

Quartalschrift

Theological Quarterly

INDEX OF VOLUME 44

	PAGE
Articles	
The Natural Knowledge of God and Civic Righteousness. III. M.	1
Calvinism: Its Essence and Its Menacing Impact Upon American Lutheran Doctrine and Practice. III. E. Arnold Sitz.....	17
The Blood Sacrifices of the Old Testament. (Cont.) E. Reim.....	35
The Instruction of our Youth of High School Age. H. A. Koch....	43
The Natural Knowledge of God and Civic Righteousness. IV. M.	91
Calvinism: Its Essence and Its Menacing Impact Upon American Lutheran Doctrine and Practice (Conclusion). E. Arnold Sitz	105
Closing Address. M.	161
The Natural Knowledge of God and Civic Righteousness. V. M.....	167
The Blood Sacrifices of the Old Testament (Conclusion). E. Reim	179
A Special Application of the Tenth Commandment to Pastor and Congregation. H. H. Eckert	192
Opening Address on 2 Tim. 3, 15-17. M.	225
The Natural Knowledge of God and Civic Righteousness. IV. M.	231
A Special Application of the Tenth Commandment to Pastor and Congregation (Conclusion). H. H. Eckert	246
Modern Developments of Philosophy. P. Peters	251
† Professor August Pieper †	
In Memoriam — by John Brenner, President	81
Herr, nun lässest du deinen Diener im Frieden fahren, wie du gesagt hast. Predigt von Pastor Arthur F. Voß	82
I Have Waited for Thy Salvation, O Lord. Sermon delivered by Professor J. Meyer	86
News and Comments	
Professor August Pieper †	63
The Ende of the Affirmation	64
Dr. Behnken at the American Lutheran Conference	65
The Voice of Missouri — Which Is It?	70
Breslau's Bekenntnis	71

	PAGE
Missouri and the American Lutheran Church	132
"A Statement" Withdrawn	134
Dr. Behnken at the American Lutheran Conference	135
The President's Promise	138
A Tribute to Luther	138
Illusions of Liberal Protestantism	141
„Gottes Werk in Deutschland“	143
„Der Zukunftsweg der lutherischen Freikirchen“	146
Professor Dr. Ludwig Fuerbringer †	205
Wishful Thinking?	206
Melanchthon and Mühlberg	210
Die kirchliche Lage Deutschlands	212
Rome and the Bible	217
Chicago — What Does It Mean?	283
The Society of St. James	284
Increase in Lutheran Church-Membership	285
Fortsetzung über die kirchliche Lage Deutschlands	286
Melanchthon the Humanist	291
Parochial Schools	296

Reviewers' Desk

A. Reviews

Here We Stand, Nature and Character of the Lutheran Faith.....	76
The River Jordan	76
The Papacy Evaluated	77
The Rebirth of the German Church	77
My Life	78
The Challenge of Israel's Faith	78
A Book of Protestant Saints	78
The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels	79
The Lutheran Ministrant	80
From Heaven's Glory	158
Heroes of Faith on Pioneer Trails	158
Radio the New Missionary	158
Our Eyes Were Opened	159
Is Masonry a Religion?	159
The Lodge	159
Road to Reformation	160
Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms	160
The Art of Ministering to the Sick	220
Sumerian Mythology	221
The New Modernism	222
For His Name's Sake	223
See His Banners Forward Go	224

	PAGE
Heirs of the Prophets	224
What Lutherans Are Thinking	297
Aus der Johannes-Apokalypse, dem letzten Buch der Bibel	298
Uebersetzungen, Konfordanzen und konfordante Uebersetzungen des Neuen Testaments	300
Government in the Missouri Synod	300
Prayer and Its Power	302
A Century of Grace. A History of the Missouri Synod, 1847-1947	303
Evangelisch-Lutherischer Volkskalender auf das Jahr 1947	304
 B. Notices	
The Northwestern Lutheran Annual — 1947	80
Der Gemeindeblatt-Kalender für das Jahr 1947	80
Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Convention of the Ev. Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America Assembled at Mil- waukee, Wisconsin, August 6-9, 1946	160
Jesus Christ Our Hope. Radio Messages of the First Part of the Twelfth Lutheran Hour	224
Rebuilding With Christ. Radio Messages of the Second Part of the Twelfth Lutheran Hour	224
Let Us Return Unto the Lord. Radio Messages of the First Part of the Thirteenth Lutheran Hour	304
Christmas. An American Annual of Christmas Literature and Art	304
A Correction	157

Quartalschrift

Theological Quarterly

Volume 44

January, 1947

Number 1

THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD AND CIVIC RIGHTEOUSNESS

III

It is a grand theme which Paul announced to the Romans: the Gospel a divinely effective power unto salvation because of the righteousness of God by faith, which it reveals to all men, to the Jews as well first as to the Greeks.

Paul at once begins to elucidate. He continues with an explanatory *gar*: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven."

The verb, which is ordinarily placed at the end of a sentence, here holds the emphatic first place, the most prominent in the Greek sentence: Revealed is, etc. Paul uses the same word in precisely the same form which he had used in the previous verse regarding the righteousness of God. There are two revelations, but they are not parallel, they are not on the same level; the one in the Gospel is superior, it by far outshines and conquers the revelation to which Paul refers in the present verse, though this also is a mighty one.

A question must be investigated as to the time when this revelation takes place. Regarding the Gospel revelation this is clear. That revelation takes place whenever the Gospel is preached. To express this customary continuous action, characteristic of the Gospel, Paul uses the tense which is regularly used to express this idea, the present, *apokalypsetai*. Now in the 18th verse he uses exactly the same form regarding the revelation of God's wrath, and that in the emphatic position of the sentence. To what time is he referring?

There are many who argue that Paul is here thinking of the future and that he means to say, the wrath of God will be revealed at some moment which has not yet arrived. They refer to chap. 2, 5. 6, where Paul speaks of the "day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds." There Paul, indeed, is plainly referring to the final judgment at the end of the world. It is true, moreover, that on that day a terrible revelation of the wrath of God will take place. But does it follow that Paul also in chap. 1, 18, must be thinking of this great and last Judgment Day? Paul knew his Greek. If he had *apokalyphthēsetai* in mind, why should he write *apokalyptetai*? If no more cogent reasons for assuming an intended future can be adduced than a reference to chap. 2, 5. 6, then it is our duty to abide by the current meaning of the form which Paul did use, the present; and we must try to grasp the idea which he wants to convey by means of it.

We shall come back to this question soon. First we take a glance at what is being (or is going to be) revealed. Paul calls it the wrath of God, *orgē theou*. Need we remind ourselves that all statements about God's emotions must be understood as anthropopathically speaking? This, however, does not affect the reality of the state of mind in God described to us from our own level. There is such a thing as the wrath of God, although we cannot adequately conceive of it. God's wrath is just as real as is His love. It is a deception of Satan, who is trying to make us believe that, since God is Love, He cannot be capable of wrath. God's wrath is real. It is terrible. Think of some of the picturesque expressions found in Revelation, e. g., chap. 14, 10: They "shall drink of the *wine of the wrath* of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." Or chap. 16, 1, where the seven angels are commanded: "Go your ways, and pour out the *vials of the wrath* of God upon the earth." Moses speaks of the "fierce anger" of the Lord (Ex. 32, 12), when His "anger was kindled" (Num. 11, 1). Isaiah describes the Lord as "burning with his anger, and the burden thereof is heavy; his lips are full of indignation, and his tongue as a devouring fire" (chap. 30, 27). He also speaks about the pouring out upon some one "the fury of his anger" (chap. 42. 23).

The wrath of God is directed "against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." The ungodliness of men, *asebeia*, lack of reverence for God in their hearts, manifests itself in a conduct of unrighteousness, *adikia*, a violation of the holy will of God, a transgression of His holy commandments. Against this attitude and conduct the wrath of God is revealed.

It is a mighty, awe-inspiring, terror-striking revelation. Paul says, "from heaven," *ap' ouranou*. What could be grander, more majestic than a revelation from heaven? The revelation of the righteousness of God in the Gospel cannot compare with the revelation of His wrath in awe-inspiring splendor. In 1 Cor. 1, Paul calls it the "foolishness of preaching" (v. 21). It appears so very insignificant when compared with the thundering, flashing and crashing grandeur of the revelation of God's wrath. Yet the revelation of God's righteousness in the Gospel, Paul would have us understand, is, in spite of its seeming beggarliness, mightier than the revelation of His wrath, whose thunderings it is appointed to silence.

When does this revelation of the wrath of God take place? There can be no doubt that it will culminate in the terrors of Judgment Day. But is that what Paul has in mind here? He uses, as already pointed out, the present, *apokalypsetai*, while he might easily have used the future, if that were what he meant. Furthermore, in carrying out the thoughts about God's wrath Paul repeatedly uses the past tense: v. 24, "Wherefore God also gave them up," *paredōken*; v. 26: "For this cause God gave them up," *paredōken*; v. 28: "God gave them over," *paredōken*. The judgment of God has been going on on earth with unabating vehemence ever since man gave Him cause for His wrath, and is still going on. We do not have to wait for a revelation of it in the future, it is going on before our very eyes. *Apokalypsetai*, God's wrath is being revealed, so that every one who does not deliberately shut his eyes can see it, must see it. No one will be able to hide behind ignorance, that he could not know how devouring God's wrath might be, seeing it had not yet been revealed. It is being revealed.

Terrible though the revelation of God's wrath is, there is one thing it never did accomplish, nor ever can it accomplish:

to frighten men out of their sinful living, or even induce them to ask for pardon. But what the revelation of God's wrath did not do, this very thing of changing men's hearts is achieved through the revelation of the righteousness of God in the Gospel. How? Does the Gospel thunder still louder than the revelation from heaven of the wrath of God? No, rather, it is a still small voice, which as such makes no impression on the hearts of men. They regard it as foolishness, as a stumbling block. Yes, the very ones who lead the world in ethical development, both Jew and Greek, do so regard it. Yet this very weak, negligible, offensive revelation of the Gospel successfully challenges the powerful revelation of God's wrath, and actually delivers sinners from their doom, among them the scandalized Jews as well first as the sneering Greeks.

What a wonderful revelation the revelation of the Gospel must be if it can thus outshine the revelation of the wrath of God!

We next turn our attention to what Paul in our chapter has to say about the people against whom the wrath of God is being revealed. Who are the ones guilty of this wrath-provoking ungodliness and unrighteousness, *asebeia* and *adikia*? To be specific, when Paul now speaks of men "who hold the truth in unrighteousness," is he referring to a special group of men, who, perhaps, are exceptionally wicked, or does his description apply to all men? Are there certain ones among men, individuals or groups, who maliciously suppress the truth, while others are more noble in their attitude over against it? Or does his remark characterize all men as they are naturally constituted?

The latter is evidently the case. Paul simply says *anthrōpōn*, using the noun without the article. Thus he stresses the quality of being men rather than pointing to particular individuals. What he here has to say pertains to men as such, to human beings just because they are humans.

The suppressing of the truth in unrighteousness, of which they are guilty, is added by means of a participle with the definite article. This makes the participle descriptive, equal in force to an English descriptive relative clause. A Greek participle without the article is the equivalent of a conjunctive subordinate clause, expressing cause, condition, concession, time, and the like; but

a participle with the definite article merely describes, and emphatically so.

Paul by this phrase then conveys the idea that humans, simply in so far as they are humans, i. e., all men, are properly described as checking the truth by their unrighteousness. Thus the attitude of all men is marked by ungodliness and unrighteousness. Against all men the wrath of God is being revealed from heaven.

The manner in which men repress the truth will be shown by Paul in greater detail in the following verses. Here he merely says that it is done in connection with unrighteousness. Their act of repressing the truth is not due to ignorance, it is due, rather, to the fact that they are steeped in unrighteousness. This will naturally also blind their understanding and will cause them to err. Yet they cannot plead their ignorance as an excuse, because it is self-incurred. It is not the final cause, but is itself rather the effect of a previous cause. As far as repressing the truth is concerned ignorance is not the prime cause, it is secondary, being itself produced by congenital wickedness.

Before we continue with investigating the further thoughts of Paul on the revelation of God's wrath, we pause for a moment to see what bearing, if any, the facts presented so far have on our problem. It stands to reason that if it is the nature of man to be in the grip of unrighteousness to such an extent as ever to hold down the truth in his unrighteousness, and if this is true even of both Jew and Greek first, who had shown the greatest interest in righteousness, and had made the greatest advances that are humanly possible in this direction, and if these hold down the truth in so great a measure as to call down upon themselves a vehement revelation of the wrath of God, from which only the revelation of the righteousness of God in the Gospel can save them: then no system of character building devised by man can be integrated with profit into the educational program that operates with the Gospel. Any effort to work out a combination of the two is *a priori* doomed to failure. It will prove more futile than an attempt to reenforce fire with water, or vice versa.

It is a grave charge which Paul raises against all men, headed by both Jews and Greeks, that they stifle the truth in their un-

righteousness. He supports his charge (*dioti*) by the fact that *to gnōston tou theou phaneron estin en autois*.

The first word to arrest our attention is *gnōston*. What is the meaning of this verbal adjective? While the verbal adjectives in *-teos* denote something that must be done (corresponding to the Latin gerundive), those in *-tos* usually refer to something as possible. Compare the famous statement in Jas. 1, 13: *Theos apeirastos estin kakōn*, which the King James Version renders, "God cannot be tempted," a translation which the Revised Standard Version retains. Goodspeed has: "God is incapable of being tempted." Menge translates: *Gott kann vom Boesen nicht versucht werden*, while Luther tried to bring the thought of this somewhat startling expression closer to the grasp of the common reader by paraphrasing, and substituting the intended idea directly: *Gott ist nicht ein Versucher zum Boesen*.

Many people assume that the verbal adjective in Rom. 1, 19, *gnōston*, similarly denotes something that is knowable, the meaning which the word usually has in classical Greek. In the New Testament *gnōstos* occurs 15 times, and in the 14 passages outside the one under discussion the meaning never is *knowable*, but always: *actually known*. We adduce six samples; of the remaining eight the great majority correspond to the two which we shall mention last.

In John 18, 15, 16 we are informed that John was a *gnōstos* of the highpriest. Lc. 23, 49 speaks of the *gnōstos* of Jesus as standing afar off, beholding His death and the accompanying circumstances. In Acts 4, 16, the members of the Sanhedrin call the cure of the lame beggar performed by Peter a *gnōston sēmaion*, manifest to all inhabitants of Jerusalem. Acts 15, 18, James says of God's works that they are *gnōsta* to Him from the beginning of the world. Most common is the use of *gnōston* with either *egeneto* or *estō*: it became *gnōston*; or let it be *gnōston*. E. g., Acts 1, 19, the suicide of Judas *egeneto gnōston*; Acts 2, 14, Peter begins his Pentecost address with *touto hymin gnōston estō*. In every one of these cases the meaning *knowable* would not make sense.

What is the meaning in Rom. 1, 19? The King James Bible translates: "that which may be known of God," for which

the Revised Standard says: "what can be known about God." And Goodspeed: "all that can be known of God." Menge agrees with them: *was man von Gott erkennen kann*; while Luther alone translates: *dass man weiss, dass Gott sei*.

We take notice that Luther does not simply substitute *das Gewusste* for *das Wissbare*, he practically changes the substantivized verbal adjective into an abstract noun, *das Wissen* for *das Gewusste*. That is what his subordinate clause amounts to, *dass man weiss*. In this he is right again.

Assuming that the adjective *gnōstos* means knowable, then the idea: "all that can be known of God" would not be expressed in Greek by the form *gnōston*, but by *gnōsta*. "All that can be known" contains a plural idea. While we in German use the neuter singular collectively: *das Wissbare*, the Greek language, more literally, uses the plural *to gnōsta*; just as Paul in the very next verse speaks of the *aeōrata*, the invisible things, of God. When in Greek we find the singular, *to gnōston*, this will refer to some specific thing, or it takes the place of an abstract noun. To illustrate this idiom we may point to 2 Cor. 4, 17, where Paul balances the abstract noun *to baros* in the second half of his sentence against the substantivized neuter adjective *to elaphron* in the first half: the *elaphron* (lightness) of our present sufferings produces for us a superabundant *baros* (weight) of glory. For further illustrations compare Rom 2, 4: *to chrēston tou theou*, the goodness of God; Phil. 3, 8: *to hyperechon tēs gnōseōs*, the excellency of the knowledge; Heb. 6, 17: *to ametatheton tēs boulēs*, the immutability of His counsel.

