm confidence and a clear and steady assent of the mind, a most certain apprehension of the truth of God." It will do well to note the introduction of the intellectual as an element of faith in this definition. In contrast it is remarkable that the Lutheran confessions did not *define* faith, but *preached* it prior to the composition of the Formula of Concord. In the Formula of Concord it receives the ensuing definition: "Wir glauben, lehren und bekennen, dass dieser Glaube nicht sei eine blosser Erkenntnis der Historien von Christo, sondern eine solche Gabe Gottes, dadurch wir Christum, unsern Erloeser, recht erkennen und auf ihn vertrauen." Ep. III, Par. 4. The 17th century fathers introduced the definition, "Erkenntnis, Beifall, Zuversicht," a misuse of which lays emphasis on the intellect and makes way for the human agency in faith, an element that rose to plague American Lutheranism later on in the Gnadewahlstreit. It helped to unlock the door for Dr. Schmidt's cooperation theory, as also to go through that door hand in hand with the *intuitu fidei*.

As far as I know, the Second Helvetic Confession is the first to bring an inclusion of prayer as a means of grace, declaring in Chapter XVI, Par. 2: "Fides merum est donum Dei . . . mediante praedicatione Evangelii, et oratione fidei." ("Faith is nothing else than a gift of God . . . by means of the preaching of the gospel and of believing prayer.") The same error has been published in the Westminster Confession. Though it may not be expressed in other Calvinistic confessions, it is nonetheless a general article of faith in Reformed circles. This will make clear the strong leaning toward prayer in these communions, both free prayer and set prayer. The free prayer tends to become a harangue of God and fellow-worshipper; the set prayer, a repetitious matter. To what lengths prayer as a means of grace may lead appears from the day of fasting observed in connection with the work on the Westminster Confession. It lasted from nine to five, eight hours, of which Baillie writes it was the "sweetest day" he saw in England, and reports: "After Dr. Twisse had begun with a brief prayer, Mr. Marshall prayed

large two hours, most divinely, confessing the sins of the members of the Assembly in a wonderfully pathetic and prudent way. After, Mr. Arrowsmith preached one hour; then a psalm; thereafter Mr. Vines prayed near two hours, and Mr. Palmer preached one hour, and Mr. Seaman prayed near two hours; then a psalm. After Mr. Henderson brought them to a short, sweet conference of the heart . . . , Dr. Twisse closed with a short prayer and blessing. God was so evidently in all this exercise that we expect certainly a blessing both in our matter of the assembly and whole kingdom." Note the proportion of prayer to the proclamation of the Word. But compare also the eight-hour worship with the caustic criticism a Lutheran minister hears today if he runs his service over an hour's time.

Probably you have been waiting for the coming section of this treatise, which has to deal with the sacraments, particularly the Lord's Supper. The whole Zwinglian position receives succinct expression in the definition, "Sacraments consist of the Word, the sign, and the thing signified." To make it perfectly clear, the Confession at once adds, "The sign in baptism is the water, the thing signified is regeneration or washing from sins. The sign in the Lord's Supper is bread and wine, the thing signified is the veritable body and blood of Christ." To clinch their teaching on this point they add, "Unbelievers do not receive the things offered." A peculiar slant is given toward sacerdotalism in the remark, "Baptism is not to be administered by women, or midwives, but by the ministers of the church."

The Calvinist says of Baptism that the pouring of the water is the *sign* of the washing of Christ's blood to cleansing. But he does not say it is the washing itself.

The accent on the intellectual again appears when the Reformed speak of the baptism of children. They teach that Baptism does not confer justification on children, because, as they say, justification is a subjective, inner process, which presupposes conscious action; neither is the child that has been baptized therefore regenerated, seeing that regeneration comprehends active faith, which faith in turn presumes self-

consciousness, as well as intellectual knowledge of the truth of salvation, of which a child is not capable. The Reformed therefore make consequential earnest with the old formula, "Erkenntnis, Beifall, Zuversicht", a formula that found its way into the Lutheran Church. To this day we hear statements among us in serious theological discussions that no one can have faith except the knowledge have entered his soul by the gate of the intellect, and has thence been relayed to the heart. If regeneration come by baptism — and the Scriptures teach it plainly — can anyone explain to us the intellectual process involved in the case of infants? Or is it not so that the impression is upon the heart, and that faith transcends intellect? Is not faith prior to and above intellect, and is not the latter the handmaid of the former?

We need not go deeply into the question of Holy Communion. All know, and from the citations above it becomes clear, that the Zwinglian believed in nothing more than outward signs. So stark was their rationalism in regard to this sacrament that even Calvin denounced Zwingli's stand as being profane. While the *Confessio Helvetica Posterior* made concessions to the Calvinistic, it still operated with John 6, echoing the Zwinglian: "The flesh — corporeally eaten — profiteth nothing." (For the sake of avoiding any confusion, John 6, 51ff. should not only not be referred directly to Lord's Supper, but in any fashion whatsoever.) The true believer, so the *Posterior* says, receives the signs as sure pledges that Christ did not only die for men in general, but also individually for every believing communicant. But the signs remain signs, for it is expressly stated, "We therefore do not conjoin the body of the Lord and His blood with the bread and the wine in the manner, but we say the bread itself is the body of Christ. . . . The Body of Christ is in the heavens at the right hand of the Father, so we must raise our hearts thitherward." The connecting link in the sacrament between the believer and Christ's body and blood in heaven, as clearly stated in Question 76 of the Heidelberg Catechism, is the Holy Ghost. On the other hand it is said, "Those who commune unworthily and without faith receive only the visible signs." Schnecken-

burger maintains that the Reformed denial of the Real Presence derives from their doctrine of the Person of Christ, expressed in the famous dictum, "Finitum non est capax infiniti," not turned about as generally supposed. The probability rides high that neither derives from other, but both are cut from the same piece of cloth. They are both notes of the same rationalistic chord, whose sour harmony Luther detected when he said, "Ihr habt einen andern Geist." There can be no reasonable doubt that the Reformed spirit of rationalism first stubbed its toe on the Scriptural doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and subsequently stumbled over the Person of Christ. Schaff is right when he asserts of the doctrine of the Lord's Table, "Zwingli's is the clearest and most intelligible theory. It removes the supernatural mystery of the ordinance, and presents no obstacle to the understanding." To remove the supernatural mystery from the Lord's Supper, however, is of no religious merit, for to succeed means to destroy it. The truly divine remains a mystery to the understanding, being designed to be apprehended only by faith, itself a divine gift and mystery.

No one can be surprised to learn that because of this stand the sacraments are sadly neglected and lightly regarded in the modern Reformed churches. For though Calvin attempted to take in a position which he considered closer to the Lutheran, as we shall see when we come to the distinctively Calvinistic doctrines, in the end he came out practically by the same door with Zwingli. Baptism has fallen to the level of an outward ordinance, not to say an empty ceremony, which can be pretty well ignored; while communion, being at best but a commemoration of Christ's death, has plummeted into the ecclesiastical cellar. In some sections it is considered smart to speak slightly of the sacraments, and to look upon those who believe in the Real Presence as religious morons. Is not this having its effect in Lutheran circles? When we recall how forty years ago babes were brought to the font on the eighth day, or rarely later than a fortnight after birth, and then gauge this practice against the increasing tendency to postpone the baptism of children into weeks and even months,

does that not reflect the growing influence of the sectarianism round about us, with whose adherents our people have come in social contact within the last twenty-five years as never before, and with whom they discuss religious things, and with whom they also more than occasionally attend worship? I must speak a word of praise here for the Norwegian Lutheran churches. They lay a good deal of stress on the sacrament of baptism, so that they bring their children early to the font. Though a Norwegian Lutheran may have drifted far, he will still insist on baptizing his babes; and if a Norwegian neglect that, you may write him down a complete apostate.

The same thing can be said about Communion. Already open communion has been adopted by many Lutheran churches in the Eastern states, borrowed from the Reformed churches. The practice has appeared in churches in the eastern Middle states, also in the United Lutheran Church in the West, as well as in the Middle West. This does not stem solely from a general indifference, but our people as well are becoming acquainted with Reformed practice and begin to pressure for conforming to the same custom. But how does it stand with the Lutheran ministry? Does the deep faith in the Real Presence still obtain? Does a holy and genuine awe suffuse our celebration of the rite? Or is it about to descend into the realm of the routine for us also?

Our acquaintance with American churches outside the Lutheran would lead us to expect that their early confessions should insist on a rigid observance of the Sunday as the sabbath. But it is not so. For of it they said, "We observe the Lord's Day in Christian freedom, not believing that one day is holier than another." It remained for the Westminster Confession, almost a century later, to introduce into the English-speaking branches of the church the legalistic Old Testament sabbath, transferring it to the Sunday; from Westminster it spread through England, and Scotland, to America, as well as to the Continent. Even the Lutheran Church here in America has in spots accepted it and teaches it. Less than four years ago the United Lutheran Church's magazine "The

Lutheran" said editorially: "Sunday is properly called the Lord's Day. It is for the temporal and eternal welfare of His creatures that God has given one day in seven a position apart from that of the remaining six." Dr. Melhorn with his synod here stood on the Reformed platform in this question of the sabbath. But the query rises, How many of us have this matter clear and well in hand? Do we, for instance, give our children in instruction a proper understanding? If we do not err in the manner of this editorial, does our insistence on Christian liberty take the form of chain-smoking a carton of cigarettes?

Although, flowing from the radical principle of iconoclasm, the Swiss reformers decried ceremonies and churchly ornament, we might do worse than to consider the grain of truth contained in the remark the *Confessio Helvetica* makes on rites and ceremonies, "The more the accumulation of human rites grows in the church, the more it is drawn away not only from Christian liberty, but also from Christ and His faith; while the crowd seeks that in rituals which it can find only in the Son of God, Jesus Christ, through faith."

As a last creedal item we bend our attention to the Zwinglian pronouncement on the function of government. Their conviction is that "The magistrate is to promote and protect religion and good morals, and to punish offenders, such as heretics." And in *Helvetica Prior* we read, "Dass sie die rechten Gottesdienste schirme und foedere mit Strafe und Ausrottung aller Gotteslaesterung;" item, "was der Diener der Kirche . . . aus Gottes Wort lehrt und vortraegt, foedere und vollstrecke." Again, "Alle Rottiererei soll durch die oberste Gewalt gestraft und unterdrueckt werden." This false principle, in nothing removed from the position of the Catholic Inquisition, not only obtained among the Swiss, where we quoted some statistics earlier in this paper, but wherever the Reformed Church held sway, in both Europe and America. Only Luther of all the Reformers, and only the Lutheran Church eschewed the use of force in the matter of religious conviction and rendered unto Caesar the things that be Caesar's and unto God the things that be God's. This attempt

to use governmental force to bring about the good is still with us. Even in our land, where separation of church and state obtains on principle, the Reformed churches frankly pressure government to pass and enforce laws carrying out their own pet ideas of what is moral and Christian. I need but to recall the prohibition experiment to your mind. While we Lutherans are interested in political affairs and should be, it is as individual citizens, not as church bodies, excepting, of course, where a church body is directly affected. But the Reformed frankly throw the weight of the church body into the political fray. Were they to have their way, our statute books would be full of blue laws. But now we also, by their example, stand in the path of temptation to try the same thing. As we Lutherans enter more and more into politics and learn the ropes, we are not only likely to seek our own by lobbying, as the Catholic and Reformed churches frankly do — the Catholics have a powerful organization housed in Washington, and the Methodist Church has a building planted right amongst the government buildings in the capital city — but to use organized political pressure to regulate the morals of others. (Speaking of learning the ropes: one of our Lutheran synods in convention assembled sent a telegram to the then President of the United States, with reply attached ready for his signature; and when the reply was returned signed, a great to-do was made about the message from the President.)

It remains for us to touch upon some extremes in Zwinglian theology, not only because they are extremes, but because they have propagated themselves into our day, though they did not find their way into the creeds. Zwingli taught that all elect children are saved whether baptized or not, whether of Christian or heathen parentage, not on the ground of their innocence, but on the ground of Christ's atonement; and he is inclined to the belief that all children dying in infancy belong to the elect. He argues, "Since eternal election precedes faith, producing faith in due time, the absence of faith in children is no ground for their condemnation." (Against the Catabaptists he wrote, "Electi eligebantur antequam in utero conciperentur: mox igitur ut sunt, filii Dei sunt, etiamsi

moriantur antequam credant aut ad fidem vocentur.”) We note here again what decisive weight Zwingli laid on the intellectual and conscious knowledge as being an element in faith. This circumstance is mentioned because in Reformed seminaries in America Lutheran reverence for the sacrament is attacked on this ground, abhorrence being expressed for a doctrine that cruelly closes the door on the children of the unbelieving and the heathen. This from those who officially declare the *decretum absolutum* involving reprobation. Our own people are driven by their aggressive Reformed friends to take refuge in an apologetic frame of mind for the stand of Scripture and the Lutheran Church. A bold return to the Scripture that says, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,” and “As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,” and a referral of such to God’s Word, instead of that which seems good to their way of thinking, is called for.