Applying this to Rom. 1, 19, we notice that none of the translators is ready to understand *to gnōston* as referring to some specific single thing that can be known or is known of God; they all translate as though Paul had written *ta gnōsta*. We must read the word as an abstract noun: either, the knowableness of God, or better with Luther, the knowledge of God.

What does Paul say about the knowledge of God? He says, it is *phaneron* among them.

It might seem a waste of time to spend much effort in establishing the meaning of the word *phaneron*, which seems so

apparent. In the English Bible we find it translated with "manifest" (R. S. V., "plain"); in Luther's, *offenbar*. Yet a comparison of a few phrases formed with this word may serve to clarify our concept. In the next chapter, v. 28, Paul speaks about a Jew who is one *en tō(i) phanerō(i)*. Both Luther and King James here render the idea with "outward," which, however, does not fully retain all the connotations of the Greek word, the opposite of which is given in v. 29 as *en tō(i) kryptō(i)* and *kardias*. *Phaneron* is something that is not in any way hidden, but is completely open to view. In Gal. 5, 19, Paul calls the works of the flesh *phanera*. Compare also the combinations *phaneron ginesthai*, Mc. 6, 14 (Herod heard about Jesus, for His name had become *phaneron*); similarly *phaneron poiein*, Mc. 3, 12 (Jesus strictly charged the evil spirits that they should not make Him *phaneron*); and *eis phaneron elthein*, Mc. 4, 22 (every *apokryphon* shall "come abroad" — so the King James; *hervorkommen* — so Luther; "come to light" — R. S. V.). The adverb *phanerōs* will shed some welcome light on the subject. According to Acts 10, 3, Cornelius saw an angel in a vision *phanerōs*, very distinctly.

St. Paul says, thus, that the *gnōston tou theou* is open, public, definite, without anything vague or indistinct about it. And it is so, he continues, because God made it so: *ho theos gar autois ephanerōsen*.

This fact, by the way, should confirm us in retaining Luther's understanding of *to gnōston*, *dass man weiss, dass Gott sei*. God did not provide men merely with the ability to know Him, but with an actual knowledge of Himself; as also the participle in v. 21 definitely corroborates, *gnontes*, men knew God.

At this point we may briefly refer to two occasions on which Paul in his mission endeavors made use of the natural knowledge of God, limiting our investigation for the present to the question whether he considered God as merely knowable, or as actually known to his heathen hearers, and whether he treated this knowledge as something definite, or as doubtful and hazy. We bear in mind, however, that our question does not concern the extent or the completeness of such knowledge.

When the Lycaonians considered Barnabas as Jupiter and Paul as Mercurius, and were preparing to bring them sacrifices,

then Paul earnestly pleaded with them: "Sirs, why do ye these things? We are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein" (Acts 14, 15). They may not know who the true God is, but they do know that there is a God, and that He is supreme. — In Athens Paul faced leading representatives of both the Stoic and the Epicurean schools of philosophy, who unanimously charged him that his message sounded rather strange to them. What common ground was there on which he could meet these schools and their divergent lines of reasoning? He used the *gnōston tou theou*. "The God who made the world and everything in it, being Lord of heaven and earth, does not live in shrines made by man, nor is he served by human hands, as though he needed anything, since he himself gives to all men life and breath and everything" (Acts 17, 24. 25 — R. S. V.). The truth of these words found a ready response in the hearts of both Epicureans and Stoics, though in their practice and in their speculations they had for a long time held it down. Nor did they now dare to deny it, for Paul could call upon their own renowned poets to support him in his statement regarding God. He borrows the language of one: "In him we live and move and are" (Epimenides) and quotes another verbatim: "For we are indeed his offspring" (Aratus; also Cleanthes — R. S. V.).

These two incidents may serve to illustrate what Paul had in mind when he spoke about the *gnōston tou theou* as being *phaneron* in men, not as a result of their research, but because God Himself had made it known.

Yes, men have a very definite and correct knowledge of God, though limited in scope. Yet such is the corruptness of their nature that when they, even the best and most noble among them, the Jews as well first as also the Greeks, begin to operate with it they invariably suppress the truth in their inborn wickedness. What, then, can be the use of the natural knowledge of God, and what may be the design of God in revealing it, if all the systems of training for righteousness which men devise never lead anywhere but to a suppressing of the truth? Before Paul answers this question, he defines more specifically the extent of the

gnōston tou theou, taking the manner in which God revealed it for his starting point.

He begins with an explanatory *gar*. In his argument we meet with a striking oxymoron: *ta aorata autou (theou) kathoratai*: the unseen characteristics of God are distinctly seen. They are unseen and unseeable in themselves, yet they are seen, and that distinctly. Paul uses the verb *horaō* reinforced with the perfective *kata*. What does Paul mean? God is indeed unseen, He "dwells in a light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen nor can see" (1 Tim. 6, 16). He is totally invisible to the human eye. Yet man is endowed by God with another organ of vision, with which he can perceive things that are outside and beyond the range of his physical eyes.

Paul says, the invisible things of God become visible because they are being *nooumena*. The *nous* of man has a faculty of vision which reaches beyond the things perceived with the eye. The *nous* of man receives impressions also of the invisible God, and thus the unseen things of God are distinctly seen.

What is it that thus impresses the *nous* of men? Paul says, God's works which date back to the creation of the world and are a continuation of that great work. In Lystra Paul said that the God "which made heaven and earth and the sea, and all things that are therein," did not leave Himself without witness "in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts 14, 15. 17). Before the philosophers in Athens he used somewhat more abstract language: "He giveth to all life and breath and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitations" (Acts 17, 25. 26). — Our mind is so constructed that when we perceive any object or witness any action, we assume that these are the result of some previous cause. And so we trace each effect back to its causes, and these in turn to some earlier causes, and so on. Our mind will not be satisfied, however, to carry on this process *ad infinitum*. We expect that at some time we shall come upon a prime mover, whose existence is not the result of previous causes. Aristotle used the term *prōton kinoun*. This being the case, the

works of God to which Paul here refers, some of which he enumerated to the Lycaonians and Athenians, testify of God so that He is perceived and becomes "visible."

This truth is voiced also by heathen philosophers. Aristotle says of God: *pasē(i) thnētē(i) physei genomenos atheōratos ap' autōn tōn ergōn theōreitai*. And Cicero: *Deum non vides, tamen deum agnoscis ex operibus ejus*.

What do the works of God, His creation of the world and the continuation of this work in preservation — what do they indicate concerning God? Paul mentions two things: His eternal power and godhead, which, however, he not only joins closely together by *te - kai* but places under a single definite article, thus making practically a compound concept of the two. The Psalmist sang: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork" (Ps. 19, 1). Infinite power, glory, and majesty, including wisdom and goodness, these are the things which our mind senses as we observe the works of God. *Ahnest du den Schoepfer, Welt? Such ihn ueberm Sternenzelt! — wo der Unbekannte thronet. — Brueder, ueberm Sternenzelt muss ein lieber Vater wohnen* (from Schiller's *Freude, schoener Goetterfunken*).

For *godhead* Paul uses the word *theiotēs*. In distinction from *theotēs*, which merely names the divine essence as such, the deity, *theiotēs* points to the fulness of His perfections, His glory and majesty, as it is expressed in Luke 9, 43, the *megaleiotēs tou theou*, the divinity.

All these invisible things of God, Paul says, are seen, being *nooumena*, perceived by the human mind. When things are thus being perceived, the resulting concept is influenced by two factors, by the object to be perceived and by the condition of the perceiving organ. To illustrate. Our eye can perceive only light rays of certain wave lengths, the colors that lie within the spectrum, infra-red and ultra-violet rays being invisible. So also what a man will perceive of God depends to a great extent on the construction and on the condition of his *nous*. Now it is a sad fact that the vision of our natural *nous* is warped by the inborn *opinio legis*. We cannot by nature view any divine thing except from the standpoint of the law and through the screen of the Law. A

Christian with his spiritual eyes enlightened by the Gospel will take an altogether different attitude over against the works of God's creation from that of unenlightened natural men. Compare the many references to nature contained in the Psalms. Nor are the works of God in creation such that they could by themselves enlighten natural man's blind eyes. That is a power with which God has imbued the Gospel exclusively. Hence the concept which a natural man derives from a study of nature about God is in its innermost essence the very opposite of what a Christian sees in nature. Hence, though true in itself so far as the substance is concerned, yet due to the bondage of our *nous* under sin, the natural knowledge of God to be gained from His works inevitably becomes false when handled by natural man.

Because of this fact the only result which the natural knowledge of God, even in its most highly developed form, achieves for natural man, is, as Paul puts it: "so that they are without excuse." That is the actual result, and that is also the purpose at which God aims by granting this knowledge to sinners. Men are sinners, slaves in the bondage of sin, yet willing slaves — *Non invitus talis eram*, says Augustine about himself. And slaves of sin they remain in spite of all the knowledge of God they gather from a study of His works of creation. To what extremes their sinfulness will drive them Paul paints in lurid colors in the remaining verses of our chapter. Men cannot plead ignorance. They know God. But since it was against their corrupt nature to glorify God as God and to be thankful, the inevitable result was: "Professing themselves to be wise they became fools."

Today men who, like the zealous Jews and the noble Greeks of old, are endeavoring to build up a righteousness by honorable living, also cannot escape this verdict of Paul. To deny such "noble souls" all mitigating circumstances in their failure, and to charge them that they have not a shred of an excuse, may seem very harsh. And it would be unjustifiably harsh if its truth could not be established. Paul does establish it irrefutably in the following. He introduces the next clause with *dioti*, contracted from *dia touto hoti*, marking the clause as stating an evident, undeniable fact, which will invalidate any excuse men may try to offer. This evident fact is: that in spite of their knowledge of God they did

not honor nor thank Him as God. The stress is on their knowledge of God and on the nature of God.

Paul says *gnontes*, an aorist participle of *gignōskō*. This verb denotes a knowledge obtained by experience. A person may, for example, read and assimilate all that ever was published on honey and its sweetness, yet the verb *gignōskein* could not be applied to his knowledge until he tasted honey. So no one can be said to know God, as long as he knows Him only from hearsay. By applying *gignōskein* to the knowledge of the Gentiles concerning God Paul says that they knew Him because they had experienced Him. He had contacted them, and they had "tasted" His eternal power and godhead. By using the aorist Paul simply stresses the fact as such, they got to taste God, without indicating the duration or the result of the action. The fact is set down as such that the Gentiles received a knowledge of God from experience. In Lystra Paul illustrated this by pointing out that God did not leave Himself "without witness" (*amartyros*: "without giving some evidence," Goodspeed) in that God filled their hearts with food and gladness. Thus He had given them a "taste" of Himself.

The second fact is that in spite of this knowledge they did not honor Him as God. The stress is on *as God*. They honored Him, in a way. The people of Lystra were ready with elaborate sacrifices, when they imagined that Jupiter and Mercurius had appeared in their midst. Paul gives the Athenians credit that they are unusually god-fearing, *deisidaimonesterōi*, with their countless altars and statues and shrines. Yet their service of "God" is one of gross ignorance, since they do not take into consideration God's eternal power and godhead. They should know better, that a God who created heaven and earth will not seek shelter in man-made temples; and that a God who "giveth to all life and breath and all things" cannot be dependent on man's ministrations. Although they tried to honor God, they did not honor Him as becoming to God, according to His eternal power and godhead.

What was the meaning of their attempts to honor God? In short it was this: by their sacrifices they tried to appease the wrath of God, and to merit His favor. But such "honor" degrades God. Since He is the Creator and Giver of every good and per-

fect gift, the only fitting honor is, as Paul puts it, to give thanks.

From bringing sacrifices to God in the spirit of thanksgiving for His unspeakable goodness to bringing sacrifices in a spirit of barter is indeed a deep fall. It is horrifying that men can so degrade the *theiotēs* and *megaleiotēs* of God. Is it conceivable that Paul should ever have thought of integrating the program of either Jew or Greek in his own Gospel work? That would have been a gross confusion of Law and Gospel, and it would simply have wrecked his Gospel work. To the Galatians he wrote: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace" (ch. 5, 4).

Though thus the fall from giving God thanks to dealing with Him on a commercial basis is truly catastrophic, the bottom has not yet been reached. It was merely the first step, so to speak, on the downgrade. As a result of the judgment of God no halting by man's insight or power is possible. The fall continues to breath-taking depths. Men are using their knowledge of God in the spirit of the Law, and the nature of the Law is to kill. Paul continues, according to the translation of the R. S. V.: "they became futile in their thinking and their senseless minds were darkened." They did do some *thinking*, not merely that they occasionally remembered God in their thoughts, but they devoted much time and energy to keen, systematic, dialectic speculations about God, His nature and attributes, man's relation to Him, and the proper way of serving Him. But their *thinking* produced no useful results, it was *futile*. Worse than that, it led them to vain and foolish ideas and actions. Far from dispelling the darkness that enshrouded their hearts, it led them only deeper into it. The darkness was intensified as a result of their *thinking*. It had to be, it could not be otherwise, since they started from a wrong premise, viz., their *opinio legis*. The R. S. V. says that "their *minds* were darkened." This is not an improvement over the old standard version: "their *heart* was darkened." The Greek has *kardia*. *Kardia* denotes the center of the entire personality. It is not considered merely as the seat of the feelings and emotions, it is the source and controlling agent of all thoughts and strivings. It is, so to say, the "power plant" of a person's life. Thus, in the very controlling center of their lives, as a result of their intensive

thinking, they became so inextricably caught in a dense darkness that they could not even distinguish any longer between light and darkness itself, that they mistook their darkness for light. "Claiming to be wise, they became fools" (R. S. V.).

All of this, let us well remember, not by accident, not because of some flaw in their *thinking* process, some slip in their logic or dialectics. No, their methods of reasoning were very correct. But just because they were so correct, they could not but lead into gross darkness, on account of the unpardonable error in the premises. Instead of the spirit of thanksgiving, they started from a spirit of barter: the *opinio legis*. Their darkness is an inevitable result of their thinking. Wherever to the natural knowledge of God as such is ascribed any independent and positive value, merely in so far as it acknowledges God's existence and majestic power, that is, wherever it is not approached from the Christian standpoint of thanksgiving, there, according to God's judgment, it will produce the results as outlined by Paul.

We might be inclined to assume that in our enlightened age the following verses could not any longer be repeated as a proper description of these results: "They exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles" (R. S. V.). It may be that no images of animals will be erected to them to honor them as gods. But what is the difference when powers of good or evil are ascribed to animals or even to parts of their carcasses? What harm can a black cat do that happens to cross our way? What luck can a rabbit's foot bring when carried in our pocket? Is not the extent to which superstitious practices increased during the war truly appalling? This, according to the judgment of God, is the legitimate fruit of the natural knowledge of God when used — I should say, abused — by man according to his inborn *opinio legis*.

In the remaining verses of our chapter Paul carries out with gruesome details to what extremes, under God's judgment, men went in their aberrations. When we read the screaming headlines on the front pages of our daily papers today, we begin to realize that Paul is pretty modern after all, his description of conditions in the world, among the most respectable people of the

world, is true to fact even today. It will have little bearing on our theme to go into a detailed study of these verses. These sordid facts merely serve to illustrate and establish the truth which Paul sets forth: The natural knowledge of God achieves no other result than to deprive men of any pretext for their failings, since they apply it, and by themselves can apply it, only according to the basic lie introduced by Satan into the world, the *opinio legis*.

However, the presence in the world of a certain type of people might be cited by some one as an instance against Paul's argument. He takes up the challenge in the next chapter.

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

III. Calvinistic Creeds

Having given some attention to the Zwinglian angle, we now turn to that which mirrors more specifically what Calvinism teaches. We mention at once the chief Calvinistic Creeds. As a common source of them all we name at the very outset the influential "Institutes of the Christian Religion," published by Calvin when he was but twenty-six. The chief creeds are: "The French Confession" written by Calvin himself; the Belgic Confession of 1561, as its name indicates for the two Netherlands; the Scotch Confession of 1560, with its second of 1580; the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, though they exhibit in some parts marked Lutheran influence, indeed, borrow certain sections of the Augsburg Confession almost verbatim, they are nonetheless generally Calvinistic, definitely Reformed, in tone. We shall return to them later. We skip creeds like the Irish Articles and Lambeth Articles to light on the famous Canons of the Synod of Dort of the year 1619, a sharp Calvinistic rejoinder to the Arminian Remonstrants. We shall touch on these last from which stem the Methodist Articles of Religion, not because they are Calvinistic, for they are not, but because of their opposition to Calvinism in its extremes, particularly its predestinarianism. We end our list with the lengthy and important Westminster Confession, conjoining with it the Westminster Shorter Catechism.

Characteristic of the Calvinistic creed appears the set toward definition. Where the Lutheran recites his creed after the pattern: "I believe, therefore have I spoken," the Calvinist, operating with the intellect and logic feels the necessity of systematic ordering, a legalistic reduction to line and precept, rule and regulation cut to order for the mind. The Lutheran creed rejoices in its salvation

through Christ, and swings along in the free movement of Christian liberty. The Calvinistic creed closes down with ever-tightening fetters, until it has eventually straight-jacketed one in the rigid weave of its dogma patterned upon its decretum absolutum.

We shall confine our summary of the Calvinistic creeds to four in number, not only because of their importance, but because they give us all the different angles of doctrine. These are The Westminster Confession (1647) and Westminster Shorter Catechism, the Canons of the Synod of Dort (1619) in connection with the Five Articles of Remonstrance, and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England (1571). This order of treatment is, of course, the reverse of chronological. But it is our purpose to underscore the maturest of the Calvinistic creeds first, then compare with the milder but earlier Thirty-Nine Articles.

The Westminster Confession sets forth the Calvinistic system in its scholastic maturity, after passing through its sharp conflict with Arminianism in Holland, sifted through Scotch and English minds. The content, with the exception of the Sabbath question, is Continental, the form English, modelled on the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and the Irish Articles of 1615.

The Westminster Confession launches out with the most elaborate article on Holy Scripture contained in any creed, going into the detail of naming the canonical books. It rightly accords Holy Writ the supreme authority in all matters of faith and life, calls it the infallible Word of God, rightly to be understood only by the working of the Holy Spirit, and giving the Old Testament in Hebrew, the New in Greek, the final authority as the inspired text. But it also introduces a foreign element, typically Calvinistic in essence, for it says, "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." In other words, logical deduction from premises apparently or actually found in Scripture carries with it the same authority as a plain statement of Scripture. With this principle the door is thrown wide open for a conclusion in respect to the decree of reprobation, for God's willing that Adam should fall into sin, and the like more,

to say nothing of the conclusions on the Person of Christ, none of which are found in the Bible.

As might be expected, the article on predestination appears early in the creed. Already the third brings it. It says, III, 3: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. 4. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are *particularly* and *unchangeably* designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased nor diminished." (When Schaff attempts to tone the above down from being an absolute decree by remarking that the word "reprobate" does not appear in the text, it would seem to be but quibbling; for the word "foreordain" ends up in a divine decree of reprobation.) In chapter V, entitled "Of Providence," we find everything not only put under the foreknowledge of God, but under the free and immutable counsel of God's will. This includes extending "itself even to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding (limitatio), and otherwise ordering and governing them, in a manifold dispensation, to His own holy ends." "God was pleased to permit the first sin, having purposed to order it to His glory." W. Conf. VI, 1. Yet they disclaim God as being Author of sin.

Alongside the doctrine of predestination, and again using the principle of logical deduction, it is taught that while Christ's suffering and death were sufficient in their intrinsic value for all the world's sins, he actually died only for the elect. "They who are elected . . . are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation. Neither *are any other redeemed by Christ*, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, *but the elect only.*" Ch. III, Par. 6. "To all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same," etc. Others, who are not elect, never truly came to Christ. X, 3. But Luke 8, 13 Jesus very plainly says, "For a time they believe, and in time of temptation fall away." There be those therefore who truly believe, but then lose faith. To such a pass does a false

principle bring one, where logic leads one to deny the plain teaching of Scripture concerning the universality of salvation: "God so loved the *world*, that He gave his only-begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And again, "Who is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world."

On the other hand, elect infants are saved without faith. Added to this there are other elect who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word. X, 3. Who would these be, "worthy" heathen? Again it is stated XVII, 1: The elect "can neither totally, nor finally fall away from the state of grace." The "finally" is well taken, but the "totally" includes too much, for it collides with passages like Ezekiel 18 and 33. And what of David and Peter? Of these in their respective sins of adultery and denial Luther asserts, "Da ist der Glaube weg gewest."

In the seventh chapter we have a curious speculation, a deduction of a legalistic type. It is stated Par. 2: "The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience." But every Scripture passage quoted in support deals with the law of Moses, Gal. 3 and Rom. 5. It is further said, "Man by his fall having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace." The real covenant of the law is ignored and passed over in this manner.

To return to the predominating thought of predestination. Since all depends for the Calvinist on the decree of predestination, the question must arise, "How shall I be assured that I am elect?" The answer is given in Art. XVIII, 2: "It is the infallible assurance of faith, founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of these graces unto which these promises are made," i. e., the witness is also within us, subject to introspective discovery. This becomes still more apparent in Par. 4, "True believers may have the assurance of their salvation diverse ways shaken, diminished, and intermitted . . . yet are they never utterly destitute of that seed of God, and life of faith, that love of Christ and the brethren, that sincerity of heart and conscience of duty, out of which, by the operation of the Spirit, this assurance

may in due time be revived, and by the which, in the meantime, they are supported from utter despair." Unlike the Lutheran, who in the day of temptation and doubt seeks out and holds to the promises of God alone for support and lifting up, the Calvinist is directed to search within himself, to look at his own good works for assurance of his state of grace, of election. This would explain the restless activity in the "Lord's work," as the Calvinist calls it, amounting sometimes to hysteria. Because the assurance must be personal, he is prone to resort to individual action, to independent working. He tries to outdo himself and others, in order that he may heap up to himself evidence that he is a child of God and elect. This is the source of much unwholesome enthusiasm, *Schwaermerei*.

As a result of this intense personal introspection, the accent on the subjective and individual, you will find that Calvinism is centrifugal. It breaks up into all kinds of movements and sects; it finds it difficult to work in communion with others, any seeming to the contrary notwithstanding; it resorts to all sorts of external means to keep together. That is why they stress *external* fellowship in ministerial alliances and union services, an artificial bridge whose abutments hang in the air, never touching the bedrock of doctrine and unity.

Again, have you noted how few hospitals and eleemosynary institutions these Reformed churches support in comparison to the Lutheran? I saw a remarkable statement in a Catholic magazine some time ago, in which it was said that the Lutheran Church supported more institutions of mercy than all other Protestant churches combined; and that if the Lutheran Church were numerically equal to the Catholic, it would outdo that church also. Because it is Lutheran to trust in the central promises of God in Christ, Lutherans are drawn together, and therefore can work together; the Reformed are driven apart by the necessity of being introspective and self-centered, seeking the assurance of election within themselves. They are the forerunners of the German "*Erlebnistheologie*."

Here lies another point on which the Reformed draws nigh to the Roman Catholic. The Catholic on principle, as well as by his system of contrition, confession, and satisfaction, can never be

sure of his salvation, as Luther so graphically portrays it in the Smalcald Articles; the Calvinist is also never sure. Hence his bent, like the Roman Catholic, toward asceticism: "temperance," no smoking, no card playing, etc. His assurance may be a false security based on faulty appraisal of his own convictions, feeling and works. But we have digressed a bit from the strict report on the Westminster Confession.

In the matter of the sacraments the Westminster Confession defines, "Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to *represent* Christ and His benefits." Baptism and the Supper of the Lord are the only sacraments accepted, "neither of which may be dispensed by any but by a minister of the Word lawfully ordained." Here we also run into unexpected sacerdotalism. We look for it in the Episcopal communion, but scarcely in the Presbyterian. The administration of Lord's Supper is reserved solely to the minister, who is also commanded to commune himself. This sacerdotalism strongly calls up Catholic conceptions of priesthood. It appears then that only in the Lutheran Church have we the earnest attachment to the priesthood of believers, of whose prerogatives Luther writes, "Wir bestehen fest darauf, dass kein ander Wort Gottes ist denn das allein, das allen Christen zu verkuendigen geboten ist; dass nicht eine andere Taufe ist denn die, die alle Christen geben moegen; dass kein ander Gedaechnis ist des Abendessens des Herrn denn das, so ein jeder Christ begehen mag."

In connection with the ministry the following may interest you. I was present a month ago at the examination of a young Presbyterian friend, looking for a license to preach after having put in two years at McCormick Seminary. He is a brilliant young fellow. The examination was conducted by the Southern Arizona Presbytery. I could scarcely hide my astonishment at almost the whole proceeding. A spirit close akin to levity prevailed; scarcely an answer was clear-cut; almost everything took on the aspect of a "problem," which sought a likely solution: the problem of the Trinity; the problem of the authors of the books of Scripture; the problem of their time of writing; and not a question was asked concerning a fundamental teaching of the Word. Whenever the examination threatened to call for a decisive reply, the motion was

usually offered and carried to declare that portion of the examination satisfactory. And so the lad was licensed on a test that would not suffice in its application to one of our confirmands. If this be general, how pitiable things look in the Reformed churches of America!

But we return to the sacraments, specifically Baptism. It has degenerated largely to an ordinance, administered, if at all, in obedience, to the Lord. It signifies the application of the blood of Christ to the child. The agent of application is the Holy Ghost. The Confession calls baptism a "sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his (the baptized person's) ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God to walk in newness of life." But this effective working is restricted through the Spirit to the elect, and it may precede or follow baptism itself. For "grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed to baptism as that no person can be saved or regenerated without it, or, that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated." "The grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such, whether of age or infant, as that grace belongeth to, according to the counsel of God's own will, in His appointed time": which would be to the elect only. This turns the baptism of the non-elect into an empty ceremony, not to say a solemn mockery. We repeat at this juncture that it is on this point of baptism of infants that we Lutherans are most fiercely attacked by the Calvinist, because we insist on Mark 16, 16 and John 3, 5. The accusation runs that we damn unbaptized infants; others more fairly say we make their salvation at least improbable. The Calvinist, consulting with his intellect, is inclined to get around the matter by concluding the possibility that all infants are elect and therefore saved regardless of baptism, betraying a certain undervaluation of baptism itself. It is not our business to speculate, but seriously to pursue what God commands us to do: baptize.

Where the Zwinglian reduced the Lord's Supper to stark bread and wine, your Calvinist attempts an approach to the Real Presence, brought about, no doubt, largely by Calvin's contact with the Strassburg Lutherans and Melancthon. The Real Presence suffers volatilization, however, into a spiritual presence, and that

only for the true believer. He receives the body and blood of Christ spiritually, through the Holy Spirit eating and drinking by faith; the unbeliever receives them not. The Westminster Confession expressly rejects the Lutheran conception of the Real Presence in the words "The body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are, to their outward senses."

Again we see that emphasis on the faith of the recipient, pressing upon the "spiritual and inner hearty approach" to the sacrament, forces the centre of gravity away from the objective sacrament and the promises of God onto the attitude and state of heart of the individual, to the intensely subjective. Since fundamentally your Calvinist receives nothing more in Communion than what he can apprehend outside of it by faith, he comes more or less in obedience to an ordinance of Christ, with a strong coloring toward its becoming a good work. Once more your Calvinist draws near to the Catholic. On the other hand, since he believes that no other communion with God is necessary save through the Holy Spirit, he is prone to indifference, neglect, and even disparagement toward the Lord's Table. The question arises whether we Lutherans do not on occasion tend to overemphasize the subjective in the way we handle the "worthiness" of the communicant. I recall how my mother for years partook of Communion but once a year and then with fear and trembling, because her good Pastor in his communion addresses overstressed the matter of worthiness. It may be well to recall the context in which the Apostle uses the word *unworthily* (1 Cor. 11, 27).

To conclude: "The Lutheran looks upon the word of Christ: "This is my body, which is given for you," and lays hold of it, coming to be served; the Reformed has his ear attuned to the word of Christ, "This do in remembrance of me," and he comes to honor God's command. In one case the shading is evangelical, in the other legalistic.

May it be permitted to digress for a moment for a word on the passage in I Cor. 11? The word "damnation" in the verse, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself" has received erroneous interpretation. Its mod-

ern meaning is that of eternal punishment, but in King James' time it was not so. "Damnation" then was synonymous with our word "judgment." If a man came from court trial in 1611, and a friend asked him how things went, he might reply, "I'm damned." He did not mean to say he was going to hell, nor was he cursing himself, for his friend would ask, "What is your damnation?" His reply might be, "Ten pounds, or thirty days in gaol." The American Standard Version therefore rightly translates, "Eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself." The Greek has "krima" without the article. Luther has contributed somewhat to the misunderstanding by supplying the article, "das Gericht." What the judgment is St. Paul at once defines in the following verse, "For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep." We should therefore exercise due care in using this passage and not load the concept "damnation" with the extreme weight of brimstone: St. Paul makes the matter serious enough, and we should not go beyond what the Holy Spirit Himself indicates in verse 30 as being "judgment."

Closely conjoined with Communion comes the question of repentance and confession of sins. Westminster Confession, Ch. XV, 1, one-sidedly declares, "Repentance . . . is an evangelical grace . . . as well as that of faith." Placing faith alongside of repentance evidently differentiates the two, accenting that repentance is substantially nothing more than sorrow for sin. Much better reads the definition in the Westminster Catechism, Q. 87. But it has remained for the Lutheran Church to put forward the true Scriptural definition of repentance, metanoia: sorrow for sin concomitantly with faith in forgiveness. The Augsburg Confession declared, "Und ist wahre rechte Busse eigentlich Reu und Leid oder Schrecken haben ueber die Suende, und doch *daneben* glaeuben an das Evangelium und Absolution, dass die Suende vergeben ist." This should never be lost sight of, lest we be found following the oblique along with the Calvinist, not to say the Catholic. The former's bias appears again when Westminster insists par. 5: "It is every man's duty to repent of his particular sins particularly." His piety takes an inward direction, centering on man, not on God. Once more we have more than a hint in the direction of unwholesome Catholicism, where particular sins must be par-

ticularly confessed to the priest. Luther refuses to pick and choose among particular sins, "sondern stoesset alles in Haufen, spricht: es sei alles und eitel Suende mit uns." Interesting indeed: out of the Roman Catholic door steps "penance," anxiously trying to appease God with the works of satisfaction; out of the Reformed strides a grave man in black, probing for his own sins and seeking to establish assurance of his redemption by the state of his heart and by his works; but in the Lutheran door stands a man who, though he finds no good in himself, goes about his business in calm and free confidence in God's Word, knowing his sins are forgiven through Christ. Yea, let God be found true and every man a liar.

Of the person of Christ Westminster holds what the Zwinglian confesses. It says, "Christ, in the work of mediation, acteth according to both natures; by each nature doing what is proper to itself; yet, by reason of the unity of the person, that which is proper to one nature is sometimes, in Scripture, attributed to the person denominated by the other nature." Accordingly the communicatio idiomatum is ruled out, and the Scripture taxed with being a bit careless in its expressions. The Holy Spirit ought to have taken human reason into closer account when He inspired Holy Writ.

We have already touched upon the new thing the Presbyterian Confession introduced into evangelical Christendom: the sabbath. In Ch. XXI, Par. 7, it is declared, "God, in His Word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, has particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto Him: which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's Day, and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian Sabbath." Just so! A plain case of usurping the sole prerogative of the See of Rome. And since its adoption this legalism has been fastened on the church, binding the conscience of Reformed Christians as the arbitrary laws of the pope do in the pope's bailiwick. Well had it been for the framers to have remembered the classic word of Luther, "Es heisst: Gottes Wort soll Artikel des Glaubens stellen, und sonst niemand, auch kein Engel!" The de-

velopment of the sabbath law was gradual: it grew stricter progressively as it passed through the hands of Calvin, Knox and the Puritans, coming out a full-blown moral duty.