Akin to this aberration, nay following from it, Zwingli also included many heathen among the saved: Hercules, Theseus, Plato, the Scipios and Catos, Numa, Seneca, and many others. Luther cried, “If this be true, then the whole Gospel is false.” But in our day the world is full of “Christians” who assert that every one will reach heaven if he be but sincere in trying to get there, no matter what he believes. A word one runs across frequently from sophisticated Lutherans. This principle has been made to include in ministerial alliances all over the country both fundamentalist and modernist, Unitarian and rabbi, and now they actually have instituted exchange professors with the Hindus. That spells unionism run into the ground and an abandonment of everything Christian.

(To be continued)

PASTORAL TABLE OF DUTIES

(Conclusion)

This installment concludes our work on the Pastoral Table of Duties. We believe that we cannot round out this work unless we focus at least some attention on those imperatives in the Pastoral letters which concerned Timothy and Titus personally. We will group them as follows:

1. The imperatives which concern the official work of Timothy and Titus.
2. The imperatives which concern their persons.
3. The imperatives which concern their relationship with Paul.

Concerning the official work of Timothy and Titus.

Titus 1, 4 Paul writes to "my true child" Titus: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are (R. V. were) wanting (margin: Left undone) and ordain (R. V. appoint) elders in every city, as I had appointed thee (R. V. gave thee charge)."

That was one of the duties of Titus, to see to it that the congregations, as they were organized or grew, were adequately manned with elders and bishops. He had to appoint such elders. *Katastēsēs kata polīm presbyterous. Kathistēmi*: To appoint to an office. Luther: "Besetzen die Staedte hin und her mit Aeltesten." — Such elders could not be plucked out of the air. They had to fit the description Paul wrote in v. 5-9. Titus' task was not easy, for practically all who were under his spiritual care were novices, Neubekehrte. It took searching and testing to find men suitable for the office of bishop. He had to weed out (v. 10-11) the "many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, . . . who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not." In short, he had to investigate every man who "desired the office of a bishop" to make sure that he had the "*dei einai*" and did not have the "*mē dei einai*" of which Paul speaks. Particularly he had to be sure that the man was *didaktikos*, "that he may be able both to exhort in the sound doctrine and to convict the gain-

sayers." R. V. — So this duty was no plaything. This was serious business.

It must weigh heavily on the consciences of them who, in our day, are charged with the duty of proposing candidates for vacant or newly organized parishes. And it has in itself a warning to all who feel the itch to meddle in these matters, if they are none of their business.

The A. V. translates: "And ordain elders." The "appoint" of the R. V. is the correct translation of the Greek. Luther's translation is fine. The Vulgata has "constituas". Most certainly the elders were ordained by the laying on of hands; but the point here is that Titus had to find and select and appoint these men.

In 1 Tim. 5, 22 Paul writes: "Lay hands suddenly (R. V. hastily) on no man." The laying on of hands connected with prayer and blessing was the ordination. Timothy should not be hasty in ordaining a man. First make sure that the candidate for ordination has the right qualifications which God demands of an elder and is free of all that disqualifies him from the office of an elder. It takes time to prove a man, really to know him, his gifts, qualifications, character, sincerity, etc. Therefore Paul writes, 3, 6: "A bishop must not be a novice"; that is one who is newly converted.

We don't have many novices seeking the office of a pastor in our day. Nevertheless the warning not to be hasty in ordaining a man is still in place. Our candidates for this blessed office are usually men who "from a child have known the holy scriptures," 2. Tim. 3, 15, and who through a thorough education extending over many years have been prepared for the office of the ministry. They can show a certificate from the Theological Seminary, signed by the faculty, which testifies that they are "ripe" and fit for the ministry. Yet it happens that men get into the ministry who just "don't belong". Which means that the burden which falls especially on the professors at the seminaries, namely to be truly convinced that men aspiring to the office of the ministry be really qualified for it, dare never be relaxed, for here the salvation of men swings in the balance.

Think only of the qualification which the Holy Ghost demands through Paul in 2. Tim. 2, 2: "And the things, that (R. V. which) thou hast heard of (R. V. from) me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." We will study that a little.

In v. 1 Paul said: "Thou therefore, my son, (R. V. child) be strong, (R. V. strengthened) in the grace that is in Christ Jesus." Timothy personally was in need of this strength for his work, against the persecution which was coming, and to retain his courage under adverse conditions. Everybody needs that strength. Therefore Timothy was charged with finding men able to teach the grace of Jesus Christ — whence it came. We know our own need of this strength, don't we? In every fight of faith? When we stand against liberal theology, or unionism, or worldliness in the church; when we fight the good fight of faith, for the pure word and doctrine; for the liberty wherewith Christ has set us free. Paul understood that there was only one way to receive this grace, namely from the Word, the pure and unadulterated Gospel and genuine doctrine. For that reason that Word had to remain unto the end of days. Paul would die. Timothy would die. But the Gospel must not die. So: "The things which thou hast heard from me by many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."

Timothy had much to commit, for he had heard many things from Paul. They are summed up in 1, 13: "Hold fast to the form (R. V. pattern) of sound words, which thou hast heard from me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." "Sound words," which expression reminds one of others like "the faithful words," "wholesome words," "the words of our Lord Jesus Christ," "the doctrine which is according to godliness"; — these Timothy should commit to faithful men. He had heard them from Paul, but they were not Paul's wisdom, for Paul could tell the Corinthians: "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." 1. Cor. 11, 23. And to the Galatians: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither

received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Gal. 1, 11. 12.

Opinions differ regarding the many witnesses of which Paul speaks. *Dia pollōn martyron*. The A. V. translates *dia* with "among," but in the margin notes: "Or by." The R. V. has "by." Luther: "Durch." The Vulgate: "Per multos testes." Thayer says: "By the mediation (intervention) of many witnessing, they being summoned for that purpose." P. 133, III, 2. Lenski translates: "Supported by many witnesses." P. 190. But he does not say how he gets the meaning 'supported' out of *dia*. Wohlenberg wants to take *martyron* as the present participle active of *martyreō*: "Durch vieles bezeugend." Kretzmann has this to say: "Als Paulus seinen Schuelern und besonders dem Timotheus die christliche Lehre vortrug, da erhaertete er selbstverstaendlich seine Ausfuehrungen mit Schriftzeugnissen, wie das ja seine Weise auch in allen seinen Briefen ist. Es war ihm darum zu tun, seinen Worten eine moeglichst feste Unterlage aus den vorliegenden kanonischen Schriften zu geben. So hatte er schon 1. Tim. 1, 18 auf die Schriften und Zeugnisse der Propheten, auf das Alte Testament, hingewiesen. Und auch an anderen Stellen finden wir den Hinweis auf die heiligen Schreiber in ihren Aufzeichnungen als auf Zeugen fuer die Wahrheit des von ihm gelehrtten Wortes; vergl. 1. Kor. 1-15; Hebr. 12, 1. Timotheus hatte demnach gewissen Grund unter den Fuessen betreffs des Wortes, der Lehre, die er von Paulus gehoert hatte. Sie beruht auf Zeugen, denen Gott selbst die Wahrheit eingegeben hatte." P. 222.

These things (sound words because they were founded on the Word) Timothy should commit to faithful men. *Parathou*, middle aorist imperative of *paratithemi*: To deposit, intrust, commit to one's charge. That meant that he must instruct as he had been instructed. But he was also to look for men who "shall be able to teach others also." Lenski translates: "Such as will be competent also to teach others."

Here Lenski expresses an interesting thought: "This is the true apostolic succession of the ministry, not an uninterupted line of hands laid on, extending back to the apostles

themselves, with all ordinations not in that line null and void; but a succession of apostolic doctrine, the deposit of what we shall hear from Paul in his writings, this held by us in faithful hearts, with competency to teach others these same things. The apostle evidently did not expect the future teachers of the Church to produce new or different teaching. The gospel is changeless in all ages." P. 789. 790.

Zorn writes: "Hier redet der Apostel nicht sowohl von treuen und lehrhaften Gemeindeaeltesten oder Bischoefen, wie 1. Tim. 3, 2 und Tit 1, 5. 9. Sondern hier redet der Apostel, — wie das "auch andern" bezeugt, welches in eben besagtem Fall nur "andern" gelautet haben wuerde — vielmehr davon, dass Timotheus die evangelische Lehre solchen treuen Menschen anvertrauen solle, die tuechtig sein werden, *auch andere zu rechten Lehrern auszubilden*. Der Apostel redet hier also von solchen, die wir jetzt theologische Lehrer oder Professoren nennen. Wie der Apostel den Timotheus erst zu seinem Amte ausgebildet hat, so soll Timotheus nun treue Menschen so ausbilden, unterweisen und unterrichten, dass diese hinwiederum tuechtig sein werden, auch andere zum Predigtamt vorzubereiten. Das Predigtamt soll fortgepflanzt werden und bleiben bis an den Juengsten Tag, und es soll treuen und wohlunterrichteten Maennern uebertragen werden." Vom Hirtenamt, P. 151-152.

2. Tim. 2, 2 must impress on us the importance of preparing, educating and selecting men who aspire to the office of the ministry.

Our Synod is engaged in this most important work. That is why we maintain our high schools and colleges. We want to prepare young men for the Seminary or for our Normal School, that they might be trained for the ministry of Jesus Christ or for teachers in our Christian day schools. At the same time the Seminary prepares men for the work of theological professors.

Since Christ by His very nature as the Savior, the word, the truth, the way, the light of the world, in Whom the grace and love of God appeared in the flesh, — since Christ must be the center of all theological teaching, it is an indis-

pensible requirement that all theological professors be men who are "strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus," who "hold fast the form of sound words," who are "nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine," and who are not hesitant in matters of sound doctrine.

The Lutheran Churches of Europe and, to a great extent, all over the world present a horrible example of the havoc which can be created when the church grows careless in its watchfulness over its theological professors. Where are their sound word and genuine doctrine? Their professors have D. D.'s, but they do not have sound doctrine. They teach what they like as they like it. But the Bible is out. Science rides high. Plenary and verbal inspiration is ridiculous, for the Bible is full of errors. — That must warn us to hold fast all the more to the Word and sound doctrine; to have nothing at all to do with "knowledge, falsely so called." It must warn us all. — perhaps our theological professors especially — to be watchmen upon Zion's walls.

"Wir wollen also unsere theologischen Lehranstalten hegen und pflegen und darauf sehen, dass die Lehrer an denselben treue und zum Lehren tuechtige Maenner sind, vor allem aber solche, die die apostolische Lehre rein und lauter lehren." Zorn, Vom Hirtenamt, p. 152.

It is in keeping with this line of thought, namely our concern about the sound words and doctrine of teachers — and preachers too —, to ask: What is to be done with one who is not sound, an heretic? Paul gives some very clear and unmistakable information on that subject to Titus. Tit. 3, 10. 11: "A man that is an heretic (R. V. heretical) after the first and second admonition reject (R. V. refuse); knowing that he that is such (R. V. that such a one) is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself (R. V. self-condemned)." *Paraitou*: Shun, avoid, reject, refuse. Titus shall have nothing at all to do with such heretics, no communion, no union, no familiarity, no society. All he could do was turn his back on them. That is in keeping with Christ's warning in Matthew 7, 15: "Beware of false prophets." A heretic is a false prophet, one who does not

teach as Scripture teaches, does not hold fast to sound words and genuine doctrine, but teaches false doctrine.

Zorn says: "Alles, was an unserer Stelle gesagt ist . . . zeigt, dass ein heretischer, *ketzerischer* Mensch der ist, der selbsterwählte, falsche, verderbliche, verdammliche, gottlose, den Herrn Jesum Christum, der ihn mit seinem Blut erkauft hat, verleugnende Lehre lehrt, fñhrt, annimmt, festhaelt, behauptet, verteidigt, ausbreitet, zu seinem Panier macht." Vom Hirtenamt. Lenski writes: "Any teaching that forsakes Scripture, and certainly such as contradicts Scripture, stamps a man as *hairéticos*. He chooses for himself what the Church by choosing Scripture must repudiate and disown. Whether this be little or much makes little difference since the extent to which he chooses his own ideas to that extent the person concerned is *hairéticos*." P. 955. Also: "In its definition heresy is identical with false doctrine and all the Scripture-texts which declare false doctrine a sin apply to heresies, the term denoting the divisive character of false teaching."

A man must be considered a heretic after the first and second admonition; "wenn er ein und abermal ermahnet ist." Luther. We find *nouthesia*, admonition, in 1. Cor. 10, 11 and Eph. 6, 4 also. Admonition can be called that only when its true purpose is to win an erring brother and when it is done "with all longsuffering and doctrine." But when the erring brother refuses to listen to such admonition then he proves that he "is subverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned." Then it is not the Church which condemns him; he does that himself.

Here a few words are in order on Lehrzucht, doctrinal discipline. Its complete absence in the Lutheran State Churches of Europe and the Lutheran Church in many other places has created the doctrinal chaos which exists in them. A Church dare not be lax in watching over doctrine. As soon as false teaching is preached, the preacher of it must be dealt with, for it does not take long for such leaven to create complete doctrinal chaos. Therefore watch, watch everybody, be he layman, teacher, preacher or professor!

In this connection may I say that Rom. 16, 17, 18 states exactly what this text states. And no argument — as put forth in some Lutheran circles today — can take away the “avoid them.”

We proceed, now, to imperatives concerning the official work of Timothy, Titus and every pastor which show how to deal with the different natural groups in congregations. See Tit. 2, 1-10; 3, 2; 1. Tim. 5, 1-16; 6, 1. 2. 17-19.

One thing is, of course, for all groups. Titus 2, 1: “But speak thou the things which become (R. V. befit) the sound doctrine.” Whether a group be composed of old or young, men or women, young men or maidens, rich or poor, married or single, any speaking to them has to befit sound doctrine, *huegoianousa didaskalia*.

Don't rebel against this frequent occurrence of the word doctrine. Note the fact that this word is used sixteen times in the Pastoral Letters. So strongly is it stressed. In the entire Bible it occurs fifty-five times, six in the Old Testament and forty-nine in the New. Of these forty-nine in the New Testament about one-third are found in the Pastoral Letters which are written especially for us pastors. Should this not make us think? Must we not be earnestly concerned about doctrine when we see it stressed so emphatically in the letters written for us? To be true to the Word and true to our calling we must preach and teach pure doctrine, fight for it, and fight against all false doctrine. We should take this to heart right now when “doctrine” is in rather general disfavor, — not alone among the sects and liberal Lutherans. Or doesn't it mean something to note the nearly total absence of doctrinal papers in our own conference announcements? Is that a healthy condition? Is that the beginning of disinterest over against doctrine? We dare not neglect doctrine; not in our studies at home nor at our conferences.

But Paul is not satisfied to deal in generalities. He gives particular imperatives to cover each natural group in a congregation. The respective texts follow: 1. Tim. 5, 1 and Tit. 2, 2 the old men; 1. Tim. 5, 2 and Tit. 2, 3 the older women; 1. Tim. 5, 1 and Tit. 2, 6 the young men; 1. Tim. 5, 2

and Tit. 2, 4, 5 the young women; 1. Tim. 6, 1, 2 and Tit. 2, 9, 10 the slaves; and 1. Tim. 6, 17-19 the rich.

1. Tim. 5, 1: "Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father." An elder here denotes an elderly man, one past 60. Such an one Timothy shall not rebuke. Paul uses *epiplēxēs*, from *epiplēssō*: to strike upon, to chide rebuke, upraid. Luther: "Einen Alten schilt nicht." Paul seeks to put across the idea that an older man should be treated with the same respect which a son would pay his father. Don't rebuke, — entreat. *Parakalei*: Admonish, exhort, plead, beg. Titus should plead with and exhort an older man to be sober. Tit. 2, 2: "That the aged men be *sober* (R. V. temperate)." *Nēphaliōus*: Nuechtern, temperate, abstaining from wine. The admonition to be temperate is not restricted to the use of wine, but covers all things. "Temperate in thought, word and deed; in particular, not rushed off their feet by any flighty teaching." Lenski. — Further, that they be *grave*. *Seimnos*: Venerated for character, honorable. Luther: "Ehrbar." — Further, that they be *temperate* (R. V. *sober-minded*). *Sōphronas*: Curbing desires and impulses, self-controlled. — Further, that they be *sound in faith, in charity, in patience*. "The phrase '*hygiainein en te pistei* etc.' is used of one whose Christian opinions (faith) are free from any admixture of error, who keeps these graces sound and strong." Thayer.

Paul knew that the example of the old men had much to do with the life of the young. — We dare not forget this injunction.

1. Tim. 5, 2: "Intreat (R. V. exhort) the elder women as mothers." How beautifully Paul brings home the fact that our treatment of older women should be on the basis of respect, esteem, kindness, love and consideration. "As mothers."

Tit. 2, 3: Intreat "the aged women likewise, that they be in behavior as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things (R. V. that which is good)." "That they be in behavior as becometh holiness." *Hicroprepeis*: Befitting men, places, actions or things sacred

to God, reverent. Luther: "Dass sie sich halten wie den Heiligen ziemet." Saints they are by their faith in Jesus Christ, cleansed completely by His blood. "He clothed them with the garments of salvation and covered them with the robe of righteousness." Is. 61, 10. Live as saints, not soiling their garments of holiness with sins, especially those mentioned here.

They should not be "false accusers." R. V. "not slanderers." Luther: "Nicht Laesterinnen sein." *Diabolous*: Prone to slander. When the Holy Ghost mentions this sin He really touches a sore spot, for this slanderous gossip, Klatschen, is a besetting sin of older women. That's bad; there is no room for it in a Christian heart. — Further, "that they be not given to much wine." Luther: "Nicht Weinsaeuferinnen." R. V.: "Not enslaved to much wine." That admonition startles us. We thought the need for such an admonition did not arise until our modern women began to frequent the taverns. But the older women must have been in danger of becoming winebibbers in that day too. Titus should intreat them not to be that, but rather to be "teachers of that which is good." Luther: "Gute Lehrerinnen."

They had a big field, namely all the younger women. And They had much to teach. "*Hina sōphronitzousin tas neas*": That they teach the young women. *Sōphronitzein*: Restore one to his senses, moderate, curb, discipline, hold one to his duty, admonish, exhort earnestly. How? By showing and telling them to be *philandrous*, husband-lovers; *philoteknous*, children-lovers. Then to be *sōphronas*, soberminded; not given to a lust-life. Then to be discrete, chaste. (Not in the Greek text.) Then *hagnas*, pure, modest, chaste. This word speaks of purity of the entire life; free from every fault, immaculate. Then *oikourgous*, home-makers, Hausfrauen, not Ausfrauen. That touches a sore spot of our present age, doesn't it? Then to be *agathas*, good, kind so as to be acceptable to God. Last but not least, *hypotassomenas tois idiois andrasin*, obedient to their own husbands. Luther: "Ihren eigenen Maennern untertan." How this is opposed in these days of so-called equality of the sexes! Especially in this

land of liberty! But thus it is written. All through the Bible. And right from the beginning. Gen. 3, 16: "He shall rule over thee."

All this the older women should teach the younger women and admonish them to listen. And the younger women should listen that the *Word of God* be not *blasphemed*. That must stand and the Christians are bound to do everything possible to keep it from being reviled.

The younger women, — "intreat them as sisters with (R. V. in) all purity." 1. Tim. 5, 2.

The younger men, — "intreat as brethren." 1. Tim. 5, 1. And "exhort them to be soberminded." Tit. 2, 6. Luther: "Dass sie zuechtig seien." *Sōphronein*, see above.

The slaves, *douloi*, — it takes a little longer to study how Timothy and Titus should deal with them.

Slavery was an institution in Paul's day. Scripture does not condemn it. Jesus did not abolish it. Nor did the apostles or the early Church. Paul's letter to Philemon shows that. But Scripture says much to safeguard the life and welfare of slaves and about the treatment they should receive. We must bear in mind, too, that many slaves of Paul's day were Christians and members of Christian congregations. They had to be dealt with. But how?

1. Tim. 6, 1 speaks of slaves whose masters were heathen. "Let as many servants (*douloi*: slaves) as are (R. V. as are servants) under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his (R. V. the) doctrine be not blasphemed."

Here were Christians, free from sin and Satan, free Children of God and heirs with Christ of eternal life. But they were not free to run out on their masters. They were not free to step out from under their yoke. *Zeugos*: A burdensome burden; used especially of slavery. They remained bound even to their heathen masters whose treatment of them could be described with the word 'cruelty' and whose cruelty knew no bounds when the slave belonged to 'that new sect', Christianity. It must have been hard to hear: "Let (them) count their own masters worthy of all honor." That

included working faithfully and according to the master's instructions. Why? "That the name of God and the doctrine be not blasphemed." How strange it sounds to hear the word 'doctrine' in this connection! — The liberty of the children of God transcended slavery. That freedom, born out of the doctrine of the Gospel, made men willing and faithful even in slavery. Slavery was endured because a man was free in Christ and its burdensome tasks were done gladly to the glory of God, — such a spirit could make men see that the Gospel was a power of God. But disobedience and disrespect would make the masters disrespect and blaspheme the Gospel.

Tit. 2, 9: "Exhort servants (again *douloi*) to be obedient unto (R. V. in subjection to) their own masters and please them well (R. V. to be wellpleasing unto them) in all things, not answering (R. V. gainsaying) again." In v. 1 this: "Speak thou the things which become sound doctrine." In v. 10 the sound doctrine.

The Christian slaves who had heathen masters should be *huepostanesthai*, obedient, in subjection; willingly performing duties assigned in order that the masters might be pleased. No argument, no contradiction, no gainsaying. V. 10: "Not purloining, but showing all good fidelity that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things." No stealing of any kind; not of money, goods, respect, or anything that a master thinks rightly belongs to him. And all the slave's work to be done in all good fidelity. That really speaks of a fidelity which is acceptable to God. Luther: "Alle gute Treue erzeugen." Such a living faith would adorn, *kosmein*, schmuecken, the doctrine of God the Savior; would make it appear beautiful. And God alone knows how many masters were won to Christ by a slave's good fidelity.

1. Tim. 6, 2: "And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren, but rather do them service (R. V. let them serve them rather) because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit (R. V. because they that partake of the benefit are believing and beloved)."

A slave dare not take liberties with his master, because the master was a brother in the faith. *Me kataphroneitōsan*: Do not despise, disdain. The fact that a master is a Christian should make the slave all the more willing to serve him, for the one benefited by the faithful service is a brother.

We have no slavery. Everybody is free theoretically. But conditions in our day must make us take to heart the words: "These things teach and exhort."

Paul had something to say, too, about Timothy's dealing with the rich.

1. Tim. 6, 17-19: "Charge them (*paraggelle*) that are rich in this world (R. V. present world) that they be not highminded; nor trust in uncertain riches (R. V. nor have their hope set on the uncertainty of riches); but set their hope on God, who gives us all things richly to enjoy; that they do good; that they be rich in good works; that they be ready to distribute; to communicate; laying up in store a good foundation; against the time to come; that they may lay hold on eternal life (R. V. on the life which is life indeed)."

The warning Paul addressed vv. 9-10 to them that desired riches certainly applies to such as have attained riches. Riches are not evil per se, but they certainly are very apt to have evil effects on men. On the other hand, they can become a great blessing through proper use. Their use should please God, be of benefit to the course of the Gospel and bring blessings to their owners for time and eternity.

Therefore they had to be warned of the danger of becoming highminded, *hypsēlo phronein*. Luther: "Dass sie nicht stolz seien." An inherent danger of wealth is pride. It makes men prone to demand special honors and to despise the less wealthy. Ps. 49, 7: "They boast themselves in the multitude of their riches." See also Jer. 9, 23. The warning is in place: "If riches increase, set not your heart upon them (R. V. thereon)." Ps. 62, 10. Riches are not abiding. It is foolish to put trust in them. Timothy's warning does not really speak of trust, but of hope. *Mēde ēlpikenai epi ploutou adēlotēti*: Do not set hope on the uncertainty of riches. They

can be lost, stolen, destroyed. Prov. 11, 28: "He that trusteth in his riches shall fall." We have seen that often. And yet even Christians crave riches.

Rich Christians, as all others, should hope in God. His promises are also to them. These promises are important. "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." Hebr. 13, 5. The almighty God is their Father whose grace, love, guidance and protection are not uncertain like material wealth. What money cannot do He does: "Who gives us richly all things to enjoy." All of us. *Tō parechonti hēmin panta plousiōs eis apolausin.* Lenski translates: "The one furnishing to us all things richly for enjoyment." Riches? Here today and gone tomorrow. But the great God? The same yesterday, today and forever.

The rich can please God with their riches. Thus they will gain lasting enjoyment from them. They have their riches "that they do good." In them also they are merely stewards of God and will have to account to Him. They have their riches "to trade with," Luke 19, 13, by doing good. Opportunities abound. Think of the Good Samaritan, Luke 10, 33-35. The poor, the needy, the hungry, the naked and the persecuted are always with us. In the spiritual sense too. That makes us think of mission work and works of charity. Lenski makes a fine observation: "The rich man can be only in one room at a time, wear only one suit of clothes, sit only in one chair, eat only one meal at mealtime; but with his wealth he can reach out in a thousand directions and work good." P. 740. Hoarding riches will bring the same results as are described in the parable of "the certain rich man." Luke 12, 16-21. — "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Acts 20, 35.