Calvinistic creeds frankly look upon the secular government as called, among other things, to root out heresy by force. (Conf. Belg. XXXVI). Guizot maintains that the spiritual and moral authority of the church over the religious and moral life of its members is to be maintained by the power of the state, if necessary. And so we find traces of this same idea in our own day and land. Calvinists look upon the government as a legitimate instrument to carry out the will of the church as an organization. It is therefore far off the beam when it is maintained that Calvin clearly saw, adopted, and propagated the principle of the separation of Church and State. How this can be asserted in view of Calvin's theocratic practice in Geneva proves an enigma. Not so, but again it was Luther who clearly stated the principle. Luther defined succinctly the separate spheres in which government and church were to operate, the one in the realm of the Spirit by the Word of God, the other in the bounds of the body and of the material by law. When Luther is saddled with having mixed Church and State in having confided the welfare of his church to the princes, it must be said that, though this did not accord fully with the principle he had enunciated, he also recognized it and excused it on the grounds of necessity, calling the princes "Notbischoefe." Calvin, however, looked upon Church and State in principle as two arms of God's government in the world, which should co-operate together to the same end; the glory of God and the good of society: the Church by infusing a religious spirit into the State, the State by protecting and promoting the interests of the Church. This principle receives statement in the creeds. Hence also the ultimate in this deplorable mixture: the burnings at the stake and the drownings. Luther's dictum devastates the practice when he says, "Laege es daran, so waere Meister Hans (the hangman) der beste Theologe."

As Calvin, though less clearly the creeds, looks upon Church and State, he makes a theocracy out of them. Kampschulte writes, "Der Grundgedanke . . . ist die Theokratie. Calvin will in Genf den Gottesstaat herstellen. Nur einer ist ihm Koenig und Herr in Staat und Kirche: Gott im Himmel . . . Gottes Herrscherruhm

zu verkuendigen, seine Majestaet zu verherrlichen, seinen heiligen Willen zur Ausfuehrung zu bringen und seine Bekenner zu heiligen, ist die gemeinsame Aufgabe von Staat und Kirche." This scheme bears the mark of the Old Testament and of the law on its forehead. No ruling place is made for the love and mercy, loving kindness and grace of God. Calvin's sharp eye, being used to the blue light of the law, did not perceive that Israel's whole history portrayed how even *God* could not make a success of the theocracy, His material being Israel and therefore carnal. Calvin himself being a sinner, his material a city of Genevese sinners, he could look for even less success. Consequently he had to resort to legalistic measures. This attempt to establish a theocracy on the mixed foundation of Moses and Christ had to eventuate in the destruction of the freedom of conscience, as well as the liberty of the citizen. He overlooked, or failed to understand, what Christ meant when He said, "My kingdom is not of this world," nor the sharp line of separation Christ drew when He commanded, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." And Christ, not Moses, rules in the Church. Hence it must be separate from the law. To Luther and his true followers the law's ultimate accomplishments can be but to drive home the knowledge of sin: as one has put it, "Durch das Gesetz kommt hoechstens die Erkenntnis der Suende." — To the Calvinist the law finally is the ruling factor and source of action in the life of the Christian. He even ascribes to the law the power to bring forth in the regenerate and in others "humiliation for, and hatred against sin," also "to restrain their corruptions." Westminster Confession XIX, 6. The Lutheran, however, rejoices in freedom from the law, and as a Christian acts spontaneously out of faith.

A direct fruit of this Calvinistic mixture of church and state proved the chaplaincy question in the recent war. There can be no doubt that on principle the Wisconsin Synod position stood correct. It fits perfectly into the Calvinistic system to say, "Let the State, as one of God's arms in government, pay; let the Church, as the other arm, do. Let them co-operate." Many a Lutheran minister who entered the service was irked by the bonds of the chaplaincy. A Norwegian Lutheran chaplain in the marines with the rank of captain frankly confessed to me that a number of Lutheran candidates

failed to make the chaplaincy at the time of his examination because of the Navy's presumptive requirements. He also was set back because he could not subscribe. He was acquainted with an Episcopalian chaplain who frankly was Episcopalian in the Navy. He asked him, "How did you make it?" He replied, "I outwardly conformed in the examination; and now I am in, I do as I please." On his advice the Lutheran did the same. He reported that the Army was far more lenient.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt that we did not solve the chaplaincy question satisfactorily. And many of our layfolk express their disappointment. No criticism is being made of the mailing job SWC did. That could not well have been improved upon. But Holy Communion could not be given by mail; nor could consolation be administered in the camp and on the battlefield by that means. And did we not compromise with principle in sending our men to Missouri Synod chaplains for communing? Luther leads out a controlling factor in such cases when he pleads necessity and love, "Liebe und die Not meistern alle Gesetze, und kein Gesetz soll sein, es soll nach der Liebe gelenkt und gebeugt werden; wo nicht, so soll es aus sein und wenn es gleich ein Engel vom Himmel gemacht haette." XI, 1685.

But the chaplaincy question is still with us. What are we doing now to help solve it properly? War lurks just around the corner, not only by political and economic signs, but by the certainty of Christ's prophecy. Now is the time to offer a new solution, not when the pressures of war-time make it triply difficult. I offer you the comment that the newspapers are more alert and more devoted to the principle of freedom of the press than the Church is to its liberty. We should do well to adopt their plan and *insist* that the Government introduce it in the chaplaincy. Newspapers have consented to put their correspondents into uniform; but they have paid them themselves, they are under no command, they enjoy no rank in the army, and it is understood they go where they think well and write what they please, just so it does not jeopardize the safety of the country. Put the chaplains in uniform, giving them no rank nor standing in the army or navy, let the Church pay them, permitting them to go where they will and to search out and serve their own people. Have them appointed in proportion to the num-

bers of each religious group in the population of the country. This solution, or one similar, should be brought to the attention of the Lutheran Church in America, as well as to the War and Navy Departments. Now!

We proceed to Church government within the Church itself. We all know that the cornerstone of the Papacy lies in the claim that the pope is *iure divino* head of the Church. Whoever therefore disobeys him, despises the law of God. In Episcopalianism — though this was a development in Laud's time and is not found in the Thirty-nine Articles — the ministry exists *iure divino*. But we may be astonished to learn that the Presbyterian form of church government also lays claim to divine right, and therefore will brook no disobedience to its commands. Ch. XX Art. 4 reads, "They who . . . shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or *ecclesiastical*, resist the *ordinance of God*. And for their publishing of such opinions, or maintaining such practices, as are contrary to the light of nature, or the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation, . . . they may lawfully be called to account and proceeded against by the censures of the Church." But still more plainly the XXXI Chapter urges the divine right of Synods, declaring, "It belongeth to synods and councils, ministerially, to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of His Church . . . which decrees and determinations . . . are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the Word, but also for the power whereby they are made, *as being an ordinance of God*, appointed thereunto in His Word."

This lends a convenient way to enforce discipline in the church. How many a pastor and congregation, how many a synod and synodical office would find its work simplified tenfold, if authority were based on divine right. We need to be on the watch against this encroachment continually. A prominent Lutheran layman in discussing Lutheran Church polity deplored the fact that we had no ultimate and definitive authority in church discipline from which there could be no appeal. We have heard in our own circles the sentiment, "Und hat die Synode in der Furcht Gottes gehandelt

und beschlossen" with the plain implication that the resolution was therefore binding, if not of divine sanction and authority. But discipline's prime and ultimate goal must always be not to put through a decision, but to *save* a soul: love and patience must rule.

With the growth of the Lutheran Church in America this problem of church government has arisen with persistency. The Scriptural and Lutheran stand remains, "One is your Master, even Christ; all ye are brethren." In pioneer days the priesthood of believers expressed itself in the lively activity of the local congregation. Synods were organized to carry out common and greater projects jointly. — To protect the autonomy of the local congregation the synod was defined as a purely "advisory body" where the internal affairs of its constituent congregations were concerned; the congregation existed as an institution *iure divino*, the synod *iure humano*. But that left many a problem. — It remained for the late controversy concerning "Kirche und Amt" to show that Synods as Christian communions also possessed certain divine prerogatives inherent in the priesthood of believers. And so the pendulum began to swing into the opposite direction, and we do well to be on our guard. The question among us Lutherans now in regard to church polity centers about counterposing of Synod and local church. When some ask, "What is church, Synod or local congregation," they really mean to ask, "Which is the controlling body, Synod or local church?" The answer remains, "Neither." Both are church, and both possess the spiritual prerogatives. But when we inquire as to order, to ecclesiastical organization, then it is apparent that the local congregation remains the prime factor. For Synod is an organization of local congregations, pastors, and teachers; and ecclesiastically it operates only with functional powers granted to it by its constituent members. Take away synodical organization and you may still have local churches, pastors and teachers; take away local churches, pastors and teachers and you have no synod whatever. Let us take care to have these things clear, lest in time it be thought that Synod really constitutes the prime body, having authority that transcends that of the local church. It is already on the oblique when it is stated that individual laymen are members of the Wisconsin Synod. Strictly speaking they are members of a local congregation which

belongs to the Synod. I may state that it is not unknown that synods in the establishment of missions by sheer weight of numbers and power of the purse have not always regarded the rights of long-established congregations. And in the minds of our laymen the idea has become familiar that Synod is the real church. Let us be on guard against this initial bias. Prime concern of any local church remains the local program; God has placed them there and called them to spread Christ's Kingdom locally first of all; and it is false to attempt to impress upon our people that the local program must recede before the program common to the synodical group. Let us beware of entering in upon something akin to Calvinistic agitation, a line to which our times are prone, called euphemistically propaganda; lest in the end we also incline toward a church government by divine right, as Dr. Alexander McGill of Princeton Seminary in his book on "Church Government" outrightly asserts.

IV. Arminianism

No stronger statement of the Calvinistic system was ever adopted than the Canons of the Synod of Dort, convened in Holland the year after the Thirty Years' War broke out in Germany: 1619. But we shall not discuss these canons; instead we shall devote a few paragraphs to the Arminian position, the Articles of Remonstrance, as they were called, not only by way of bringing out the contrast to Calvinism, but also because the remonstrant wind has blown so strongly here in America and has ruffled our sails as well. Called to the University of Leyden, himself a strict Calvinist, to combat the views of the learned secretarius of Haarlem, Dirck Volkertsoon Coornhert, who stood for universal grace and freedom of the will, Jacob Arminius found Coornhert's arguments stronger than his own convictions. He came into open conflict with his fellow professor, Gomar, from whom the Calvinistic party then got the name Gomarists. At his death his work was carried on by Episcopius, and in the Remonstrant party were found such illustrious names as those of Grotius, Oldenbarnevelt, and others. Starting from their opposition to the doctrine of absolute decrees, they set up a remonstrance in five articles, whence the dispute has received the name "Quinquarticular Controversy." In their first article they radically denied predestination, denouncing the ab-

solite decrees, with its supralapsarianism. They taught a conditional predestination, God desiring to save those men who, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, believe in Jesus Christ and persevere to the end. In their second article they went a step further and condemned sublapsarianism: that God ordained to exempt part of mankind from the consequences of sin, and left the rest to damnation. Against this view they placed universal atonement; that Christ died for all men, and for every man, and His grace is extended to all. He who is lost is lost by his own guilt. Thirdly, the Arminians condemned the Calvinistic teaching that Christ died, not for all men, but only for the elect. Over against this they placed the milder statement that man is unable to attain to saving faith unless regenerated by God in Christ through the Holy Spirit. Fourthly, against the Gomarist irresistible grace they asserted prevening, co-operating, assisting grace in conversion. As their fifth and final remonstrance they refused to accept that they who have once received grace cannot totally and finally lose it, and counterposed that there was a possibility of total and final fall of believers from grace. As a rule the Arminian movement is criticised, if not denounced, as one of the most abhorrent in radical direction in the Protestant Church; and the Synod of Dort is usually described as having rescued Reformed Protestantism from disintegration. The fact is, however, that the Remonstrants exercised a necessary sharp critique of Calvinism; it was a natural reaction to the extremes and stark false doctrine, only that in pointing out the unscripturalness of the latter the pendulum was permitted to swing into the opposite extreme: it seldom halts in the middle. From election and reprobation it curved to free will; from God's will and pleasure to men's co-operation in conversion, and faith as a moving cause in election; from exclusive redemption of the elect to universal atonement, etc. Later on Arminianism was taken over to a large degree by Methodism, and so was transplanted to America. While it died out almost completely in Holland, England and America offered it a home. And here, because of its strong trend toward rationalism, it has grown into the shallow modernism dominant in the Methodist Church, where it has reached the stage of disintegration. It is true, other factors, like emotionalism and the like also enter in, but we cannot take them into consideration now.

Lutheranism came into sharp contact here in America with the German Methodists, called the Albrechtsbrueder; and many a Lutheran immigrant joined that church. Methodism with its latitudinarian yeast has always leavened doctrinal fidelity. Since the sharpest sort of antagonism prevailed between Lutheran and Calvinistic schools of theology, especially since Melanchthon's time, a strong wave of sympathy for the Remonstrants rolled through the Lutheran Church of Germany; and there can be little doubt that it helped to bring out in Lutheran dogmatics the doctrine that, within fifty years of the Arminian movement, was taken for Lutheran: that men are elected to salvation in view of faith. For it was in the fifty years cited that the great dogmaticians did their work: Paul Gerhard, Quenstedt, Calov, etc.

It remained for the Synodical Conference here in America to return to Luther's biblical outlook to the scriptural and confessional Lutheran stand on election, universal grace, the will of man, and the judgment of the lost, not however, before a great conflict had taken place concerning predestination and conversion. With Scripture they learned to let the three propositions stand, which, if we recall that God is omniscient, omnipotent, merciful, and just, do not hitch in logical fashion, viz: 1. The earnest will of God for all men's salvation; 2. The election of the elect, which election from eternity is the cause of ensuing faith in time; and 3. That those who lose their souls do so as a result of their own wilful fault.

(To be continued)

THE BLOOD SACRIFICES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

(Continued from last issue)

B. The Significance of the Variant Features

In our previous discussion we noted that the common features of the blood sacrifices are found chiefly in the general ceremonial which was prescribed. An almost equal measure of agreement appears in connection with the substance of the offering, the use of the blood, and the consuming of the flesh. It only remains, therefore, to note the significance of the slight variants that occur under these latter headings and then to observe the bearing of the differences which appear in the other categories of our table, and which have not yet been mentioned, viz., the names, occasion, and purpose of the four types of offerings. We refer once more to the comparative table which appears on pages 274-5 of our last issue.

1. *The Burnt Offering*

The first offering to be described in Leviticus is the *OLAH*. The word itself means nothing more than a going up, and describes the manner in which the offering, through being consumed by fire, was caused to rise into the presence of God "for a sweet smelling savor." The various translations of this term (*burnt offering*, *Brandopfer*, *Ganzopfer*; also the "holocaustum" of the Vulgate and *LXX*) go well beyond the inherent meaning of the word and incorporate something of the subsequent description of the details of this offering, namely that all except the ceremonially unclean parts of the offering were carefully to be laid upon the altar where they were then to be totally consumed in the slow, smoldering manner of the sacrificial burning. The application of the blood in the case of the *OLAH* was according to what one might call the normal use, even as this entire offering might be considered the standard type. Significant deviations from this norm will therefore show up only when we study the other types.

The normal nature of this offering appears also from the occasions when it was employed and the purpose for which it was designed. It was used as a daily rite in the Tabernacle and subse-

quently the Temple. It was the morning and the evening sacrifice — the solemn opening and close of daily worship. Together with other ceremonies (see Ps 141, 2) it was employed in connection with the daily offerings of prayer and praise, as well as with special acts of worship on extraordinary occasions, e. g. Solomon's offering at the dedication of the Temple, 2 Kings 8, 64. It was a means by which the entire congregation could render homage to its God, but could also serve as an expression of personal devotion on the part of an individual in some memorable hour. On all such special occasions it served as a voluntary expression of love and reverence of a Covenant People for their God.

The principal features of this offering arise out of the nature of these occasions and purposes. The use of the blood was, of course, basic. These offerings were, above all, blood sacrifices. For there could be no approach to God, whether in prayer or any other manner, except upon the basis of this atonement for their sins which God had given His people upon the altar. In addition to this it was required that the victim be without blemish. This requirement is fully accounted for by the fact that no imperfect gift would be adequate as tribute and in worship of the perfect God. The offering must also be a total one in order to express the complete dependence of man upon his Maker, also that nothing may be withheld from the God who is Lord of all.