That means that they be rich in good works. Luther: "Dass sie reich werden in guten Werken." This wealth they can gain by using material wealth to do good. The charge naturally follows "that they be ready to distribute." Luther: "Gerne geben." *Eumetadotous einai.* *Eu* denotes a happy and pleasant willingness; *meta*, with and *dotos*, giver; one who gladly shares his riches with others. Hebr. 13, 16: "*Wohlzutun* und

mit-zu-teilen." The rich should be "willing to communicate." *Koinōnikous*, fellowshiping, inclined to share one's possessions with others, liberal in giving. Luther: "Behilflich sein." Of this fellowshiping we read in Acts 2, 42. Its results are stated in v. 44: "They had all things common."

Thus they will be "laying up in store for themselves a good foundation." *Apothesaurizōntas*, storing up abundance for future use. *Themelion*, foundation. Thayer: "A solid and stable spiritual possession, on which resting as on a foundation they may strive to lay hold on eternal life." So they gather treasures which are not corruptible but eternal. They lay up for themselves a solid foundation for their Christian hope, for this foundation is to be an assurance against the time, *to mellon*. Luther: "Schaetze sammeln, ihnen selbst einen guten Grund aufs *Zukuenftige*." *To mellon*, a thing future, a thing to come, the more perfect state of things which will exist in the *aiōn mellōn*. Thayer. If rich Christians, in fact, any Christians, have this foundation they may lay hold on eternal life, on the life which is life indeed. *Ontōs*, that which is truly, is indeed.

No, this does not mean that rich Christians earn salvation by liberal use of their wealth. Christ earned salvation for every sinner. He said: "It is finished." It cannot be bought or earned. It is always a free gift of grace. It is taken hold of by faith. But faith is active and proves itself in works. Without works faith is dead. James 2, 17-26. If the rich will follow the charge of the Holy Ghost they will bring forth fruits of faith which again makes for a real life. Matth. 25, 34-46 Christ clearly shows that works of faith do not earn salvation by His choice of the word "inherit."

So our work with the rich is cut out for us as it was for Timothy.

* * * *

We now must write a temporary *finis* to this work. God willing, we shall finish when the press of other duties has ended. This unfinished study shows us how precious, serious and responsible the office of a bishop is. W. BODAMER.

THE BLOOD SACRIFICES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

The following study is the outgrowth of an assignment by the Program Committee of the Misericordias Conference (Mixed) of Milwaukee and vicinity. The purpose of the committee was to bring about a comparison of the several types of blood sacrifices prescribed in Leviticus, to note the points in which they agree as well as those in which they differ from each other, and finally to try to ascertain the significance of the common features on the one hand, and of the variants on the other, with particular attention to any New Testament references which might be noted. This material was presented to the 1945 Conference in lecture form. The present article follows the same line of thought, but may occasionally vary somewhat in its presentation.

In view of the prescribed limitations there will be no attempt to treat either the origin or the development of sacrifice as a rite of worship. Nor is there any occasion for comparing the sacrifices of Israel with the many forms of offerings practiced by heathen nations. It will be enough to study the material presented in the first five chapters of Leviticus (excepting only chapter 2, which deals with the bloodless Meal Offering), with the additional information supplied by chapters 6, 7, 16, and 17, plus a few references in the Book of Numbers.

These are the divinely sanctioned sacrifices of the Old Testament, constituting an integral part of the Covenant of Sinai, and setting apart the Chosen People from all other nations. These are the forms under which God would be worshipped by them. They reflect the Messianic promise for the sake of which this Covenant was established, and served to keep it ever before the people in a rich variety of types. This justifies our speaking of their New Testament significance, noting the New Testament fulfillments, allusions, parallels, and applications, which constitute the chief reason for this study.

For the sake of facilitating the necessary comparisons this

material has been condensed into a convenient table to which we shall refer from time to time during the course of this study. It will, of course, be understood that such a condensation cannot do full justice to the original material, and therefore should not be permitted to supplant it. After all, there is no adequate substitute for the original text.

A. The Significance of the Common Features

It will be seen from our table that the Blood Offerings of the Old Testament were four in number: the Burnt Offering, the Peace Offering, the Sin Offering, the Tresspass Offering. These several names in themselves constitute variant features, the significance of which shall be discussed later. For our present purpose it will be enough to note that they cover the different phases of worship and prayer, of confession and absolution. Something of each of these elements is included in every one of these different types of sacrifices. The different types, in turn, serve to give particular emphasis or expression to one or the other of these elements of worship. Together with the one bloodless offering they are a complete expression of the relation of a Covenant People to their God.

There is little uniformity in that part of these codes which deals with the nature of the sacrificial victim, unless it were the requirement that there be a victim, and that this be without blemish. The approved list runs from the powerful bullock down to a shrinking pair of turtle doves. A further bit of consideration for the poor was shown when they were permitted to bring as little as a tenth of an Ephah of meal (Lv. 5, 11). After this, however, there follow a number of steps in which a striking similarity runs through each of the several types of sacrifices under discussion. They are a) the Presentation, b) the Laying on of Hands, c) the Slaughtering, d) the Use of the Blood, and (after flaying and dissection) e) the Consuming of the Flesh. In the case of d) and e) certain variations occur within the action which we shall note later. But in each case the action itself is the same.

The formal act of the presentation of the offering took

THE BLOOD-SACRIFICES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

	OLAH	ZEBACH	CHATTATH	ASHAM
	Burnt Offering Brand-, Ganzopfer. Lev. 1.	SHELAMIM Peace, Thank Offering Dank-, Heilsopfer. Lev. 3.	Sin Offering Suendopfer. Lev. 4, 1—5, 13.	Trespass Offering Schuldopfer. Lev. 5, 14—6, 7.
VICTIM HOSTIA	Cattle, sheep, goats, or doves. Perfect male.	“One of the flock,” perfect, male or female.	Bullock, goat, sheep, doves, <i>or</i> meal offering (<i>without</i> oil or incense).	Ram, plus amends. — Lamb for lepers and Nazarites.
CEREMONIAL (general)	Solemn Presentation; Laying on of Hands; Slaughtering (on north side of Altar, except in SHELAMIM); Use of Blood; Consuming of Flesh.			
CEREMONIAL of	Dashed against sides of Great Altar.	The Same	1) To Horns of the Great Altar. 2) To Altar of In- cense, against Veil. 3) Into Holiest, upon KAPPORETH.	Against sides of Great Altar.
BLOOD				
CEREMONIAL of	Sacrificial burning (HIQTIR) of entire victim (Holocaust) except hide and offal.	Sacrificial burning of select fat and flesh. Part for priests, remainder for offerer, guests. Leavings burnt.	Sacrificial burning of select parts. Remainder consumed by priests or burnt outside of camp (SARAPH).	Sacrificial burning of select parts. Remainder consumed by priests.
FLESH				

OCCASION	Morning and Evening Sacrifice. Also personal devotion.	For blessings received (public or private). On entering or completing a vow. Voluntary offering.	For sins, of High-priest (ch. 4, 3-12) Congregation (12-21) Rulers (22-26) Commoners (27-35)	For specific trespass; not part of festival ceremonies.
PURPOSE	Worship, Prayer, Reverence: — “ <i>Sacrificium latreuticum.</i> ”	Thanksgiving, Praise, Entreaty. Communion of blessings: — “ <i>Sacrificia eucharistica vel impetratoria.</i> ”	Propitiation, Expiation of sin before God. Cf. Lev. 16.	Satisfaction for violation of rights of others. Restoration of obligations.
N. T. SIGNIFICANCE	Prayer, Worship: in word, (Hb. 13, 15) in “service” (Rom. 12, 1).	Thanksgiving, Supplication, Intercession. Participation in Xtian privileges. Fellowship, sacramental and personal.	The Great Atonement (Hb. 9-10). Confession, Absolution.	Fruits of repentance (apology, amends, restitution).

EXPRESSING
the Covenant Relationship.

RESTORING
the Covenant Relationship.

place at the door of the Tabernacle, Lv. 1, 3. It involved an examination of the animal to determine whether it met with the ceremonial requirements. The presence of these animals in the Court of the Temple (John 2) would seem to indicate that they had been previously examined, and were now offered for sale to the worshipers as "certified stock." Koenig holds that because of this examination the act of presentation can not be considered a part of the sacrificial action proper, since it would always be possible that the intended victim might have to be rejected. But this reasoning is hardly cogent since such a rejection need constitute only a temporary interruption, and not an annulling of the sacrifice. Presumably the offerer would soon appear with another offering to carry out his original intention. In all other respects this part of the ceremony is certainly filled with sacrificial implications. The offering is called by the solemn liturgical name of QORBAN (QARAB — to approach in reverence and worship). The injunction, "He shall offer it of his own voluntary will" points to the quality of conscious, active surrender to God, which is an essential element of any offering which should be pleasing to Him. But in one respect this voluntary quality, essential though it was, could not possibly express the true situation existing between the offerer and his God. It could not give adequate expression to the fact that because of man's sin his life was forfeit. For this purpose the silent victim had to serve, by dying as the substitute, that the offerer might live. But the death of this victim was incomplete in turn, could not be otherwise, in fact. For in this passive role the voluntary element is necessarily missing. These two essential features were to be combined once only, thus to create the perfect sacrifice: "Christ . . . hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor" (Eph. 5, 2). This alone was the perfect Presentation, an offering without blemish.

The next part of the ceremonial of sacrifice was the peculiarly impressive laying on of hands. It is carefully prescribed in connection with every offering but the so-called Trespass Offering. According to Keil no conclusions are to

be drawn from this omission, since the procedure had been quite firmly established by the preceding ordinances. We are not ready to share the positiveness of this assertion, but feel that this does not detract from either the solemnity or the significance of the action. The usual form was that the offerer would lay his hands upon the head of the victim. The ceremony was made doubly impressive when on the Day of Atonement (YOM KIPPUR) the High Priest placed both hands upon the head of the Scapegoat and confessed over him all the sins of the Children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat (Lv. 16, 21). This leaves no doubt as to the significance of this action in connection with the Sin Offering. In other cases the thought may well have been of a more general nature, and in keeping with the character and purpose of the particular type of sacrifice in question. By this action the offerer would then be dedicating his sacrifice to God, and making it the vehicle, as it were, of the particular thought that was uppermost in his heart and which constituted the specific purpose of his offering, be it worship, prayer, thanksgiving, or perhaps a particular confession of sin. It is this last thought which is used in a most appropriate manner by Isaac Watts:

My faith would lay her hand
 On that dear head of Thine
 While like a penitent I stand
 And there confess my sin.
 (LUTH. HYMNAL, 156, 3)

The prophet likewise clearly has this same particular feature of the Atonement Day ceremonial in mind when he says of the great Servant of the Lord, "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Is. 53, 6).

The ceremonial slaughtering of the sacrificial victim is designated by the word SHACHAT, rather than the Piel or Hifil MUTH which would suggest the bare act of putting to death. As in the case of the previous actions (presentation, laying on of hands), so this function was as a rule performed by the offerer himself. Exceptions occurred when this was

done by the Highpriest in behalf of the people at large (Day of Atonement) or when the priests brought the standing offerings of worship and prayer which were repeated each day. It is sometimes said (e. g. by Oehler) that the SHACHAT was a purely functional act, needed to secure the blood for the subsequent rite, and that it had no significance of its own, perhaps as picturing the punishment by which satisfaction is made for sin. But if we note that the blood is accepted as an atonement "because the life of the flesh is in the blood" (Lv. 17, 11), then surely one can not escape the conviction that a broader significance is to be attached to the death of the victim which has already been designated as the accepted substitute for the one who is bringing the offering. It is a drastic preachment, made doubly impressive by the fact that the offerer must with his own hand carry out the fatal sentence, to the uniform effect that "the wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6, 23).

The next step in the solemn sacrificial rite was the use of the blood. The manner of doing this was by no means uniform, but was most carefully prescribed for each particular occasion. Sometimes the blood was to be poured out from a vessel against the four sides of the Great Altar, and this with considerable vigor (ZARAQ — dashed). Sometimes it was sprinkled with the fingers (HIZZAH). On certain occasions it was applied (NATHAN) to the horns of the altar, on others poured out in great quantity (YISHPOK) at the foot of the altar. Another variant was the manner in which the blood of the doves was caused to spurt against the sides of the altar (Lv. 1, 15). But regardless of how much difference there was in these matters of detail, the constant factor remains that the blood was always to be used. The only exception was the Meal Offering (which the A. V. somewhat misleadingly calls Meat Offering), in which God's people by their token gifts of grain, flour, or cakes acknowledged Him as the sole Giver of their Daily Bread, and which therefore lay on a somewhat different plane. But otherwise, whenever these people came before their God, whether in solemn worship, in joyful praise, or in mournful confession, there was always

enacted before their eyes the shedding of that blood which God had given them upon the altar for an atonement for their souls.

Not only was this the obvious climax of the sacrificial rite, but it was also clearly an indispensable part of it. In noting its significance we come to the very heart of the entire institution of blood sacrifices. Concerning this use of the blood God Himself had told His people (Lv. 17, 11): "I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls" (literally: for a covering unto your souls — L'KAPPER AL-NAPHSHOTHEIKEM). Like a protecting shield this blood was to come between these lives that because of sin were subject to death, and the just vengeance of their God. Its mute appeal was to be a constant plea for pardon, and its price, namely the life which had been yielded in the shedding of this blood, was to render full satisfaction for the enormous debt which had been incurred. This was the way of the Atonement, of reconciliation, without which no true Israelite who was conscious of the holiness of God could venture to come into His presence.

Obviously, this could not rest on terms other than those designated by God Himself. He was the One to whom satisfaction had to be made. Neither work nor offering designed by man could be of any value here. It was therefore a powerful support to the faith of true children of the Covenant that they could look to the express words in which their Lord had said to them: "I have given it to you upon the altar." Now let reason come upon the discovery that there is no inherent value in the blood of bulls and goats. The blessing of the Atonement was still secure to them. It rested on God's solemn promise. Any means chosen and designated by Him must needs be effective, be they ever so far beyond the power of reason to understand. We may well apply to this blood rite of the Old Testament what Augustine said concerning the divinely instituted ceremonies of the New: "*Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum.*"

In another respect, however, the majesty of the "I," which could well inspire boundless terror in the heart of a member of the Covenant, is tempered by the sheer grace of the next

word, NATHATTI, I have *given*.. It was simply God's royal, gracious gift, tendered in mercy to a people who had nothing adequate of their own which they could bring. It placed a readily available means for atonement at their disposal, even as once before in an hour of desperate need God had provided an Abraham with a substitute for the sacrifice.

If in magnifying the grace of this gift it has been brought out that these blood offerings had no inherent value of their own, at least not for the purpose for which they were to serve, and that no particular merit could therefore be attributed to the bringing of such an offering, this still does not imply that this use of blood as the means for bringing about an atonement constitutes an arbitrary choice of an irrelevant token on the part of God. The contrary is rather implied by the words which state the reason for this choice. For it seems certain that the prepositional Beth in BANNEPHEESH is instrumental, stating that the blood makes an atonement *through* the life. We would perhaps say, through the fact that it is the vehicle of the life. Better than any other instrument that could have been chosen it brought out the fact that the issue was indeed one of life and death, and that the offering had to be one that was in kind.

True, this might, and probably did, suggest another problem to the mind of many believers of old, concerning the grave discrepancy between the blood and life of a sacrificial animal and the high purpose which it was to serve. So little was being offered where so much was being sought. But if the need of a greater sacrifice was thereby indicated, that was well and good, for a Greater Sacrifice was indeed to come. It was supplied when "Christ, being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Hb. 9, 11f. To point to Him was the sole purpose of these Blood Sacrifices. Because of this all important function these countless offerings are completely justified. Everything which these elaborate ceremonies had

foretold in their picturesque type found its complete fulfillment in the perfect antitype, Jesus Christ.

The solemn rites of sacrifice which we have traced so far end with the consuming of the flesh. Again there are several methods which were employed, but it is the same function which in each case was thereby carried out. Once an offering had been consecrated to the Lord, no part of it was ever to revert to profane use. It was to be given to God in its entirety. In the case of these offerings this was sometimes done by a slow burning upon the altar (HIQTIR), sometimes by a bright blazing fire beyond the borders of the camp (SARAPH, the same root which appears in the word SERAPHIM). Sometimes it was to be eaten by the priests, sometimes even by the offerer and his guests. Compare the Table. When certain parts of the offering were consumed by the priests, the thought was that God was receiving His tribute through them. When the offerer and his guests shared in the sacrificial meal (at the Peace Offering), the thought was still that the offering was already the Lord's, and that He was permitting men to share in His bounty, to rejoice in His gifts and blessings. As His guests they were consuming this offering for Him. For even under these circumstances the offering was to be a complete one.

If we may assign some New Testament significance to this feature, it is perhaps best to abide by the simple fact that the offering of our great High Priest was to be a complete one. He yielded Himself without reservation, giving His body, shedding His blood, surrendering His will to that of His heavenly Father, rendering perfect obedience, even unto death, paying to His Father the tribute of perfect trust, and at last commending His soul into the Father's hands. It was a perfect offering when *Christ gave Himself for us*.

E. REIM.

(To be continued)

"A LIVING LUTHERAN THEOLOGY"

This pamphlet by O. H. Pannkoke, D. D., in the Wartburg Seminary Quarterly, March, 1946, Dubuque, Iowa, has been sent to all Lutheran pastors in America by the American Lutheran Conference. It is provided with a "Foreword" by Dr. H. L. Yochum, President of the American Lutheran Conference, and an Introduction by Dr. E. E. Ryden, Chairman of the American Lutheran Conference Commission on Lutheran Unity, and is recommended, according to the author's prefatory "Note", by a whole galaxy of leading theologians in the A. L. C. and the U. L. C., and must thus be regarded as reflecting the position prevalent in these churches. It is, therefore, worthy of serious attention and of a more extended review than its intrinsic importance might justify.

According to Dr. Yochum, "this essay cuts away the alluvial deposits of post-Reformation theology, with its scholastic, Aristotelian method, and lays bare again the solid bedrock of Luther's dynamic theology in all its simple, rugged, Scriptural majesty." According to Dr. Ryden, "Dr. Pannkoke makes it clear that the seat of true religion is not found so much in the intellect and affections as in the conscience of man. . . . The deepest problem of the Church in our day is 'the problem posed by the need for a living faith, sensitive to the needs of life.' In order to express such a faith 'it is necessary to have a living theology.'" For this reason, Dr. Ryden thinks that the pamphlet should "help to crystallize the thinking of the Church — and become a vital factor in promoting a spirit of unity and understanding in American Lutheranism."

We have here, then, an attack on the so-called "intellectualism" of Lutheran theology, especially that of the "orthodox period," and an attempt to promote Lutheran unity by minimizing the importance of doctrine and "by treating the Christian religion as an organic whole at work in life to save souls."

When we examine this essay, we are struck by the highly intellectualistic character of its polemic against "intel-

lectualism" in Lutheran theology. Its language is the language of modern psychology and philosophy, no less abstruse, and considerably less in harmony with Biblical language and thought, than the Aristotelian forms of logic were made to be in the hands of such dogmaticians as Gerhard, Calov, etc. The Bible is scarcely quoted. Nor is there any real use made of Luther's writings. Instead it makes a series of bold assertions, many of which are contrary to fact, or, at best, highly misleading. We cannot review them all here without writing an essay at least as long as the one under consideration. As the author correctly states: "It has been well said it is easier to refute error than to clear up confusion." And his essay is filled with the "half-truths which lead to confusion." We shall, then, not try to list all the objectionable statements in this pamphlet, but only indicate the character of the mistakes in it, assuming that our readers have the essay before them.

The opening statement is rather a startling one: "To have a living faith, . . . this has been a deepening desire of our Church *for more than a decade.*" (Our italics.) Has not the orthodox Lutheran Church *at all times* sought to have, and to give to others, a "living faith?" To say that "the deepest problem, the problem posed by the need for a living faith, . . . remains to a large extent unsolved" is to make the indefensible charge against Lutheran pastors that they have, in general, not succeeded in bringing souls to Christ. If it does not mean that, it reflects a "schwaermerisch" view of what true Christians are expected to accomplish in the way of "exerting influence upon men and governments." We are told that the Lutheran Church has "failed" and now faces extinction in much of Europe because it has not had such "a living theology" as Dr. Pannkoke demands. We can agree that the judgment of God has fallen upon the nations because of their apostasy from the true faith and the denial of the inspired Word which has characterised practically all of Protestant theology in Europe during the last decades. But we cannot agree that this apostasy is to be traced to the "intellectualism" of the 17th century theologians. It is simply not true that "it was inevitable that the age of orthodoxy should end in

the age of dead orthodoxy, and that dead orthodoxy was followed by the *sacculum rationale*." It was the Pietistic reaction against orthodoxy which led directly to rationalism, — the same sort of confused, heterodox thinking as is found today in the theologians to whom the essay before us refers with approval, — Barth, Brunner, Buber, Kierkegaard, etc.

Nor is it right to say that the Lutheran Church has "failed" because it did not prevent the World War or save men from the disasters in the social and economic spheres that have overwhelmed them. Did the Lutheran Church "fail" because the horrors of the Thirty Years' War followed the successful Reformation which Luther began? There is no promise in Scripture that the Church of Christ shall ever gain such power and influence in the world that it can dictate to governments and force its will upon men. True Christians will leave all strivings after such power to the Antichrist in Rome and to the Social Gospel enthusiasts with their Chiliastic dreams of a kingdom of God on this earth.

In answering the question: "What is the nerve center of the Christian religion?", the author describes traditional Lutheran theology in a way that must be called a caricature of it. He says that it "believed that fundamental doctrines like the existence of God and the divine origin of the Word can be rationally demonstrated. Such logical proof, it is held, is important to create faith." But the fact is that no orthodox theologian, certainly not such "intellectuals" as Gerhard, Quenstedt, etc., ever suggested any such thing. They did discuss the various philosophical arguments for the existence of God, as a part of that "Natural Theology" which all men can gain by the light of reason. But they never equated this with revealed theology; nor did they teach that rational arguments would convince any man of the divine origin of the Word. It is the Word itself which creates faith in it, because it is the power of God, as they showed clearly over against the rationalizing Reformed theologians.

Nor is it true that "the age of orthodoxy . . . made the Christian religion . . . a religion of the intellect instead of a religion of conscience," etc. It defined correctly the part which

the mind, the heart and the will play in the Christian faith, following the clear Bible teachings strictly, without any admixture of heathen philosophies, such as color too many of Dr. Pannkoke's statements. It is one of the strange characteristics of the essay that it continually puts into opposing categories things which really belong together. It argues that "a living theology . . . is *not* a religion of the intellect or the affections. It is a religion of conscience." Could anything be more unpsychological, as well as unbiblical, than to separate the intellect and the feelings and the conscience of man from one another in this way? A true "living theology" governs the whole man, intellect, feelings, will and conscience. One must *know* something about God in order to love Him. And it is the love of God — revealed in His Word to appropriate which we must use our intellect — which so stirs a man's heart and will that, repenting of his sins, he comes to believe in the Savior. The intellectual giants in the Golden Age of Lutheranism, men who combined a real piety with monumental learning, never made such banal mistakes as to deny this. The essay, indeed, makes bold to say: "The classical dogmaticians formulated the three steps: knowledge, assent and trust. They did irreparable harm through this mechanical logical formula." This is to say that we do harm to the souls of our young people by asking them to learn such statements as Q. 103, 124, 166 in the new Syn. Conf. Catechism, or Q. 189 in the old Norwegian Synod Catechism: "This is true faith in Jesus Christ, that I, a lost sinner, *know* Jesus Christ as my Savior from sin, death, and the devil, that I lay hold on Him and His merits, and *trust with all my heart* in Him alone." Suffice it to say in reply, that the author's confused reasoning in this connection is as unbiblical as the theology of the heterodox Modernists whom he seems to be following, men who substitute subjectivistic *philosophising about* religion for the Scripture-based, objective formulation of Christian doctrine which orthodox Lutherans have always presented.

If we are to speak of "the nerve center of the Christian religion" at all, it must be the "will" to which we give this place, since it is the enslaved will of man which God must

set free by the power of His Word before any man can truly know and believe in God. This setting up of opposites where there should be a more realistic synthesis is carried to Hegelian extremes: "Out of the contrast between abstract and concrete flow four further important contrasts: uniformity vs. tension, rationality vs. fate, coherence vs. dialectic, system vs. problems." Much space is devoted to such dialectics, as well as to discussing, along evolutionary lines, the proposition: "The abstract absolute acquires significance only through the concrete relativity of history." We have translated Baier into English and have struggled with his Aristotelian logical terms, but have not found anything in all 17th century theology which reduces theology to abstract logomachy so successfully as this short essay does. We must, indeed, make sure that "our doctrines . . . describe the Christian religion as it is actually revealed in the Bible." But it is not "Aristotelian dialectics" which we today need to fear, lest it "color our doctrines"; . . . it is the evolutionary philosophy of *unlimited change* which permeates practically all modern thinking, including such thinking as there is in the essay before us. The 17th century theologians, after all, used the logical forms and terms of Aristotle, because it was the learned language of their day, and only as an aid toward *systematising*, and setting forth clearly, the doctrines of the Bible. Their teachings were in no sense "colored" by the philosophy of Aristotle, but were the teachings of the Bible alone. To deny this would be only to reveal one's ignorance of the writings of orthodox Lutheran theologians.