In looking for New Testament counterparts for this Old Testament offering we must consider the entire range of congregational as well as personal worship, including the personal consecration which marks the new life of the believer. The truths embodied in these God-given ordinances of the Old Testament will necessarily emerge and stand forth clearly, now that the hour has come when "true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." (John 4, 23f.) This must apply particularly to that central thought which was expressed by the blood ceremonial of the ancient rites.

It is therefore most fitting and proper that the form of worship which is commonly followed by our congregations should have as one of its first liturgical elements the traditional Confiteor, in-

cluding not only a confession of sins, but also the absolution. Thus not only room but prominence is given to the thought that our entire service, our very right to come before God, all rest upon the atoning work of the Savior. The same thought appears in all true Christian prayer. For when we make our requests in the name of Jesus, this is more than a mere phrase. It is a clear confession that because of our sins we are worthy of none of the things for which we ask. At the same time it is an expression of confidence in which we rest our case upon the forgiveness earned for us by the precious blood of Christ. This same thought is also reflected in true Christian songs of praise. For these are hymns called forth by the undeserved mercies of God. They are simply the song of those who are redeemed by the Blood of the Lamb. Nor should we in this connection overlook the role of the true Christian sermon. For it is essentially a showing forth of the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvellous light. Insofar as the sermon remains true to the great central theme of all Gospel preaching it is a tribute of praise to the grace and love of God as manifested in the vicarious atonement of Christ.

All this is equally true of the prayer, praise, and personal devotion of the individual Christian. But here another opportunity for God pleasing sacrifice and worship appears. Paul calls attention to it: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (*latreia* — Rom. 12, 1). "Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's" (1 Cor. 6, 20). Here the mercies of God and the price with which we have been bought not only provide the motive of gratefulness which elicits this tribute of a "new obedience" and of the Christian works which result therefrom, but they also supply the reason which makes it clear why the imperfect works of man can yet be a "service" which is acceptable to God. For not only the last sentence, but the entire quotation must be considered carefully when we read the well-known passage from Hebrews: "*By Him* therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name. But to do good and to communi-

cate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." (Hebr. 13, 15f.)

2. *The Peace Offering*

The second chapter of Leviticus deals with the Meat (Meal) Offering, which does not come under the scope of our discussion. The next sacrifice in which the use of the blood plays an essential part is the so-called Peace Offering. The Hebrew term is ZEBACH SHELAMIM. The word ZEBACH signifies a slaughtering, either for sacrificial purposes (cf. MIZBEACH — altar) or for food. Then it may also designate the flesh of the slaughtered animal, likewise a repast, banquet. In our case this latter use of the word is obviously combined with the sacrificial meaning. The word SHELEM is, of course, related to the word for peace. Specifically it is derived either from the Piel SHILLAM, in which case it would mean to restore, repay, thank, or it stems from the Qal SHALAM or SHALEM, and would then convey the thought of living in peace and plenty. That is why the LXX translated it with *thysia eirēnikē* or *thysia sōtēriou*. The English "Peace Offering" comes closer than "Thank Offering," and the German "Heilsopfer" is preferable to "Dankopfer." However, the thought of thanksgiving is certainly not to be excluded from the thought which the term is to convey.

As we consider the occasions on which this offering was employed and the purpose for which it was designed, it appears immediately that this ceremony was of a decidedly festive character. There were many occasions in the life of a devout Israelite or of the nation as a whole which would justify and call for these special sacrifices of thanksgiving and praise. The blessings which had been granted by a merciful God, the help experienced in fulfilling a vow or in completing some major undertaking would naturally call for some expression of gratefulness and rejoicing. Thus the major part of the offerings brought by Solomon and the people at the dedication of the Temple were such SHELAMIM. See 1 Kings 8, 63. At other times the purpose might be that of entreaty, which need not necessarily be inconsistent with the festive and joyous character of these offerings since it could and should express the confident assurance of aid to come, as well as a joyful awareness of Israel's

great privilege of being able in every need to turn to the Covenant God for His promised help.

All this was expressed in a peculiarly vivid manner by the provisions for the consuming of the sacrifice. The entire offering was consecrated to God, and was His in every sense of the word. Yet only certain specified parts were to be consumed by the fire upon the altar. This was all that God claimed. The remainder was to be eaten, in part by the priests (as also in some of the other offerings where the thought was that they were thereby acting as God's representatives, receiving the gift for Him), in part by the offerer, together with his family and possibly some guests. Since the entire offering had been consecrated to God, and thus formally belonged to God, this meant that the people were now the privileged guests of a Divine Host, enjoying His bountiful blessings in His gracious presence. The SHELAMIM thus become a ceremonious communal meal, expressing the believers' conscious, undisturbed, confident enjoyment of God's favor and many blessings, including specifically the right to entreat Him for further mercies. When Moses and the Seventy Elders ate and drank in the presence of God on Mount Sinai (Ex. 24, 9-11), this expressed the same gracious relationship: "Upon the nobles he laid not his hand: also they saw God, and did eat and drink." When devout Israelites of later generations gathered at the altar for their SHELAMIM, eating and drinking of the sacrifice and with their priests sharing also their spiritual blessings in the presence of their God, this was essentially a repetition of the scene on Sinai, albeit under much less dramatic circumstances.

A brief comparison will show that this offering involved no departure from the normal sacrificial use of the blood. There was no occasion for any deviation. The same significance which is expressed by the presence of the blood upon the altar in the previous type of offering is in evidence here also. If the SHELAMIM expressed the conscious, undisturbed, confident enjoyment of God's favor and blessings, the presence of the blood served as a constant reminder that this blessed communion with God could be attained only after an atonement had been made for sin, which otherwise must always separate man from his God. The atonement by blood was the divinely established premise upon which their privilege

rested. Even as this blood admitted the Covenant People to this blessed communion with their God, so it also set them apart from all other nations, making them truly "a peculiar people," separated unto their Lord. What this meant to them, and what blessings it conveyed to them, appears from a word of Paul to the Corinthians (I, 10, 18): "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrificés partakers of the altar?" He is saying that by eating of the sacrifice, by taking advantage of this gracious opportunity provided by their God, these Old Testament believers shared in everything for which the altar stood and which that altar intended to communicate to them. And that, as we have seen before, is nothing less than the great salvation which was effected by the perfect sacrifice which was prefigured by this Blood Atonement of the Old Covenant.

This leads us directly to the first and foremost point of New Testament significance of which we may speak in connection with this ancient ceremony. For St. Paul is citing the foregoing passage in order to illustrate what he has been teaching in the two previous verses: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." In this sacrament of eating and drinking we become actual partakers of the body and blood that were given and shed for the remission of our sins. We find ourselves in full possession of every blessing secured for us by this great sacrifice. But in sharing this blessing with other believers we find ourselves drawn into a most intimate fellowship with each other, a fellowship which sets God's people far apart from the world in which they live. In this respect note a repetition of the effect which followed out of the sharing of God's blessings in the *SHELAMIM*. But if this Old Testament ceremony goes no farther than to indicate a fellowship in which a believer is united with his God on the basis of His Covenant, and thereby separated from the world, this does not preclude the necessity of subsequent additional New Testament warnings which call for steadfast rejection of error and for studious avoidance of all such as promote, defend, and perpetuate such departures from the truth of the Word. For in such

error we must recognize a force which will not only vitiate the truth, but must make of any fellowship which one might base upon such a treacherous foundation a hollow sham which can not stand before the searching eye of God. It may be that this involves a decision which runs counter to our natural inclinations. It is not an easy matter to take the uncompromising stand for which this calls. But there is no legitimate way of getting around these warnings of God.

But while we recognize the stern necessity of these warnings, that need and should not in any way lessen the joy of sharing this fellowship with others where the proper basis for it is present. The very concern with which God guards it by means of such earnest warnings against errors and errorists will make it all the more precious in our eyes, and at the same time make us more concerned about retaining its purity.

It will readily be understood that our New Testament counterpart of this Old Testament ceremony is not restricted to the Sacrament alone. The blessings which we receive are spiritual, and they come not only by the sacramental eating and drinking but by the hearing of God's Word as well. There we are in a most direct way partaking of what is truly the Bread of Life. As we experience its blessings our joy is heightened by the knowledge that others share them with us. Our faith is strengthened by mutual contact. A fellowship of hearing develops, and we become aware that a special blessing lies in exercising this privilege together, even as a particular danger results from neglecting this opportunity. That is the reason for the apostolic admonition "not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is."

We know that these assemblies of believers also provided for a joint exercise of the privilege of entreating the Lord in common prayer. But we may also be sure that where there were conditions which called for the avoidance of errors and errorists, these warnings were needed with reference to prayer as well as to the other demonstrations of the fellowship of believers. There is no word of Scripture to indicate that the warnings which apply in other cases were not intended for this fellowship of prayer as well.

In conclusion we note that the enjoyment of these incomparably rich blessings of God certainly also calls for a sincere return-

ing of thanks to the Giver. Thereby we are reminded once more of the significance of the unfailling use of the blood in the ancient sacrifices. This blood will call to mind that our foremost reason for gratitude is certainly the wondrous salvation which has been purchased for us by the Blood of the Cross. But it will also lead us to recognize another important truth, namely that all other gifts of our Lord, and they are without number, become true blessings for us only through the Atonement which was made when "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."

The substance of these two first types of offerings, the Burnt Offering and the Peace Offering, may therefore be summed up by stating that they serve to express the Covenant Relationship. In the former, man is worshipping his God; God is receiving a tribute which is due Him. In the latter, God is blessing man; man is freely receiving and enjoying blessings which he never could merit by himself.

E. REIM.

(To be continued)

THE INSTRUCTION OF OUR YOUTH OF HIGH SCHOOL AGE

Essay read before the Conference of Missionaries of the North Wisconsin District of our Joint Ev. Lutheran Wisconsin Synod assembled at Rhinelander, Wisconsin, on September 26, 1946, by Pastor Dr. Henry A. Koch of Manitowoc, Wisconsin. Its publication in the Theol. Quartalschrift was requested by the Conference of Missionaries

The task has been assigned to me to speak to you on the instruction of our youth of high school age. We are all agreed on the importance of this instruction. We may differ with one another as to the best method of imparting it. Each one of us can only speak of his own experience and method. Since the instruction of our youth is a burning question, it is therefore highly advisable that we exchange our experiences and compare our methods so as to develop, if possible, a productive, efficient method for the indoctrination and guidance of our Christian youth.

The spiritual care of our adolescent youth must be one of our major concerns. We are to feed the lambs and the sheep. It has been said that he who has the youth has the future. The Church of Rome and the many advocates of "isms" and world views act according to this catchword. There is a certain truth in this statement. We do not subscribe to it as though the future of the Church depended upon our youth. The Church's existence and survival does not depend on any human agency. The Invisible Church will always continue to exist in spite of all the onslaughts of Satan. The future of the visible churches however does depend on their fidelity to the true Word and Sacrament. For the existence of our true Lutheran Church the care for our youth is of vital importance. Over and above that, we are individually and as a whole responsible to Christ, the Head of the Church, for every soul entrusted to our care. Nothing more and nothing less than faithfulness is required of us, the stewards of Christ. How can we exercise such faithfulness in the best possible way and obtain the most blessed results?

That is the question for our study and meditation, and may the Lord bless our deliberations.

It is not the question of our youth in general, but the youth of high school age which concerns us at present. As long as children are still small, under the immediate care of the parents and pastors in religious instruction, the danger is not as great. The dangerous and critical years for our youth lie in the period of adolescence which in the main coincides with the years of high school instruction and the first years of college. It is in these years that our youth seeks greater freedom. It is their wish to live their own lives, to enjoy life as the other young people do, and to have a good time with classmates and friends, who in only too many cases are not bound by Biblical injunctions and restrictions, especially by the words of Christ that we are to live in, but not be of, this world. They fail to understand and appreciate the advice and concern of their parents and pastors, when they are warned against the temptations of the world, such as the movie, the bar, the dance floor, joy rides with doubtful companions, and the like.

Beside the temptations of the modern world we have the beguilement of modern education. There lies the grave danger of the destruction of faith in the hearts of those who sip at the fountain of worldly wisdom. These dangers do not only lurk behind the theories of evolution and geology, they are to be found in every human subject of instruction. They are to be found wherever human factors are solely considered, a mere human cause and effect are sought and God as the Ruler of the universe is eliminated, as in the teaching of history and literature.

We shall have to limit ourselves to comprehensive statements. There is no one among us who does not know and feel very keenly the perils surrounding our youth when they leave their homes and receive their education in public high schools and colleges, where the poison of unbelief seeps into their youthful hearts ere they are aware of it. The Devil can tear down more in one day than we can ever hope to build up in a lifetime. We should have to despair, if we did not have the Word of God as our divine weapon against the great Deceiver. The years of adolescence are not merely the so-called "Flegeljahre", as they have been termed in German, they are the most dangerous and critical years in the life of the growing

boy or girl. Often faith has been torn out of the heart through a godless education. The chastity of many a boy's or girl's life has been destroyed in those years of adolescence when the young people wanted to be on their own and considered themselves strong enough to resist the wily temptations of the unholy trinity: the Devil, the world, and their own sinful flesh.

It has been maintained that the founding of young peoples' societies with their manifold social activities could and would offset the inner craving of our youth to seek worldly pleasures. It has been the almost general experience that those young people who are not worldly-minded attend the meetings and activities of such groups, but the others go their own way nevertheless. The more or less harmless activities of Christian societies are not according to the liking of those who are to be won by them. There is nothing wrong in itself in the founding and maintenance of young peoples' societies if they are properly conducted and under the personal supervision of the pastor and congregation. We would deceive ourselves, however, if we thought that a mere engagement in social activities, such as games, plays and sports, banquets and get-togethers would be the answer to the spiritual problems of our youth. It cannot be our purpose here to discuss the many possible dangers of young peoples' societies as mere social centers within the congregation. Only if the Word of God remains the dominating force of such a society can the detrimental factors be offset to a certain extent. Social activities have the tendency to drown out the study of and the interest in the Word of God. There can be but one answer to this vexing problem: Bible study and thorough indoctrination must offer the spiritual food, and wholesome social activities may be the dessert. The child which is only fond of dessert is a spoiled child, and they who offer their children only dessert will soon see the disastrous results. Such young people will be spoiled for the wholesome food of the Gospel and unwilling to accept pastoral and parental admonition. Only the food of the Gospel can nourish the soul and give strength to resist the temptations in school and life. Bible classes or instruction in whatever form may seem best to the local congregation are the only real answer to the manifold problems confronting our youth. Out of

pure doctrine there flows purity of life. Let us make full use of this divine weapon and power.

It is clear to all of us that our Bible classes should not be a mere repetition or continuation of our confirmation instruction. While we used Bible histories and Catechisms at the time, we shall now have to go to the prime source of both Bible History and Catechism, the Bible, the Book of Books. We must advance from the secondary sources to the Bible itself.

Again the question confronts us: How shall we approach such a study of the Bible? Shall we study our Bible by reading and discussing all kinds of books about the Bible, or shall we study the Bible itself at once? There can be but one answer. While there are many fine books giving us valuable information on the Bible, leading up to and aiding in a better understanding, there is but one textbook: the Bible itself. We have tried both methods and have found that only the Bible itself can truly hold and command the prolonged interest of the young people, because it is God's Word itself. It is like being satisfied with translations instead of the original text. Nothing can replace the original, and all substitutes will finally fail. Only if we let the Bible be the touchstone to test the real value of the appraised gold and silver content of worldly education and let our young people see the fallacies and deceptions of theories offered to replace the true Biblical facts, can we hope to hold our ground. The Devil is too wily and we can ward him off by no other weapon than the Word. "One little Word can fell him."