These theologians also knew better than to think that "dogmatics," the branch of theology which sets forth Christian teachings in systematic form, was the whole of religion. It is the fundamental historical error of Dr. Pannkoek's essay that he bases his philippic against "intellectualism in religion" on this false charge. Correct and clear dogmatical teaching is as valuable for the Christian as correct analysis, e. g. of plant structures, is for the botanist. At Harvard University there is a famous "museum of glass flowers," the only one of its kind in the world. The glass flowers were made by a few

German artists whose art apparently will die with them. Their work is of immense value in the study of botany, since it has "frozen" an amazing variety of plants in all stages of growth, "breaking them up into their component parts," and showing, often in magnified form, just what the plants look like in those various stages. But would anyone suggest that those German artists thought they were "giving a true picture of reality" when they thus reproduced living plants in blown glass? They knew, of course, that there was no life in their glass flowers, nor could they describe or set forth the whole of botanical science in this way. And it is no less ridiculous to suggest that the orthodox Lutheran theologians thought they had presented the whole of true Christianity when they published their *Loci* or *Sentences*. These were professedly but the analysis of a doctrine which must be lived to be truly known, a doctrine which they also knew must become a part of our inmost being by an intimate, spiritual union with Him Who is the Truth, the Way, and the Life.

Dr. Pannkoke thinks that all Lutherans have the same faith, but that they are separated chiefly because they "differ in their conception of the nature of theology and in theological method." The above should be enough to indicate that there can be no compromise between orthodox Lutheran theology and such Modernistic, quasi-philosophical, anti-Lutheran theorizing as confronts us in this pamphlet. Lutheran unity is still a long ways off, if this so-called "Living Lutheran Theology" must be relied on to bring it about. May the Lord of the Church guard and keep His true visible Church in the old paths in spite of all false friends and "blind leaders of the blind," for His mercies' sake.

GEO. O. LILLEGARD.

A CORRECTION

On page 217 of the July, 1946, number of the *Quartalschrift* the first three lines, which do not follow in their correct order, should read: (It) was forced to close its doors in December of 1939 and was replaced by the "kirchlich reguliertes Privatstudium" of the Bohemian Brethren. In May of 1945 the Hus-Faculty was reopened. It is divided into two Sections:

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

The Doctrinal Affirmation Revised. — A revised version of the Doctrinal Affirmation, the "one document" for union which is before the American Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod, was submitted to the Synodical Conference (August 6-9) by the Joint Union Committees of the several synods of the Synodical Conference. The then current issue of the *Lutheran Witness* (July 30, p. 256) brought a report by this same committee in which the origin of this revision was explained and a statement was made concerning the future plans of this committee with reference to this revision. It might also be said here that the version finally accepted by the Committee on Doctrinal Unity is somewhat different from the draft submitted to the Synodical Conference.

In the words of the *Lutheran Witness* report:

"... the Doctrinal Affirmation was not charged with any doctrinal error, and therefore no modification of its doctrinal content was required, although some held that the phraseology here and there did not exclude doctrinal error. What therefore seemed imperative to meet the sentiments expressed in the comments was a *clarification of expressions* (italics by ed.). . . . To insure, if possible, a kind reception of such suggested clarifications throughout the Synodical Conference, at the request of the Committee on Doctrinal Unity, representatives of the sister synods were appointed as advisory members. This group, meeting on January 7 and 8, of this year, agreed unanimously on clarifications to be suggested to the Committee on Doctrinal Unity for consideration."

Plans for the future are to the effect

"... that the Committee on Doctrinal Unity should ask for a meeting in the near future with the American Lutheran Church Committee on Intersynodical Fellowship, to inform this Committee of the proposed clarifications, and to gain its approval."

We agree that criticism of the Doctrinal Affirmation was largely, although not solely, to the effect that "the phraseology here and there did not exclude doctrinal error." We can, however, not share the conclusions of the committee when it states that what seemed necessary was "a clarification of expression." To us this seems to be an understatement which probably will convey to the reader the impression that the entire matter was really not as serious as it had first seemed. It plays down the storm of criticism that was called forth by the Affirmation. But when one recalls that the doctrinal errors to which the report refers, and which in the sober judgment of many members of the sister synods as well as of Missouri itself were *not excluded* by the Affirmation, are the old and well known errors which have troubled the several synods for at least two

generations, when one further recalls that the Doctrinal Affirmation was to settle the controversy on these very issues, then it becomes clear that this revision is by no means a matter of minor importance. Nor is it in fact only a "clarification." By returning more and more to the concise and pointed language of the Brief Statement of 1932, this revision, as it was reported to the Synodical Conference, is in many points acquiring the antithetical quality which, at least to some of the advisory members, is essential to any document which seeks to settle a controversy that has divided the church.

As for the further intentions of the Committee on Doctrinal Unity, which now proposes to gain the approval of the A. L. C. Committee for this Revision, we can only say that this was not our conception of the assignment given to the sub-committee and its advisory members. The plainly expressed purpose was rather to see whether we in the Synodical Conference still see eye to eye on these questions, and are able to state our position jointly in such a manner that it will meet with general approval in our own circles. In this respect the unanimity of the small group which drafted the revision was, of course, very gratifying. But it would be a serious mistake therefore to take the wider acceptance of the revision for granted. This still remains to be seen. And this is of prime importance. For to establish our internal unity is our first need. Until that has been attained, it can only work further havoc to embark on a new series of negotiations on the basis of a document, the general acceptance of which is still pending.

E. REIM.

The Doctrinal Affirmation Doomed? — From October 10 to 17, the American Lutheran Church will hold its convention in Appleton, Wisconsin. The *Lutheran Standard* for September 28 lists fifteen "leading issues that will come before the convention." Among them, the forecast of the *Standard* on the probable action to be taken concerning the union question is of special significance to the synods of the Synodical Conference. We reprint it here.

"2. Concerning church fellowship the Appleton convention will be told that in the official negotiations between our Church and both the U. L. C. and the Missouri Synod the last two years have witnessed no advance. Our Committee on Intersynodical Fellowship will recommend that the effort to formulate a unified doctrinal statement in our negotiations with the Missouri Synod be abandoned, and that our Church declare its readiness to offer pulpit and altar fellowship to that synod on the basis of its *Brief Statement* and our *Declaration*.

As to selective fellowship, which means official approval of fellowship between our pastors and congregations and all other Lutheran pastors and congregations that adhere to the historic confessions and

church practices of the Lutheran Church, this has been so wholeheartedly approved by the several districts that its approval at Appleton is a foregone conclusion. This will mark another step in Lutheran togetherness and will pave the way for more joint work with other Lutheran bodies, *e. g.*, in such projects as Mexican and Negro mission work."

We of the Wisconsin Synod deeply deplore that the union endeavors of the past decade should thus end in "selective fellowship," which reduces the high status of a synod as a confessing body of Christians, *i. e.*, a church, to a purely human expediency. The genuineness of confession will suffer somewhere along the line if members of one confessional group are permitted to fellowship members of another group with a different confession. — There were many steps taken in the union movement that we could not approve, but we hoped and prayed that, under God, the doctrinal discussions which were being carried on would lead to a deeper appreciation of the church's confession. We still are convinced that the Word of God will not return void, though we may not be able to determine the beneficial results according to size and number. — For practical purposes the action of the A. L. C., outside of its approval of selective fellowship, will throw the discussion back to where it stood after Sandusky in 1938: What is it in the *Brief Statement* that the *Declaration* supplements? What does it want stated with greater emphasis? What becomes of the *Brief Statement* when "viewed in the light of the *Declaration*"? In reality, however, the effects of the intervening years, both good and bad, cannot be erased.

May God increase in us the love of the Truth.

M.

Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary. — A new theological Seminary within our Synodical Conference was opened on September 24, 1946, by our brethren of the Norwegian Synod. In a solemn inaugural service conducted by Pastor A. M. Harstad, President of the Norwegian Synod, the Rev. Norman A. Madson was formally installed as Dean of the Theological Faculty. Other members of the faculty of Bethany College who will also serve as instructors on the Theological faculty are Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker, Prof. Martin Galstad, Prof. B. W. Teigen, Prof. Paul Zimmerman and Prof. Alfred Fremder.

Thus the Norwegian Synod is carrying out a plan of long standing and is taking a step for which provisions had already been made in the constitution which was drafted at the reorganizing of this synod which became necessary when a small minority found itself constrained to leave the old synod at the time of the Norwegian merger in 1917. The experiences which this small minority suffered for conscience' sake in contending with a unionistic trend in that day and the lessons which were learned in the course of that struggle constitute a valuable contribution

to an evaluation of similar trends in our day. Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary, therefore, has a distinctive and important function to fulfill. We welcome this sister institution and wish its faculty and student body God's richest blessings.

E. REIM.

God's Word Is Not Bound. — These words of the Apostle Paul (2 Tim. 2, 9) came to mind when reading the joyous exclamation of one of the Free Church pastors in Germany: *Gottes Wort ist wieder frei*. Indeed, God's Word is never bound even when its apostles are imprisoned and suffer as evil-doers unto bonds. But relatively speaking we can say that God's Word is bound to a certain degree in certain countries in comparison with other countries. In this sense Pastor Kirsten writes: "The past times were times of great need, God's Word in our land was bound. Only with great trepidation could one think of the possibility of a victory of the German armed forces. At least we are relieved of this nightmare even if a new menace is already lifting its head in the East." Pastor Kirsten speaks of all this as of "a ray of hope hovering over the work of the Church, at least in the western part of Germany. Added to this," he continues, "some people have been awakened by the terrors and judgments of God, which they have experienced, so that we at least have many more opportunities than in the prewar days to spread abroad the Word of God."

And now the work that is waiting to be done is listed in this letter. As a primary work, the *Flüchtlingswerk*, the relief work for refugees is mentioned. It consists in bringing spiritual and physical relief to the millions of refugees coming from the East and pouring into the Western Zones of Germany. Pressing these many millions into the zones of Western Germany which already are overcrowded only makes the hopeless conditions still more hopeless, Pastor Kirsten adds. Professor Strathmann, an Erlanger professor, speaks, to quote from *The Christian Century*, of the "mass misery of the millions from the East" which surpasses "all that has yet happened on this earth." One of the undertakings to meet the needs of some of these refugees will be the founding of several orphanages thanks to the promised help of the brethren of the Missouri Synod. As a second important undertaking the *Einigungswerk*, the work of uniting the German Free Churches of Germany into a God-pleasing union of Lutheran churches is also mentioned. Rev. Oesch, into whose hands all the negotiations in the Western Zones have been placed, writes that these union endeavors do not only extend "to the Breslau Synod but also to six small Free Churches, the three in the North having already been contacted. . . . There are to be contacts with the three Southern Free Churches and with Bishop Meiser of Bavaria and Professor Sasse at Erlangen." The third great work to be undertaken by our Free Church brethren is the *Hochschularbeit*, the work of preparing young men for the ministry, a work

which had been brought to a close by the War, the destruction of the Zehlendorf Seminary-buildings, and the death of the Hochschul-Rektor, Dr. M. Willkomm. At present a preparatory school is to be opened at Isehagen near Gross-Oesingen, Hanover, for which an enrollment of 14 students has been reported as of August 23, 1946. The neighborhood of Frankfort-on-the-Main has been chosen as the future site of the new theological Seminary of the united Free Churches of Germany, God willing that such a union be realized by means of the *Einigungswerk*. A fourth work mentioned by Pastor Kirsten is the publication of church papers and church literature. To this end the *Lutheraner-Verlag* has been founded, which already is publishing the church-paper *Lutheraner* and which will continue with the publication of catechisms, Bible histories, hymn-books and devotional literature. Due consideration has also been given to the editing of a theological periodical to which the representatives of orthodox Lutheranism in Germany and America will be asked to contribute. Its tentative name signifies the importance attached to this publication: *Die lutherische Kirche in der Welt* with the subtitle: *Lutherische Kirche heute*. In view of this post-war work already begun we can indeed exclaim: God's Word is free again in Germany, God's Word is not bound.

P. PETERS.

Words of Warning. — In the *Northwestern Lutheran* of August 4 we had occasion to quote Dr. M. Willkomm, deceased, regarding the union of Lutheran churches in Germany. His words were words of warning against "the un-Lutheran doctrine and practice of most of the State churches of Germany." Since then communications have reached us directly and indirectly which also sound these notes of warnings. First of all our attention is called to *The World Council of Churches*, called the *Oekumene* in Germany. "It seems to me," we read in one of the letters, "that besides the papacy a new antichristian front is being formed, the *Oekumene*. . . . If an alliance of true Lutherans is not formed in opposition to such a World Council of Churches, Lutheranism is lost".

In this large circle of *The World Council of Churches* we find the *Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland*, the Evangelical Church of Germany headed by the bishop of Wurttemberg, Dr. Wurm. In February of this year Dr. Wurm and Rev. Niemöller attended the meeting of the Provisional Committee of The World Council of Churches in Geneva. Both of these leading representatives of the E. K. i. D. have been chosen as members of the Central Committee which is to meet in 1948. Concerning the Unionistic movements of the Evangelical Church of Germany we read in one of our communications: "Here in Germany we must break the ban of the E. K. i. D."

Again in this large circle of the E. K. i. D. including Lutheran, Reformed, and United churches we find a smaller circle representing the *Union of United Lutheran Churches*. Concerning this Union Dr. Willkomm

wrote: "In the E. K. i. D. a union of the Lutheran State churches has been formed under the leadership of the Bavarian Bishop, Dr. Meiser. Meiser has written the Committee of the Lutheran World Conference: 'In an historical hour the Lutheran Church of Germany, bound to its confession and called upon to lay down a confession, can for the first time since the days of the Reformation determine its own church polity. Therefore we have resolved to form one united *Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany* modeled for Germany after the model of *The Lutheran World Conference*. As the United Lutheran Church of Germany we shall stand in a common front in our struggle against dire need and in our endeavor to bring our people under the influence of the forces of the Gospel united with the *Reformed* and the *United Churches of Germany* (Unierte Kirche Deutschlands) in the E. K. i. D."

These unionistic endeavors are being stressed without hearing "a word," as Dr. Willkomm wrote, "about the un-Lutheran doctrine and practice of most of the State churches." Till now we also have not heard such a word. We are repeatedly hearing Niemöller's call to the German people to repent of their sins of omission over against the Nazi regime in World War II, but no word seems to have been spoken concerning the need for repentance because of their past sin of omission in speaking "the things which become sound doctrine" and in condemning the things that are "contrary to sound doctrine." Indeed, a church lacking the courage to raise its voice against transgressions of the Law of God on the part of those in authority as a government makes itself guilty of a gross sin of omission. But certainly a church may never forget its greatest duty, namely that of testifying against all false doctrine and of adhering to all sound doctrine. These things the German State churches failed to do in the past and are apparently failing to do in the present, unless in this "historical hour" they will let themselves be guided by God's Word and repent. Otherwise they will fall victims to the general trend of selling out Lutheranism to Calvinism and Unionism.

These words of warning, however, should not only be heeded by us as they pertain to the Lutheran churches in Germany but as they pertain to the Lutheran churches in America. "It does not seem to me," we again read in one of the communications received, "that enough emphasis is laid in America on the awfulness of all association with *The World Church Movement* and its organizations, these powerful organizations of the World Churches which are without a confession and which have been briefly but misleadingly called *Oekumene* by the Germans. If an alliance of true Lutherans is not formed in opposition to such a World Council of Churches, Lutheranism is lost. It therefore seems to me that the doings of the *National Lutheran Council*, which are headed for an entanglement with Geneva, are very hazardous." Let us also heed this word of warning.

P. PETERS.

Theological Literature and Theological Faculties in Germany. —

A letter by Professor Strathmann of Erlangen dated June 11, 1946, and published under *Correspondence* by *The Christian Century* of September 25, 1946, contains the following valuable information concerning theological literature and theological faculties in Germany. "We are depressed by the continuing hindrances to theological books. To be sure, the New Testament commentary (*Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, a popular four volume non-technical commentary and translation) will appear in revised form. Since Professor Buechsel died, I have been assigned the revision of the commentary on John." And now follows the information for which we have been waiting and an answer to the question which has so often been asked: "Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch* will be continued." Then follows a reference to the *Theologische Blätter* edited by Professor Strathmann, but forbidden by the Gestapo in 1942 and to "the most important theological book which appeared during the war . . . the *New Testament Theology* by Stauffer, an unusually stimulating but also constructive volume."

As to the theological faculties we are informed: The theological faculties in the western zone are almost all active again. The most well attended are those at Erlangen, Göttingen and Tübingen, each with about 300 students. . . . The theological seminary in Bethel is open again with about 170 students; also a free faculty — that is, without state recognition — in Berlin and in Elberfeld. The strongest theological influence which has arisen is Professor Thielicke in Tübingen. P. PETERS.

Communism's Clear-Cut Confession. — Whatever may be said of Communism, it is outspoken when asked to define its attitude toward religion and revolution. While it considers religion to be the opiate of the people it looks upon revolution as the very essence of its existence and the Red flag, the emblem of the revolutionary class, as its flag to the exclusion of all other flags. Our Congressional Record of recent date can dispel the doubts of all those who may question these facts. It contains answers given by the head of the Communist Party in the United States, William Z. Foster, to the chairman of the congressional committee investigating Communism. These questions and answers are taken here from the *Lutheran Standard* of September 7, 1946:

"*Chairman.* 'Mr. Foster, does your party advocate the destruction of religious belief?' *Mr. Foster.* 'Our party considers religion to be the opiate of the people, as Karl Marx has stated, and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices among the workers.' *Chairman.* 'To be a member of the Communist Party, do you have to be an atheist?' *Mr. Foster.* 'Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples, but a worker who understands the elementary principles of the Communist Party must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religious beliefs, and when he joins the party he will soon get rid of them.'"

Communism's revolutionary principles are voiced in the answers to the following questions: "*Chairman*. 'If I understand you, Mr. Foster, the workers of America look on the Soviet flag as their flag.' *Mr. Foster*. 'The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag. That's the Red flag.' *Chairman*. 'Mr. Foster, do you owe allegiance to the American flag? Does the Communist Party owe allegiance to the American flag?' *Mr. Foster*. 'I stated very clearly that the Red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class, and we are part of the revolutionary class, and all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class, and we owe no allegiance to them.'"

P. PETERS.

Buechertisch

The New Covenant, Commonly Called The New Testament Of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Revised Standard Version. Translated from the Greek, being the version set forth A. D. 1611, revised A. D. 1881 and A. D. 1901, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A. D. 1946. — 553 pages, 5¼×7½. Blue cloth with title in gold stamped on backbone. Price: \$2.00. Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York.

This edition of the New Testament is the first part of the very latest translation of the Bible. The Old Testament will not be ready for publication until four years from now. The revision was authorized by the International Council of Religious Education, which represents the educational boards of forty Protestant denominations of the United States and Canada. Incidentally, the Synodical Conference is not represented in this Council.

Previously there existed three major English versions of the Bible. The King James Version of 1611 was the first of these and is still used exclusively by Lutheran bodies comprising the Synodical Conference and by the majority of the other Christian churches.

In 1870 a committee of British scholars was authorized to undertake a revision, since it was believed that the discovery of manuscripts older than those used in 1611 for the King James, or the Authorized, version together with a considerable development in biblical studies demanded such a revision. A committee of American scholars was appointed a year later to participate in this translation and sent its own version to the British committee. The English Revised Version of the New Testament was finally published in 1881, but a portion of the American committee's recommendations failed to find acceptance with the British scholars and was printed in an appendix to this second major version.

Thereupon, in 1901, the American committee published its own translation in what is known as the American Standard Version, while the British readings were in turn relegated to the appendix.

This third important version was copyrighted by Thomas Nelson and Sons, and in 1928 this copyright was transferred to the International Council of Religious Education. Thus it came about that the Council now authorized the latest revision which is before us, and that this latest translation came to be known as a revision of the American Standard Version and was therefore entitled the Revised Standard Version.

Nine members of the Revision Committee have in addition published a pamphlet with the title: *An Introduction of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*. Each of the nine chapters appears over the signature of one of these members. The first article is written by Dr. Luther A. Weigle under the heading: *The Revision of the English Bible*. Here we learn what reasons chiefly prompted the Council to authorize the new translation.

1. The English Revised and the American Standard Versions "lost some of the beauty and force which made the King James Version a classic example of English literature. They are mechanically exact, literal, word-for-word translations, which follow the order of the Greek words, so far as this is possible, rather than the order which is natural to English. These versions convey the meaning of the Scriptures more accurately than the King James Version; but they have lost much of its beauty and power."

In its directions to the Revision Committee the International Council took note of this fact by requiring that the new revision be "designed for use in public and private worship, and to be in the direction of the simple, classic English style of the King James Version."

2. The second reason given by Dr. Weigle is that "scholars are better equipped today than they were sixty years ago, both to determine the original text of the Greek New Testament, and to understand its language." In support of this claim he points to newly discovered manuscripts and above all to "the amazing body of Greek papyri . . . unearthed in Egypt," containing "private letters, official reports, wills, business accounts, petitions and other such trivial, everyday recordings of the on-going activities of human beings." The discovery of these papyri revealed the remarkable fact that the New Testament was written in a type of Greek "which was spoken and understood practically everywhere throughout the Roman Empire." Many words which were formerly believed to be found exclusively in the New Testament occur in these recordings and have aided tremendously in obtaining a clearer understanding of the New Testament. Perhaps Dr. Weigle is justified in saying that these discoveries make "a revision of the English version of the New Testament imperative."

3. The third and final argument in favor of a revision advanced by Dr. Weigle appears to be based on his grievances against the Authorized Version. He states that the Bible is not only a classic of English literature, but the Word of God. "And the Bible carries its full message, not to those who regard it simply as a heritage of the past or praise its literary style, but to those who read it that they may discern and understand God's Word to men. That Word must not be hidden in ancient phrases which have changed or lost their meaning; it must stand forth in language that is direct and clear and meaningful to the people of today."

There are few if any among us who would object to these arguments in favor of a new translation, even though the Authorized Version has been to us the most precious literature in the English language. All of us have had our share of trouble as preachers and teachers because of ancient phraseology in the Authorized Version, and we have valid reason to fear that people find it more and more difficult to get what they should out of their personal Bible reading, and hence read the Bible less and less frequently. The first two reasons advanced by Dr. Weigle should also meet with full approval on our part. In fact, it is fairly well known that efforts are being made within the Synodical Conference to produce a new translation of the Bible, and these efforts are no doubt also to be ascribed in part at least to the fact that the previous English translations are not as satisfactory as they might be, and that the older manuscripts now at hand plus the papyri would be of considerable value to a modern translator.

On the other hand, however, this latest translation confronts us with the question whether it has the qualifications necessary to make it acceptable to the membership of the Synodical Conference for public and private worship. Now it is evident that an answer to such a momentous question will require a very thorough study of every chapter in the new translation. Every translator is an interpreter. If there is reason to assume that the men who have produced the new version have liberal tendencies in the field of theology, there is all the more reason why we should scrutinize carefully those passages in their translation where errors of modernism might be expected to reveal themselves. We do not hesitate to predict that the Lutheran Church would refuse to introduce the new version into church and home if but one sentence contained an evident and clearly dangerous error in doctrine, provided this error could not be removed by our protest.

Even at this early stage in the perusal of the new translation certain words have been found which disturb us profoundly. Since this is only a preliminary review, we shall restrict ourselves to the discussion of one such word, namely the translation of the term *monogenēs* in John 1: 14, 18; 3: 16, 18. Luther translates: "der eingeborene." Our Authorized

Version has "the only begotten". In marked contrast the R. S. V. consistently translates this word with "only," — "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son."

Now a true believer would not offhand think of objecting to the substitution of "only" for "only begotten." In fact he is accustomed to saying with the Apostolic Creed, "I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son." The Christian reverently clothes this phrase with the complete details concerning the relation of the Son to the Father as they are revealed to us in the Scriptures. To him, Jesus is the "only" Son of God in the sense that He was begotten of the Father from eternity and that He is therefore true God "before all worlds" and in the fullest sense of the word.

But this is precisely the doctrine concerning the Savior which many liberal theologians do not accept. Now if such an one were desirous of eliminating from these passages in John any suggestion that Jesus might have been begotten of the Father from eternity, he could accomplish this very neatly by simply substituting "only" for "only begotten."

While we do not accuse the committee of translators of harboring this intention, we consider their effort at "simplifying" the translation of this specific Greek word, which actually means "only begotten" and nothing else, a very grave mistake. We find that our fears are justified and not imaginary when we recall a statement in an article by Floyd V. Filson in the July number, 1946, of the periodical *Theology Today*. In this article, entitled *The Revised Standard New Testament*, Professor Filson has this to say about the translation of monogenēs: "The expression "only begotten" is so deeply worked into Christian tradition (sic!) that many will be shocked to see it replaced by "only" in the Gospel of John. . . . Nevertheless, "only" is correct and the R. S. V. is fully justified in using it not only when some ordinary human being is in mind (e. g., Lk. 7:12) but also when Jesus Christ the Son is meant. The word makes no reference to the Virgin Birth or to the strange concept of eternal generation of which theologians have talked."

The italics are ours, and they emphasize the fact that this writer has thrown overboard a vital doctrine of Scripture. He frankly denies the Biblical truth that our Savior was indeed begotten of the Father from eternity. This "strange concept of which theologians have talked" is the same concept which the Church has publicly confessed for sixteen centuries in its Nicene Creed, formulated in A. D. 325, which solemnly states: *Credo in unum Dominum Iesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum et ex Patre natum ante omnia saecula.*

Since Professor Filson finds his anti-scriptural and un-Christian views concerning the divine origin of Jesus Christ well supported by the word "only" in the R. S. V., the Lutheran Church will in all probability find it impossible to adopt R. S. V.'s translation of monogenēs. If "only begotten" is the translation which most unequivocally declares the eternal

generation of our Lord, then this is the term upon which the true believer will insist.