Again we ask ourselves: shall we at first give a general survey of the different books of the Bible as we find it in Schaller's Book of Books, or shall we go into the reading of the Bible at once? Our answer would be: We pastors ought to know the essential contents of every book of the Bible and also use such books as the fine Introduction of Schaller or any other of a similar nature in order to be able to instruct properly and also answer the questions put to us by our young people, but let us by all means go over to the reading of the Bible at once and in the course of our reading pass on whatever information should be necessary for the better understanding of the text. Let us not flood the minds of our youth with the contents of other books and try to impress them with our

own learning, but let us rather lead them to the fountain of all wisdom at once and let them experience for themselves by their own reading that and why the Bible is the Book of Books. Books of reference are very valuable for us pastors and many of our pastors' libraries ought to be more replete with good books of reference on the Bible than on shallow homiletical material from liberal Lutheran and Reformed sources. Books of reference should never replace the reading of the Bible on the part of the pastor as well as of the young people. We ourselves are in danger of reading all kinds of books and magazines about the Bible, but not the Bible itself. Luther informs us that he read the Bible at least three times each year. Where do we stand? I am ready to confess my guilt in this matter too. If Luther could do it with his immense burden of manifold duties, we have no excuse. With us it is either inner indifference toward our real field of labor or a lack of proper organization of our work and time.

Another question arises: which books should be read first of all and how fast shall we progress with our reading? Shall we carefully read and analyze each verse, or shall we resort to a more cursory reading at first and rather endeavor to convey a more general picture and only call attention to especially important and difficult passages? The latter course is preferable.

In our opinion there can be no better beginning than by starting out with the reading of the Book of Genesis. Do not the first chapters alone give us a wealth of material to discuss and refute the fallacies of evolution? Does not the story of the Deluge give us a fine opportunity to refute the false conclusions of modern geology? Do not the beginnings of the human race grant us the possibility to disprove the theories of modern anthropology and history? Then we can speak of sin and our Savior, of prophecy and fulfilment. Is there not a wealth of doctrinal information to be found in the first chapters of Genesis alone and above all in the first Promise? It may interest you to know that Carl Manthey Zorn wrote a book entitled: The whole Christian Doctrine according to Genesis 1-5.

The reading of additional chapters at home can be furthered by asking the young people to find the answer to one or more salient questions in each chapter and then to discuss the answers in the

next meeting. There are many ways of inducing the young people to do some additional private reading. This method enables faster progress in the reading of the individual chapters and books of the Bible.

During the reading the young people will be agreeably surprised to find the many Bible passages which they learned during their Confirmation instruction in their natural setting and they will begin to understand them much better. They will discover that the doctrines they learned are not abstract truths which they merely had to memorize, but living truths of God's own Word. Just as it is helpful to children if they see the objects of their study in their natural surrounding, it will be of the greatest benefit for our young people to find and restudy the Bible passages in their original setting. What a grand opportunity for a pastor to review in brief the truths once taught! The young people will then discover that the study of the Bible and Christian doctrine is not a dry matter, but full of spiritual life. They will see the terrible power of sin in the various characters of the Bible. They will learn that there is not a general upward trend of the human race from the aborigine to the superman, but rather a steady deterioration of nations, races and individuals ending in utter bankruptcy and destruction. Only the grace of God can counteract the terrible power of sin. Human nature does not change of its own accord. They will furthermore discover that the promises of God proclaimed in the prophecies of old are woven like a golden thread into the pattern of Old Testament history, that the faithful of the Bible as well of all ages see only the rough side of God's pattern for their salvation and that only a blessed eternity will reveal the perfect pattern.

If you desire to make your Bible Class interesting and instructive, then read the Book of Genesis with your young people, study what Luther has to say in his masterful and magnificent interpretation of that most colorful first Book of Moses. You will learn from Luther how to preach sermons of power and life and also inspire your young people. You will also find the English commentary of the American Lutheran theologian Leupold very valuable. He is a conservative theologian, to whom the days of creation are days of 24 hours and no indefinite periods, who accepts the Flood as a universal and not as a partial one, who makes no attempt to

explain the miracles away. He brings many quotations from Luther and thereby discloses that he is a faithful student of the great Reformer.

In dealing with questions of science, of evolution as well as geology, you will find that you will have to give your young people real weapons into their hands against unproven theories. It will not suffice to merely say that the pseudo-scientists are all wrong. It is a comparatively easy thing to denounce the others as false teachers in sweeping statements and vague generalities from the pulpit as well as in the Bible Class. Such easy and slipshod refutations will not strengthen the faith of those entrusted to your spiritual care. You will have to make a real study of the matter and know whereof you speak. Let us not forget that we are dealing with high school students who are exposed to false theories day after day. They need a strengthening of their faith and must be put into a position to give an account of the faith within them. For such personal study I should like to call your special attention to the books of Th. Graebner on: God and the Cosmos, and Evolution. In them you will find a veritable arsenal of Scriptural proof and rejection of modern theories. Professor Th. Graebner has made a thorough study of these related subjects and knows whereof he speaks. He offers you very fine apologetical material for your own studious preparation.

Then we should also like to focus your attention on the books of Harry Rimmer who himself is a great student of theology and science. He is Reformed and has made Christian apologetics his special field. He endeavors to harmonize Scripture and Science. His weakness is that he thinks that he can offer a rational proof for Scriptural doctrines such as the atonement of Christ. If the Scriptural doctrines could be proven to be rational, they would no longer be articles of faith. They are beyond our sin-stained human reasoning. We cannot grasp them. We accept them with a childlike faith because Scripture, the Word of God, tells us so. In spite of this shortcoming in the works of Harry Rimmer, in which he betrays his Reformed theology and with it his adoration of human reason, you will find much valuable material for your Bible Class in his numerous books such as: The Harmony of Science and Scripture, and: Modern Science and the Genesis Record. In the

latter book he does speak of eras of creation instead of days, but otherwise he is dead set against evolution. We should also like to mention his book on: *The Theory of Evolution and the facts of Science*. If you begin with their study, you will discover their value for yourself and be inclined to acquire other books of his for your own library and study. I frankly confess that the works of Harry Rimmer opened many new vistas of interpretation to me and I am convinced that you will experience the same when you study them. It is self-evident that they have to be read with discretion, but they certainly contain much precious information, such as we need when we endeavor to teach and to warn our youth that is being infiltrated with a pseudo-science in our modern high schools and colleges.

Another question arises in the instruction of our youth: Is it necessary and even advisable to read every passage of Genesis and of the whole Bible, since there are many passages, in which the sins against the sixth commandment are mentioned and exposed? May not such a reading in mixed classes cause embarrassment? May not questions be put which we could answer more easily in separate classes or privately? We know that some pastors have read the whole book with their classes, but we are in doubt as to the advisability. We found it to be more practical to read the most important portions of each chapter. At the same time we told the young people to reread the chapters we had discussed at home so as to understand them more fully. If they had any further questions to ask, they could come to me privately and I would gladly give them all desired information. It did not take the young people very long to notice why I did not read every verse in every chapter, but merely gave them the main line of thought. I called attention to the various sins in such a way as I found I could justify before mixed classes. I pointed out that the Bible does not try to hide the grievous sins of the saints. Human histories, biographies and autobiographies only too often try to hide. They either glorify or give a morbid picture of the depths of human depravity with the very purpose of arousing sensual lust whereas the Bible pictures sin in order to warn us. The Bible does not cover up sin and is no book on pornography, such as for instance the book of Miss Schmidt on David the King is. The patriarchs and their

wives, their sons and their daughters are not portrayed as perfect saints, such as we find in the literature of the Church of Rome. Autobiographies often cover up more than they reveal. You have to do much reading between the lines. God does not always give us all the details we may often desire and consider noteworthy, but He does give us all of the essential facts.

The Book of Genesis is in our opinion the book of the Bible with which we should like to begin our reading of the Bible with our young people, since we can take for granted that the stories of the Gospels are more or less known to them from their former confirmation instruction.

We should like to continue with the reading of the Book of Exodus. Here again we shall have to make wise selections reserving the other portions for private reading or for later study at home. It is impossible to read every chapter of every book. We can but strive to make the reading of the Bible attractive to our youth and to arouse in them the personal desire to read more and become real students of the Bible. In the Book of Exodus we also have a wealth of material. The 400 years in Egypt, the going out of Egypt, the Passover, the giving of the Law on Sinai, the Tabernacle, and the Covenant with the Israelites offer us a wonderful chance to speak of the many types in the Old Testament and their fulfilment in Christ, of the wanderings of the Israelites and the ways of God with His people and of our own wanderings as pilgrims through the wilderness of this world.

In Leviticus we could select those passages and chapters which deal with some of the specific laws of Moses, political as well as ceremonial. We would discuss the most important Jewish festivals, the Sabbath and the Jubilee Year, slavery, marriage, divorce and polygamy. We could make comparisons with our own church year and liturgy.

In like manner we could also make the proper selections from the other books of Moses, thereby always keeping in mind the general indoctrination we should like to impart and not losing ourselves in too many details. This of course means that we ourselves first of all become real students and readers of our Bible so as to be able to make the proper selections and give the main line of thought. Unforgettable to me are those wonderful lectures of

our venerable Professor August Pieper on Isagogics in which he gave us the main line of thought of all of the books of the Bible and inspired us to read the Bible ourselves and filled our hearts with a love of the Gospel and the burning desire to preach it to our people, young and old. Oh that we could but in part inspire our young people with a love for the Bible as we were inspired in those incomparable lectures on Isagogics! That was no dead and dry instruction, but a live presentation of Biblical truths and characters.

Thus we can go from book to book and wherever we dig a little deeper we shall discover that the Word of God is unfathomable and that we pastors derive the greatest benefit from such a study of the Word of God for our whole ministry among young and old. We should never forget the special spiritual needs of our youth when we discuss the Book of Books with them. We should also not forget that we are not speaking to young theologians, but to young and untrained Christians grappling with the problems of modern education and life.

It stands to reason that we cannot discuss all of the books of the Bible in like manner in this paper, but we should at least like to call attention to a few facts and books to make it clear how we visualize a fruitful study of the Bible with our young people.

When studying the Book of Joshua with its story of the conquest of Canaan we can impress our youth with the truth that only they will be blessed in time and eternity who share the faith of Joshua and his house and who live according to God's commandments. We can explain why the children of Israel should not mix with the Canaanites, warn against mixed marriages, explain that and why we Christians are a peculiar people who live in this world, but are not to be of this world.

The long period of 300 years covered in the Book of Judges lets us study such characters as Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson. In the study of this book we observe the refrain: Everyone did what was right in his own eyes and all were falling away from Jehovah. In their greatest distress the Israelites prayed to Jehovah and He sent them judges who saved them. This was the period of theocracy. The discussion could also center around different forms of government and the attitude of the Christian toward his own gov-

ernment. That the whole tribe of Benjamin was practically annihilated with the exception of about 600 men is another proof for the truth of the Word of God. No profane Jewish historian would have revealed this fact. Historians only too often try to cover up, not so the Word of God, which contains the warning: "Be not deceived, God will not be mocked." There are many other valuable facts of a similar nature which may be brought out in a study of the Book of Judges.

In the first Book of Samuel we have the beautiful and model family life of Elkanah and Hannah, the early youth of God-fearing Samuel. What a contrast when we look at the house of Eli! There the truths of the fourth commandment and of the close of the commandments can be stressed. What a venerable character is not Samuel, the last judge and one of the first prophets after Moses, the man who was asked to liquidate the theocracy and substitute the monarchy. The greater portion of the Books of Samuel is devoted to the greatest king of Israel, the ancestor of Jesus, the pride of the Hebrews, the man after the heart of God, and yet that great sinner whose sins are so mercilessly portrayed for our instruction. The terrible power of sin and the tragic results which haunted David all his lifetime, and yet could not prevent him from dying in the peace of His heavenly Lord and in the sure knowledge of the forgiveness of all of his sins (Psalms 51 and 103) offer an untold wealth of material for the instruction of our youth. Was it not David who confessed: Remember not the sins of my youth? (Ps. 25: 7.) His adultery was the greatest blot in the life of the greatest king Israel ever had. He reaped what he had sown. His own daughter was raped by her own brother, his own son, Absalom, rebelled against him. The divine promise of the Eternal King was the last comfort of this great man who revealed his inner life and struggles in his Psalms and gave us the most beautiful Prayer Book of the Old Testament, the comfort of untold millions of all times and climes.

In the two Books of the Kings we witness the glorious reign of Solomon and also the infamous end of the Israelite nation. Judah falls from the pinnacle of her fame and power and ends in captivity. What a warning are not those books for all rulers who think that the world exists merely for the fulfilment of all of their

own whims, pleasures and ambitions! In the life of Solomon we see the disastrous results of idolatry in their beginning and the tragic end of Israel in captivity and dispersion. Think of Solomon! What a fall from the riches and wisdom given to Solomon by God Himself to the terrible sins of polygamy and idolatry to please his harem of women! Solomon's sins are truthfully told, nothing is hidden. Here we see how luxury, riches, and sensual pleasure ruin men, women, and nations. It is the old refrain of wine, women, song, and pleasure. Surely the Bible is not a book invented by men or it would not have published the sins of the great so mercilessly. The sins of the great of today which shriek to the heavens are hushed up in every possible way. The Bible has been written for our instruction and admonition. Let us carefully study and select just such passages and stories of Holy writ which will enable us to admonish our young people in the proper way and give them the power to overcome sin. We have no greater power than that of the Cross and the Gospel.

The study of righteous Elijah and ruthless Ahab and Jezebel, the scene on Mount Carmel, the training of Elisha and his school of the prophets should not be overlooked. Here a comparison can be made with our own schools of the prophets in our colleges and seminaries with their prime purpose of training young men for the ministry and teachers for our schools.

To one Book we should like to call your special attention, the Book of Esther, which will offer you a grand opportunity to speak of the role of the Jews among the nations of this world and what Jesus had to say about them: "This generation shall not pass away till all things are fulfilled." (Luke 21 : 32.)

Of the Book of Job some of the most outstanding chapters could be selected for reading. The sufferings of Job let us meditate on the cause and purpose of all suffering. It points to the Cross and to Him of whom Job confesses: "I know that my Redeemer liveth." Thomas Carlyle said of the Book of Job: "I call this Book apart from all theories about it one of the grandest things ever written."

In making our selection from the books of the Prophets it will be well for us to remember the real purpose of the Prophets, to pronounce God's Warnings, punishments, and promises to the

faithful. The whole of the Old Testament reveals to us the rise and fall of the chosen people. The Prophets lived in the days of the fall of that proud nation, foretold and described it. The nation as such was practically destroyed. Only a remnant remained which believed in the Branch that was to come out of the house of David.

Of the books of the Minor Prophets I should like to ask you to study above all the Book of Jonah with your Junior Bible Class. You will find Speckhardt's treatise on the Book of Jonah published by the Concordia Publishing House an excellent aid. In this Book we learn of the folly of trying to escape God, of the mission at Niniveh, and the purpose of mission work. Last, not least, we have the sign of Jonah fulfilled in Christ: "As Jonah was three days in the belly of the whale, so the Son of Man will remain three days in the bowels of the earth." Prophecy and fulfilment, the power of the Word of God, the true mission of the Church, these are some of the many lessons to be derived from this short Book of Jonah.

We should like to point to one subject which should deserve your special interest and which will pay fine dividends, if properly used in your instruction. It is the subject of archaeology which has thrown much light on the Bible. When the lips of men have remained silent and the pens have failed to rally to the defense of the Bible, when the modern scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees who pretend to know the Scriptures and blatantly deny Christ and the Gospel, endeavor to silence the truth of God's Word, the stones cry out that very same Truth. Whether you think of the cuneiform writings of Babylonia or the Rosetta Stone of Egypt, whether it be the unearthed walls of the Palace of Nebuchadnezzar or the Pyramids of Egypt, they all have had to serve to bear out the truth of God's infallible Word. The pick and the shovel have unearthed many valuable findings to support the Biblical record over against those who try to reduce it to a mere collection of myths and fables.

We should like to mention some of the more important books on archaeology. In Halley's Pocket Handbook of the Bible you will find a welcome introduction which should whet your appetite for further study. You could pass on to Marston: *The Bible Comes Alive*, and then to the more comprehensive George Barton: *Archaeology and the Bible*. There is another very fine English

series by Urquhart which is very rare. It is entitled: *Recent Discoveries and the Bible*. It is written from a conservative standpoint and comprises several volumes. Hurlbut's *Historical and Descriptive Bible Atlas*, published by Rand McNally, gives you some of the more important recent discoveries. It also contains maps of Bible lands, reconstruction of the Tabernacle, the Temples of Solomon and Herod, and the like. Last, not least, we should again like to mention H. Rimmer: *Dead Men Tell Tales*, which is a book on Old Testament archaeology and: *Crying Stones*, a companion book covering the New Testament. Both of the works are written in such a way that even a layman can understand them. These books on archaeology will fascinate you from the beginning till the end. The great discoveries in Egypt, Babylonia, and Niniveh are all asked to bear record to the truth of the Bible over against the errors and fallacies of Higher Criticism. If you desire to let the stones speak to your young people in defense of the Bible, then make a thorough study of these and the other above mentioned books on archaeology. You will enrich your own knowledge immeasurably and arouse your young people to say: We should like to hear more of this from you.

While we should like to suggest to you to make a proper selection from the vast treasures of the Old Testament, it would seem advisable to us to read one or the other Gospel in full, perhaps one of the Synoptic Gospels and John with one group and then change off with another group. The Book of Acts could and should be read with every class, for it gives us the history of the early Church in its characteristic beginnings and phases from Jerusalem to Rome. The Book of Acts gives us the grandest opening to a discussion of the prime work of the Church: mission work. Limited time will prohibit more than a cursory reading. Passages, however, which emphasize some important doctrine or principle of mission work should be studied more fully. If at all possible, try to get the young people to enter in upon a discussion. This is not so easily achieved. A round-table discussion will bear the most blessed fruits.

As far as the reading of the Bible in class is concerned you will find that not all of the young people will care to read. They may be afraid to mispronounce words or not to read as well as

others. Only those who volunteer should be asked to read before others. In most cases it is the wisest policy for the pastor to do the reading himself. We should not forget that we are dealing with high school students who in only too many cases have only begun to take their studies a little more seriously and who are not advanced as far as we should like to expect.

For your own private study and reference we should like to recommend above all John Schaller: Book of Books which offers a fine and readable Introduction to the books of the Bible and also offers other valuable historical information. To anyone who is acquainted with the widespread material on the Introduction and History of the New Testament Canon and Higher Criticism, Schaller reveals a thorough knowledge of the subject and much study. We who have been privileged to have been students of his will appreciate his fine Introduction to the study of the Bible doubly, and we owe him a debt of gratitude for having placed this book into the hands of the pastors. It should be found in every pastor's library. In it you will find the conservative and accurate information you desire and need.

The Bible references for the Old as well as the New Testament of Rupprecht also give helpful and very valuable information for the correct interpretation of the Biblical text. Above all we should like to focus your attention on John Ylvisaker: The Gospels. This is a grand book and will offer you many hours of fruitful and delightful study, abundant material for your sermons and Bible classes. It is a scholarly work. By all means try to get this masterwork. No pastor's library should be without it. A pastor can be judged by his library and by his study of the best books on theology. Above all, let your Bible-copy of the original text as well as of Luther's text and that of the Authorized Version experience the most usage. Let us prove ourselves good householders who bring forth out of this treasure things new and old.

In my work with my young people I discovered that a knowledge of the physical geography of Palestine was very valuable. I asked them to compare the geography of the Holy Land with that of the southeastern section of our State of Wisconsin. Palestine is about one-third as large as Wisconsin. There is a very fine three-dimensional map of Palestine showing the length, breadth and

depth of the country in seven different colors. Ask the young people to locate the different places mentioned in the Bible and associate the Biblical events with the places. It will add greatly to the interest in this small and yet most important country in the world and the history of mankind.

Personally I am a great friend of visual education. It is much easier to bring home some of the Bible stories through this mode of education. It is the modern application of the precepts of the German pedagogue Herbart, even though many do not even know that they are indebted to him. To this day there are no finer visual aids for such Bible study than the Cathedral Slides Series. A Christian Day School teacher of the honorable Missouri Synod was the originator of the novel idea. Till now this series only covers some of the stories of the New Testament. The stories of the Old Testament have not even been begun. The life of Saint Paul is in the making. These slides should make the study of missions a most attractive one. The enhancing feature of the Cathedral Slides is that they endeavor to give the Oriental color and background. There is nothing to our knowledge today which can and does approach these colored slides as an aid to visual education. The public and high schools, as you all know, are devoting much time to such visual education. In this respect we can learn very much from them. Of course, the first inevitable purchases are very expensive, but they are a more or less permanent possession which can be used time and time again.

It has been our experience that the interest of the young people can be greatly increased through such methods of visual education. For those of us who cannot make use of such material for the time being, numerous books and magazines offer valuable visual aids. The books of Wm. Dallmann on Jesus, Peter, John and Paul contain a wealth of fine pictures which can be used very successfully. The vivid presentation of the well-known writer can show us how to make our presentation more interesting and instructive. Furthermore the Westminster Bible Dictionary offers much valuable material in the line of pictures and descriptions. This Bible Dictionary, however, must be used with discretion. Is it necessary to call your attention to the exquisite material to be found in the many fine articles, pictures and maps of the National Geographic Magazine? In

one of the most recent issues an excellent map of Bible Lands was added. Some time ago an outstanding map of Classical Lands of the Mediterranean and Europe was published. Young people can even be urged to look for fine picture material and articles in magazines and newspapers. The photographic sections of the more outstanding Sunday papers contain many a fine picture which may serve as a visual aid.

Just as a good and efficient mother will strive after variety in the foods she brings on the table, a good pastor and teacher will also seek variety in the presentation of the old Gospel truths. Why should we not make use of a good Anschauungsunterricht? When we used modern visual aids in our work in the Sunday School and Bible Class, our young people and children told us: Now we can understand the Bible story much better. Even adult Bible classes can be taught more effectively through such visual aids. Let no one come with the argument that the Word of God must do it. No one wants to deny that. The visual aids are no means of grace, but merely an aid to a better understanding of the text, merely a means to an end.

A final question arises: In which way should we lead up to the study of the Epistles, those veritable treasures of our Christian doctrine. In our opinion the real study of the Epistles should be left to advanced adult Bible Classes. Dr. Dallmann has shown how a fine introduction to the study of the Epistles can be used even in a Bible Class for young people. In his excellent *Life of Saint Paul*, for instance, he brings the main line of thought of the Epistles in their natural and historical setting. A brief résumé of the Epistles given in connection with the life of the Apostles can aid in bringing the heart of our Christian doctrine nearer to our young people. In our opinion a direct study of the Epistles appears rather abstract to our youth. In later life they are in a much better position to understand and appreciate the depth of wisdom found in the Epistles. In his sermons the pastor has the best opportunity to preach doctrine, but even there it should not be a dry presentation. If the great Apostle already found it necessary to give his Corinthians milk instead of meat, what should we say? Did he not write to them (1. Cor. 3:2): "I have fed you with milk and not with meat, for hitherto ye were unable to bear it neither yet now are ye able."

Let us prove ourselves as good householders and heed the advice of the Master (Matth. 13: 52): "Every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." The study of the Gospels and the Book of Acts will afford us ample opportunity to preach doctrine. That we present it properly and in the best possible manner will be our specific pastoral task. Only if we ourselves are good Bible students and clear in our own minds on our Christian doctrine, will we be able to present it effectively. If we ourselves are confused or disinterested we shall never be in a position to impress our hearers, the young as well as the old.

Luther already tells us that we should never preach above the heads of our hearers, but rather in such a manner that Hans and Gretel can understand us. It does not pay to appear learned before high school students. They are just beginning to sip at the fountain of human wisdom and their ignorance in general and above all in spiritual matters is often appalling unless they have previously enjoyed a good training in a Christian Day School. We should never take anything for granted. This does not mean that we should only give our young people milk and no firmer food. They will have to be led up to it gradually. Each pastor will have to decide for himself just how fast he can make progress. Our Junior Bible Classes should gradually lead up to Adult Classes. That will be the natural and desirable result. Even adults will never have completed their learning. Dr. Martin Luther confessed that he wanted to be a student of the Catechism all his lifetime.

Let us always keep the ideal goal before our eyes. No pastor will ever reach it fully. It will be well nigh impossible to get the whole congregation and even all of the young people to attend the Bible Classes regularly. This should not deter us from trying to reach our goal. We cannot apply the Law to bring our young people as well as the adults to our Bible Classes. The Gospel is still the only power to sway a man's heart.

It is self-evident that we give this work our prayerful attention. Just as we begin our work on our sermons with prayer and ask the Lord to give us the right understanding of the text and the right thoughts and application for our hearers, we should do the

same for our Bible Classes. We should give this work the same prayerful attention. We should never go to our Bible Classes unprepared, as little as we should ever dare to stand in our pulpit unprepared. In an emergency the Lord has promised us that we shall be told what we are to say. Such "emergencies" should, however, never become the rule. If we plan our work carefully and methodically, we shall always find time for the necessary preparation. Procrastination is the thief of time in this matter too, otherwise we are no better than those children who endeavor to cram all their studies into a few minutes and hours before classes.

The teacher cannot fail to notice this, and our hearers young and old will do the same. It is a grave mistake on our part, if we think that our hearers cannot judge whether we are prepared or not. They will detect very soon, whether we are rambling or really leading them to the fresh waters of God's Word. Our young people need our special care and nurture. Let us do this work in the fear of the Lord knowing that we shall have to give an account of our stewardship for every soul, young or old, entrusted to our care. Many a blessing has come from faithful work among the young people and many a person has in later life thanked his pastor for the blessings he or she derived from the Bible Class.

These are some of our experiences which we gathered in our work among the young people. We have found it to be a very necessary and blessed work. If at the end of such a Bible Class there is still time for a social gathering, it certainly can do no harm, if conducted properly; but the main purpose of all of our work must be and remain to lead souls to Christ and to try to keep them with Him so that we too at the end of our pastoral career can say: "Lord, here am I and those whom Thou hast given me." May we then too be privileged to hear the comforting words of our Lord and Master: "Oh thou faithful servant. Well done. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Permit me in conclusion to mention a few statements of great men of all walks of life on the importance of the Bible. Our own great President Abraham Lincoln said: "I believe the Bible is the best gift God has ever given to man. All the good from the Savior of the world is communicated to us through this Book." The English Prime Minister Gladstone confessed: "I have known

95 of the world's greatest men of my time and of these 87 were followers of the Bible." The great German poet Goethe had to admit: "Let mental culture go on advancing, let the natural sciences progress to an ever greater extent and depth, and the human mind widen itself as much as it desires, it will never go beyond the elevation and moral culture of Christianity as it shines forth in the Gospels." The English poet Tennyson remarked: "Bible reading is an education in itself."

Of our own statesmen we should like to mention a few. Daniel Webster remarked: "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering, but if we and our posterity neglect its instruction and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury all our glory in profound obscurity." How prophetic and how true! Patrick Henry acknowledged: "The Bible is worth all the other books which have ever been printed." Benjamin Franklin said in a speech at a convention held for the forming of the Constitution of our United States in 1787: "I have lived a long time (81 years) and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth that God governs the affairs of men. If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured in the sacred writings that: 'Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it' (Ps. 127:1). I firmly believe this and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall proceed in this political building no better than the builders of the Tower of Babel. We shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests; our prospects will be confounded and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword to future ages." How prophetic and how true!

If the great of this world already had to confess the power and importance of the Bible for the benefit and future of mankind, how much more should not we Christians and especially we Lutherans who represent the Church of the Word emphasize the necessity and the importance of the study of the Word of God. May this Word ever be the dominating force in our own lives and may we do all we can to let it live in the minds and hearts of our members young and old. Let us always be ready to sit at the feet of the great Master and Savior Jesus and let us never grow tired in im-

pressing those entrusted to our care with the one thing needful. May we who are ambassadors for Christ and representatives of the Lutheran Church of the Word not be found wanting. God grant it!

H. A. KOCH.

NEWS AND COMMENT

† Professor August Pieper † — Professor A. Pieper departed this life on December 23, and was buried on December 27, 1946.

August Otto Wilhelm Pieper was born on September 27, 1857, at Carvitz, in the province of Pommern, Germany, as the second youngest son of August Bernhard Pieper and Bertha Lohff. After his father's death, the mother with her four youngest sons — two older ones having preceded her — emigrated to America in 1870, and settled at Watertown, Wisconsin. Here August attended the Christian Day School; in the year following he was confirmed. In order to prepare himself for the holy ministry he now entered Northwestern College. Having completed the prescribed exams of study there, he now enrolled at Concordia Theological Seminary in St. Louis, Mo. After his graduation in 1879 he received his first call as pastor from our congregation at Kewaunee, Wisconsin. Here he labored till 1885 when he followed a call to the Church at Menomonie, Wisconsin. During the six years of his stay there he not only served this congregation, but established, besides, a number of preaching stations in the neighboring region. From 1891 till 1902 he was pastor of St. Marcus Church at Milwaukee, whence he was called to a professorship in the Theological Seminary of our synod at Wauwatosa, now located at Thiensville, Wisconsin. Here he lectured chiefly on Isagogics and Old Testament Exegesis. After 41 years of service, during which time the majority of the present pastors of our synod, still active in the work of the Kingdom, have been his students, he spent the declining days of his life in the home of his daughter, Mrs. M. Kornreich.

His faithful spouse, the former Miss Emma Koenig of St. Louis, Missouri, to whom he was married since 1881, was called to her eternal home in 1929. A daughter, Mrs. Lydia Stern, had died in 1923. Six children are his survivors: four daughters and two sons, both pastors, beside twenty-five grandchildren and eighteen great grandchildren. The deceased reached the advanced age of 89 years, 2 months, and 26 days. His has been the high privilege to work for sixty-four years in the Lord's vineyard.

The funeral service was held on the Friday after Christmas at two o'clock in St. James' Church, Milwaukee. His pastor, the Rev. Arthur Voss, conducted the service and preached on Luke 2, 29 in German, while Profes-

sor J. P. Meyer, his colleague at the seminary for over twenty years, spoke in English on Gen. 49, 18. The whole assembly as well as a students' choir rendered appropriate hymns. Interment was made in Wanderers' Rest cemetery. The sermons, delivered at this occasion, we intend to bring in the next number of the *Quartalschrift*.

In spite of the inclement weather and treacherous roads a goodly number of his former pupils were present to do homage to the memory of their sainted professor. Besides, many letters of condolence from educational institutions of our own and sister synods, and from friends has reached the family of the deceased.

An appraisal of Professor August Pieper as theologian and teacher will follow in a later issue. M. L.

The End of the Affirmation. — At its Appleton Convention (October 10 to 17, 1946), the American Lutheran Church took occasion to define its future policy on the question of Lutheran unity in a pair of resolutions which must be commended, if not for their content, then at least for their complete frankness. The resolutions:

A. Selective Fellowship

WHEREAS, The matter of "Selective Fellowship" was discussed at the 1944 convention of the Church and was referred to the districts for study and consideration, and

WHEREAS, The Committee of Fellowship of the American Lutheran Church reports that all districts endorsed "Selective Fellowship" in principle, therefore be it

Resolved, That pastors and parishes of the American Lutheran Church shall be free to have pulpit, altar, and prayer fellowship with such pastors and parishes of other Lutheran synods as agree, in doctrine and practice, with the declarations made in Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Article II — Confession of Faith — of the Constitution of the American Lutheran Church.

B. Intersynodical Fellowship

WHEREAS, The attempt to formulate a unified doctrinal statement, such as the Doctrinal Affirmation, has not produced a document generally acceptable, and

WHEREAS, After years of effort in this direction we despair of attaining Lutheran unity by way of additional doctrinal formulations and reformulations; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of the Minneapolis Theses, the Washington Declaration, the Brief Statement and Declaration, the Pittsburgh Agreement, and the Overture on Unity has demon-

strated that the chief obstacles to Lutheran unity are not matters of doctrine so much as differences of background, approach, spirit, attitude, and practice, which can and should be resolved in an atmosphere of candor, mutual understanding, and love, therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our sincere and earnest desire to achieve official church fellowship with all Lutheran bodies, and to that end continue our Committee on Fellowship, charging it to explore the measure of agreement we have with other Lutheran bodies and to further such agreement toward the goal of true unity.

We have stated our position toward these resolutions in the *Northwestern Lutheran*, November 24, 1946, page 371. No more will, therefore, be necessary now than merely to draw attention once more to the self-contradiction that appears when the convention states that it despairs of attaining Lutheran union by way of additional doctrinal formulations and reformulations and then, almost in the same breath, goes on to say that the chief obstacles to Lutheran unity are not matters of doctrine.