While the above misgivings had to be voiced in our review, we cannot close our eyes to the merits of the R. S. V. It stands head and shoulders above the previous revisions. In fact, this new translation is a work of such preeminence that no future attempts at Bible translation will dare to ignore it. Moreover, no student of the Bible, no pastor, no Christian instructor, can afford to be without this New Testament. Preachers will discover that in reading their sermon text in this translation they will far more quickly discern the line of thought in difficult and involved passages than in reading the same text in the Authorized Version. To bring but one example, — 2 Cor. 8:1-5 is one of the richest texts a sermon on Christian giving in the entire New Testament. Anyone who has discovered its beauty in the Greek original and has labored over the task of using the complicated and inadequate translation of the Authorized Version for such a sermon will greet with delight the skillful and limpid style in the translation of the R. S. V.

In conclusion may we say that the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament will prove an indispensable tool in every pastor's workshop. It will serve as a most valuable stepping stone to those who may some day be called upon to prepare a translation of the New Testament for the Lutheran Church. Its introduction into Lutheran homes and Lutheran churches, however, will very likely be out of the question until the Church has become firmly convinced that this new version will in no wise harm the faith of our people, and that its merits far outweigh the faults of our treasured Authorized Version.

A. SCHALLER.

Plain Talks on Practical Truths. By Wendell P. Loveless. Moody Press, Chicago, Illinois. 144 pages. \$1.50.

Some of our readers have, no doubt, at some time or other had occasion to read books emanating from the Moody Bible Institute and have been pleasantly surprised by the fine testimony of the authors. This little volume of Plain Talks is another case in point. The author attempts to answer some of the "perplexing questions which are inevitable in our Christian life," questions on prayer, on separation from the heterodox, on proper dress, on adiaphora, on our salvation, on sanctification and service, on "Sabbath" and "Sunday," etc.

Our pastors will find the book stimulating and enjoyable, although they will *not* place it into the hands of young Christians, for whom it is especially intended, because it does contain some patent errors.

The author complains that "there are any number of people who have been brought up to believe that the true Christian must be constantly watchful lest he lose his salvation" (p. 43). In the chapter on "Eternal Security" he returns to this topic and clearly reveals his Calvinistic

tendencies. "The issue before us is clear: the sinner who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ as his personal Savior and thus is saved or 'born again', passing out of death unto life, either is saved 'for keeps', or he is not. Either he has 'eternal life', or he has a quality of life which is temporary and may be lost again."

Here is a mingling of most glorious Gospel truth and of soul-endangering error. Surely we would not dream of denying that Jesus has made our salvation absolutely secure. It is He who says of His sheep: they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. On the other hand, this same Savior likewise warns: "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Here lies the answer to the problem which the author solves in an un-Biblical manner. Our sinful flesh is weak, is God's enemy, and therefore a constant danger to our salvation. In writing to the Galatians, Paul clearly states, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by law; *ye are fallen from grace.*" These people had become Christians. Paul calls them his brethren. And yet he warns them repeatedly that they are on the very point of losing that salvation which Christ had so dearly bought for them whenever they permit their flesh to convert them to the theology fostered by the Judaizers. Our daily wrestling with the Old Adam is a part of that "good fight of faith" to which Paul encourages Timothy (1 Tim. 6, 12), the cessation of which may indeed cause us to lose the crown of life.

We would assuredly not place a book into the hands of our Christian youth which presents errors such as this one. Nevertheless we maintain that our pastors will in other respects find these Plain Talks interesting reading.

A. SCHALLER.

A Beginning Greek Book Based on the Gospel According to Mark.

By John Merle Rife, professor of classical languages, Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio. Blue cloth, with title in gold on front cover and backbone. 215 pages, 5½×7¾. 1946. Price: \$2.50. Obtainable from the author, New Concord, Ohio.

We paged through this latest text for elementary work in Greek with considerable interest and pleasure. The reason for this is found in the explanatory phrase of the title, "based on the Gospel according to Mark." The author elaborates on this in the preface as follows, "The sentences for translation are taken mostly from Mark, and with as little alteration as possible. A number of sentences from the rest of the New Testament are included, as well as a few from other Koine sources, such as the Apostolic Fathers, the papyri, and the services of the Orthodox Church."

It seems plausible that a text based on these sources would be ideally adapted to classes who are being trained for extensive work in the Greek New Testament and in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, although this

book is intended to be an elementary text for the study of Greek literature in general. The author explains his choice of the material in this manner: "The object of the present work is to combine three prime desiderata of elementary work in Greek, namely, that the easiest form of the language be presented first, that the selections for translation be authentic, and that they be from important documents. . . . Selections of this kind are decidedly preferable to the artificial inventions of a modern foreign scholar."

The main section of the book, comprising the Lessons, is composed of fifty-six chapters. Here the rules of grammar and syntax are presented very briefly and in a lucid style. We mention only a few items which we consider particularly noteworthy. Lesson VI offers rules for the transliteration of Greek words into English, together with an application of these rules to proper names in the New Testament, e. g.

Petros	Petrus	Peter
Ioanes	Joanes	John.

On page thirteen we found this practical explanation of the difference in meaning between the imperfect and the second aorist: "the aorist is a snapshot, and the imperfect is a motion picture, or time exposure."

On page fifty-six there are reproduced two fine examples of ancient Christian acrostics.

The last thirty-eight pages of the book bring the details of grammar and syntax required for the course. Appendix I gives the Greek alphabet with modern pronunciations; Appendix II offers orthographical details; Appendix III contains the inflections, and Appendix IV the syntax.

Finally there is a general Greek-English vocabulary and an index.

An outstanding feature in Appendix III is the list of principal parts of irregular verbs, "intended to include all New Testament verbs that can not, with reasonable care, be identified in a lexicon."

A slip enclosed in each book lists a few errata. The author will no doubt welcome the report of several others: p. 77 under b: the period after the word imperative; p. 104, second line in note: catagories for categories; p. 181, third line from above: thte for the; p. 189, 104: is true for as true.

We also noted what seemed to us a slight inaccuracy in the rule governing *ou* used in questions anticipating an affirmative answer, p. 102. The example given is, *tauta ou gignōskeis*, which the author translates: don't you know these things? It would seem that this question does not necessarily anticipate an affirmative answer, as is the case in the Greek. We would prefer the circumscribed form, You know these things, do you not?

In the main, however, we would rate this book as a stimulating, well-arranged, and concise textbook for beginners in Greek, and recommend it not only to teachers of Greek, but also to pastors who desire to brush up a bit on the elements of the Greek language.

A. SCHALLER.

Questions That Trouble Christians. By W. A. Poovey. 187 pages, 5× $\frac{3}{4}$. Blue cloth with black title on front and backbone. Price: \$1.50. — The Wartburg Press, Columbus 15, Ohio.

This book treats the following ten questions: "Does God answer prayer? — What is the unforgivable sin? — Why do Christians have to suffer? — Are denominational differences important? — What is predestination? — Has science undermined the Bible? — Why doesn't God destroy sin? — Is church membership necessary? — Can only Christians be saved? — Is there such a place as hell? — In the "Introduction" the author says that it is not his intention "to supply a complete list of the questions that bother mankind, nor to provide a complete answer to any of them."

The author approaches every question in a sane and sober spirit. His style is vivid and pleasing. Where God has drawn a curtain over a matter, he does not curiously try to gain a peek into God's secret councils, but advises his readers to practice modesty and to trust in the Lord's wisdom and goodness.

This does not prevent an occasional lapse. For example, in discussing Ps. 16, 10, he interprets *hell* to mean *grave*. Is the *soul* ever consigned to the *grave*?

A more serious lapse is found in the chapter on predestination (pp. 80-95). He says very correctly: "It has been said by some that God predestinated man *in view of faith*. This statement was usually well meant, but even such an expression takes the emphasis away from the grace of God and places it upon man." Yet he himself has practically nothing but an *intuitu* election. Witness the following summary statement: "He (God) chose those who He knew could be saved." He illustrates this in the following manner: "In His wisdom God foresaw the result that would occur when each man would come in contact with the Gospel. He thus knew that Luther would not resist but would allow the Holy Spirit to work in his heart. He saw that Judas would accept for a time and then later harden his heart and turn away despite every effort of God to keep him in the truth. He saw that Cain would refuse even to consider the message of the Gospel. On this basis He was able to predestinate all mankind." — A solution at which Pelagianism of every shade might not take umbrage. Too bad that this ugly naevus should mar an otherwise very helpful book.

M.

And Some Believed. A Chaplain's Experiences with the Marines in the South Pacific by Chaplain Arthur F. Glasser, U. S. N. R. Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Illinois. Price: \$2.00.

One does not lay this book aside before having read how this Baptist chaplain, an "evangelical" or "fundamentalist", spoke in defense of Christianity to the Marines, while they were having a real "gab-fest" on board

their ship (pp 5ff.), how he had to contend with a "liberal" and "modernist" chaplain among the passengers (pp. 68ff.), how his first visit to a seminary in Melbourne was his last (pp. 93ff.), what his *Memorial Day Address* was like (pp. 202ff.), and so many other "hows" and "whats". Especially the pastor, both as theologian and as spiritual adviser, will benefit by reading this book, despite its derailment from the line of doctrine laid down by the Scriptures in regard to the Sacraments (p. 139). P. PETERS.

Truth vs. Dogma by J. C. Macaulay, Pastor, Wheaton Bible Church. Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Illinois. Price: \$1.25.

This is a very timely book in that it wants to instruct Christians in the true differences between the Protestant and the Roman-Catholic faiths. The Roman doctrines are clearly and quite comprehensively set forth, especially on the basis of the Tridentine decrees and the teachings of Roman-Catholic authorities. As to Protestant doctrines only Zwingli and Calvin are quoted. Quotations from Luther's writings to show that Roman doctrines are contrary to Scriptures are sadly missing. Also where the author speaks of Rome making "it a matter of obligation on her people to send their children to the Catholic school," he does not call attention to the Lutheran schools as a counterpart to the Catholic schools. Still we rejoice at the confession which Rev. Macaulay lays down in this connection: "I am persuaded that we shall not be fulfilling our task in regard to our youth until we have them under positive Christian influence and teaching seven days a week" (p. 118).

P. PETERS.

Edifying Discourses, by Soren Kierkegaard. Volume IV in a series of four volumes. Translated from the Danish by David F. Swenson and Lillian Marvin Swenson. Published by Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1946. Price: \$1.50.

The Augsburg Publishing House is doing pioneer work in publishing an English translation of *Eighteen Edifying Discourses* by Denmark's greatest philosophical and literary genius, Soren Kierkegaard. Most of us are hardly aware of the fact that "it is only ten years since the first English translation of one of his works, the *Philosophical Fragments*, appeared." Since David F. Swenson, 1876-1940, was one of the first American scholars to "discover" Kierkegaard and to devote his life to an effort to "understand" his teachings, we'll not fail to find in this translation a trustworthy interpretation of Kierkegaard's *Edifying Discourses*.

P. PETERS.

The Boy Who Fought With Kings, by Edna and Howard Hong. Illustrated by John L. Ellingboe. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis 15, Minnesota, 1946. Price: \$2.00.

Christmas. An American Annual of Christmas Literature And Art, edited by Randolph E. Haugan. Volume Sixteen. Augsburg Publishing House, Publishers, Minneapolis 15. Price: \$1.00.

The editors and publishers are to be commended and congratulated on both these publications. The written and pictorial description of the life of Luther, *The Boy Who Fought With Kings*, with its many illustrations in various colors and its running account of Luther's life couched in simple and unpretentious language, should be in the hands of all our Lutheran Christians, both young and old. Still more, we venture to say, are the editors and publishers of the Annual, the 16th volume of "Christmas," to be complimented on a splendid work of art and literature. It goes without saying that both works are most appropriate Christmas presents for the learned and the unlearned in our Lutheran families.

P. PETERS.

Communion Tracts, Nos. 144, 145, 146, 147 and 148. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis 18, Missouri, 1946. Price: 5 cents each, dozen 45 cents, \$2.00 per hundred.

The titles of these tracts are: "What mean ye by this Service?"; "The Supper Up Yonder"; "A New Commandment"; "... is it I?"; "The Sermon in the Sacrament".

„Unser Glaube“, Tägliche Andachten für die Zeit vom 22. April bis zum 10. Juni 1946. Von F. Hartmeister, P. em. Preis: 5 Cents pro Exemplar portofrei; 48 Cents das Duzend, Porto extra; \$3.00 das Hundert, Porto extra. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

“More Than Conquerors”, Daily Devotions, No. 68, April 22 to June 10, 1946, by Rev. Charles A. Behnke. Price: 5 cents each, post-paid; 48 cents per dozen, postage extra; \$3.00 per hundred, postage extra. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

“The Incomparable Cross”, by J. C. Macauley. Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Illinois, 1946. Price: 50 cents.

Contents: I. The Incomparable Crime of the Cross. II. The Incomparable Sorrow of the Cross. III. The Incomparable Love of the Cross. IV. The Incomparable Triumph of the Cross.

P. PETERS.