If the doctrinal differences have really been reduced to the vanishing point, why was the Doctrinal Affirmation unacceptable to the A. L. C.? Why must the new method of "Selective Fellowship" be invented in order to get around an obstacle that allegedly does not exist?

E. REIM.

Dr. Behnken at the American Lutheran Conference. — President Behnken has favored us with a copy of an address on "Fellowship Among Lutherans" which he delivered before the convention of the American Lutheran Conference November 14, 1946, at Rockford, Illinois. Because of its exceptional importance, we intend to present it in its entirety in this and in the following issue of the *Quartalschrift*.

E. REIM.

"Fellowship Among Lutherans"

Address to the American Lutheran Conference

November 14, 1946, at Rockford, Illinois.

Dear Friends:

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

opportunity to speak on this important question and set forth what we of the Missouri Synod consider essential toward the accomplishment of fellowship among Lutherans.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Efforts have been made to effect inter-Synodical lay organizations. We are told that these organizations are to be of social and civic character and that they will avoid any attempt to become pressure groups which will demand Lutheran union. However, there, too, some have become so enthusiastic as to call this a real step in the direction of fellowship among Lutherans. Some have said that now we are getting down to the real issues for in this way Lutheran union will emanate from the grass roots. Someone said that the past was the period for the clergy and the future is the day of the laity. Concerning the non-achievement of Lutheran union someone said that the fault must be sought not in the pew but in the pulpit. We must carefully avoid every effort to pit the laymen against the clergy or the clergy against the laymen. God forbid that the impression should go out that the preachers have been blocking the cause of Lutheran unity. Let us guard against any indictment of those who have stood for Scriptural principles. We know that God has explicitly outlined the duties of His watchmen and God uses some strong language in that connection. The Lord wants preachers who are loyal to His cause, who will not deviate in the least from any part of His Word, who will defend every jot and tittle of it, who will insist that the church continue in sound doctrine. On the other hand, God wants laymen who continue in His Word, who believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God. Efforts toward fellowship among Lutherans must never become a lay movement nor a clergy movement, but a church movement. It must find its grass roots not in the laity, not in the clergy, but in Scripture itself.

Another important feature which we must heed if fellowship among Lutherans is to be achieved is that church bodies practice thorough Scriptural discipline, brotherly discipline both in matters of doctrine and in matters of practice. This business of preaching doctrine not in harmony with God's Word cuts deep bloody gashes into the body of the visible

church. Such as are guilty should be admonished by their brethren in a spirit of love. Love demands this. Love never closes an eye to indifference in doctrine but uncovers the fault and with God's help corrects it. True Christian love is not spineless but has a very firm back-bone. Just think of the love which Jesus manifested toward Peter when He said to him, "Get thee behind Me, Satan." Or think of the firmness of Christ's love when He asked Peter that heart-searching question, thrice repeated, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?" Think of the bold and firm love which prompted St. Paul to withstand Peter to the face when the latter had become guilty of hypocrisy. Even so our love must prompt us to uncover any false doctrine which we may find in any of our brethren.

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

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

On the other hand, there cannot be a confluence of the streams of Lutheranism and Calvinism. The waters of Calvinism are also danger-

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

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

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

(To be continued)

The Voice of Missouri — Which Is It? — In the preceding pages we have reproduced at least in part the address delivered by the President of the Missouri Synod, Dr. John W. Behnken, at the convention of the American Lutheran Conference at Rockford, Illinois. We completely support the position taken by the speaker, namely, that doctrinal unity must remain the indispensable prerequisite for Lutheran union. We are entirely with him when he objects to the various substitutes which are being suggested to replace the slow and sometimes difficult method of doctrinal study and discussion as a means for attaining fellowship, e. g., cooperation in various endeavors or a resort to intersynodical organizations of laymen. Speaking as he did before a body which has stood in outspoken opposition to this old-Missouri point of view, President Behnken made a confession in which we rejoice. We appreciate particularly the following:

"Instead of growing weary of doctrinal discussions, those who desire a genuine Lutheran fellowship should realize that this" (lack of doctrinal unity) "necessitates a deeper study of Biblical doctrine and the Lutheran Confessions and a frank, but friendly discussion of the doctrinal differences which have been keeping us apart so that with God's help and under His blessings doctrinal unity might be reached.

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

We are, therefore, somewhat amazed to find in the *Lutheran Witness* for November 19, an editorial signed by Dr. W. G. Polack for the staff of the *Lutheran Witness* in which he commends the American Lutheran Church for stating that it despairs of "attaining Lutheran unity by way of doctrinal formulations and reformulations," and in which he invites what the A. L. C. did not even mention in its Appleton resolutions, viz., a renewed attempt to bring about the desired result on the basis of Missouri's synodical position of 1938. (This after the previous issue of the *Lutheran Witness* had reported the Fellowship Committee of the A. L. C. as saying that the Brief Statement and their Declaration "express differences in doctrine which do exist . . . , but which would not make fellowship impossible.") Dr. Polack then goes on to plead for a drawing in of the laity and suggests that "our congregations must vote on church fellowship with others." Could this be an echo of the Appleton resolution on Selective Fellowship?

We cannot but compare this meek acceptance of the Appleton ultimatum of the A. L. C. with Dr. Behnken's declaration of sound Lutheran principle. Which of these is the true voice of Missouri?

E. REIM.

Breslauer Bekenntnis. — Folgendes Schreiben des Breslauer Oberkirchenkollegiums ist dem Unterzeichneten von dem Allgemeinen Präses der Ev.-Luth. Freikirche in Deutschland, Pastor P. H. Petersen, zugesandt worden. Wir glauben ganz im Sinne des Einsenders zu handeln, wenn wir es hiermit einem größeren Leserkreis unterbreiten. Es handelt sich um das Bekenntnis des aus Geistlichen und Laien zusammengesetzten „Oberkirchenkollegiums“ der Ev.-Luth. Kirche in Preußen, die 1841 auf der Generalsynode zu Breslau als freie Kirche gegründet wurde. Obwohl sich hiermit die Breslauer Freikirche von der Union getrennt hatte, hielt sie doch noch die Kirchen- und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft mit den sogenannten lutherischen

Landeskirchen aufrecht. Auch ließ sie ihre Gymnasiasten auf deutschen Universitäten Theologie studieren, wenn sie auch ein eigenes theologisches Seminar unterhielt. Nunmehr bekennst sie in ihrem Schreiben, daß sie sich nicht länger an die lutherischen Landeskirchen Deutschlands anlehnen kann, daß sie sich zwecks kirchlicher Verbindung nach Amerika wenden muß. Kurzum, die Breslauer Freikirche will sich nicht der VELK, der „Vereinigten Ev.=Luth. Kirche“ Deutschlands innerhalb der EKD, der „Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands“, anschließen. Ist doch letztere nichts anderes als ein Unionsverband der Nachkriegszeit, der eine unglückliche Fortsetzung der DEK, der „Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche“ der Vorkriegszeit mit ihrem ebenfalls starken Unionscharakter bildet. Neben der Gefahr des Unionismus droht seit Barmen (Januar 1934) die des Kalvinismus unter der Führung von Karl Barth. Diese Gefahr hat die Tagung in Drehsa 1945 nur noch mehr heraufbeschworen (vgl. Quartalschrift, Jahrg. 42, 277). Breslaus Trennung von den lutherischen Landeskirchen bedeutet nichts weniger, als daß sich diese älteste Freikirche Deutschlands der gegenwärtigen Gefahr für das lautere Luthertum wohlbewußt ist. Dies kommt vollends im Schreiben des Oberkirchenkollegiums zum Ausdruck.

Oberkirchenkollegium
T. Nr. 383/46

Berlin=Schlächtensee, Matterhorn-
straße 86, den 15. Oktober 1946

An die Herren Landesbischöfe
der lutherischen Landeskirchen in Bayern

Hannover
Medlenburg

Hochwürdige Herren!

Im Bewußtsein der Mitverantwortung, die wir für die Zukunft der lutherischen Reformation tragen, erlauben wir uns, dieses Schreiben an Sie zu richten und bitten, es um deswillen freundlich aufnehmen zu wollen.

Sie wissen wohl, daß unsere Evangelisch=lutherische Kirche Mitpreußens eine von Gott dem Herrn schwer geschlagene Kirche ist. So läge es an und für sich nahe, daß wir uns nur mit der maßlos schwierigen Wiederherstellung unseres aus vielen Wunden blutenden Kirchenkörpers befassen und alle unsere Kräfte allein dafür einsetzen. Das können wir aber nicht. Unser Verbundensein mit dem gesamten Luthertum in Deutschland macht es uns zur Pflicht, darüber hinaus die Neugestaltung der kirchlichen Verhältnisse genau zu verfolgen und an unserem Teile daran mitzuarbeiten, so weit uns irgend Zeit und Kraft dazu bleibt.

Was seit dem Zusammenbruch im vergangenen Jahre in den evangelischen Kirchen Deutschlands sich vollzog, hat uns zunächst mit neuen Hoffnungen erfüllt. Die unglückselige DEK zerbrach, die preußische Unionskirche wurde in ihrem Bestand schwer erschüttert, den lutherischen Landeskirchen war der Weg geöffnet zur Errichtung einer unionsfreien, im vollen Sinne auf das lutherische Bekenntnis gegründeten evangelisch=lutherischen

Kirche Deutschlands. In den lutherischen Landeskirchen selbst aber nahm eine neue Befinnung auf das lutherische Bekenntnis und Glaubensgut einen verheißungsvollen Anfang. Sollte unserer Kirche die Möglichkeit gegeben sein, so fragten wir uns, den lutherischen Landeskirchen noch näher zu kommen und mit ihnen in dieser einen lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands zu stehen?

Aber die Hoffnungen, die uns erfüllten, schwanden bald dahin, und mehr und mehr regte sich die Sorge, ja der Schmerz bei uns. Die Entwicklung des kirchlichen Neubaus nahm einen Verlauf, der die schwerste Gefahr für die Kirche der lutherischen Reformation mit sich bringen muß und auch bereits mit sich gebracht hat. Wir haben das im Auge, was in Drehsa geschehen ist und nun fortwirkt.

Zum zweiten Mal machten sich hier die lutherischen Landeskirchen zu Gliedern eines Kirchenverbandes, dessen Unionscharakter, obwohl eine ausgeführte Verfassung noch nicht vorliegt, nicht mehr bezweifelt werden kann. Wir wissen wohl, daß Ihre Auffassung der EKD eine andere ist. Sie glauben, in ihr einen bloßen Kirchenbund sehen zu können, der die verschiedenen Konfessionskirchen lediglich in externis zusammenschließt. Wir verstehen, daß uns das mehr und mehr eine Unmöglichkeit ist. Die erste Proklamation dieser Kirche spricht es klar aus, daß sie kirchlich gegründete innere Einheit sei, wie sie zuerst auf den Bekenntnissynoden in Barmen, Dahlem und Augsburg sichtbar geworden und wie sie über den Kirchenbund von 1922 hinausreichte. Wir haben nicht gehört, daß das zurückgenommen worden sei; im Gegenteil: völlig in diesem Sinne bewegen sich die Neuerungen der die EKD nun einmal beherrschenden und tragenden Kreise, wenn sie es z. B. als Forderung aufstellen: konfessionelle Aufgliederung der Kirchen und Gemeinden, aber zugleich Kanzel- und Abendmahls-gemeinschaft zwischen Lutheranern und Reformierten; oder wenn sie erklären, daß den Einzelkirchen das Recht auf konfessionelle Eigengestaltung zu gewähren sei, ihnen aber zugleich die unabdingbare Verpflichtung auferlegen, die in Barmen geschaffene Einheit zwischen Lutheranern, Reformierten und Unierten, die sich „als Kinder der gleichen Reformation zusammenschmiedet“ wissen, nicht zu stören oder gar zu sprengen. Das hat doch eine ganz auffallende Ähnlichkeit mit dem, was Friedrich Wilhelm III. in seiner bekannten Kabinettsorder von 1834 als Wesen des von ihm geschaffenen Unionskirchenverbandes proklamierte: die lutherische Kirche bestche unverändert innerhalb der Union fort, nur verlange es der Geist der Mäßigung und Milde, um der Verschiedenheit in einzelnen Lehrpunkten willen der anderen Konfession die kirchliche Gemeinschaft nicht zu versagen. Die praktischen Konsequenzen aus solcher Geisteshaltung für die gegenwärtige Zeit zu ziehen, hat die Landeskirche Württembergs sich nicht scheut und dadurch den Charakter der EKD noch deutlicher offenbar gemacht. Bei alledem ist noch abgesehen von jener peinlichen Erklärung in dem Ordnungs- und Nachrichtenblatt der EKD vom 22. März 1946, wonach die Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland die Fortsetzung der DCK von 1933 ist. Nach immer erneuter Prüfung der vorliegenden Verlautbarungen und Tatsachen können

wir nicht anders als unsere Beurteilung der EKD dahin zusammenzufassen: hier ist jene Ausdehnung des Unionsgeistes auf ganz Deutschland im Fortschreiten, die unser D. Hocholl bereits um die Jahrhundertwende in fast prophetischen Worten vorausgesagt hat.

Mit schwerem Herzen müssen wir Ihnen, hochwürdige Herren, nun zum Ausdruck bringen, welche Folgen die durch die EKD bestimmte kirchliche Lage des evangelischen Deutschlands für unsere lutherische Freikirche im ehemaligen Preußen hat. Sie werden wohl erwartet haben, daß wir über kurz oder lang uns zu einer Angliederung an die VELK bereit finden lassen. Sünde die VELK außerhalb der EKD, so könnte dieser Weg vielleicht einmal von uns gegangen werden. Da aber das Gegenteil der Fall ist, so bedeutet die Angliederung für uns eine Unmöglichkeit. Wir würden damit in einen Kirchenverband hineingeraten, dessen Unionscharakter uns unzugänglich gemacht ist. Das hieße, die Geschichte unserer Kirche, die mit dem Kampf gegen bekennniswidrige Union begonnen hat, durch einen Friedensschluß mit einer Union beenden, die zwar nach ihrer geschichtlichen Erscheinungsform eine andere, ihrem Prinzip und ihrer Bedeutung nach aber jener aufs engste verwandt ist.

Damit steht ein Zweites im Zusammenhang. Eine kleinere Freikirche hat das natürliche Bedürfnis, sich an einen größeren Kirchenkörper desselben Bekenntnisses anzulehnen. Bisher konnten wir diese Anlehnung bei einzelnen lutherischen Landeskirchen suchen. Freilich brachte uns das seit 1933 infolge der Zugehörigkeit dieser Kirchen zur damaligen Einheitskirche der DEK in starke Gewissenskonflikte und schuf Spannungen in unserer eigenen kirchlichen Ausrichtung, die auf die Dauer nicht zu ertragen waren. Jetzt hat die Entwicklung der kirchlichen Verhältnisse dazu geführt, daß sich in Deutschland kein größerer lutherischer Kirchenkörper mehr findet, der jeden bekennniswidrigen Unionismus konsequent ablehnt. Nach Amerika wenden wir uns, um die kirchliche Verbindung mit einem solchen Kirchenkörper aufnehmen zu können. Wie unsagbar traurig ist das, daß das deutsche Luthertum dem Geiste falscher Union, mit dem zu ringen seit den Tagen von Marburg sein Schicksal ist, offenbar nicht mehr zu entinnen vermag.

Uns bedrängt bei alledem die Frage, ob man denn nicht sieht, welche ungeheure Gefahr für die Erhaltung der in der lutherischen Reformation geschenkten Evangeliumsverkündigung damit gegeben ist. Wir möchten nicht anspruchsvoll erscheinen, glauben aber um der Sache willen zum Ausdruck bringen zu können, daß uns durch die Entstehung wie die weitere Geschichte unserer Kirche ein allezeit offener Blick gerade für die der lutherischen Kirche aus dem Unionismus erwachsende Gefahr geschenkt worden ist. Unsere Kirche hat es daher seinerzeit den sogenannten Vereinslutheranern in Preußen gegenüber an einem Zeugnis nicht fehlen lassen, daß sie ihr lutherisches Glaubensgut nicht allzu lange werden bewahren können, wenn sie sich nicht entschließen, aus der falschen kirchlichen Verbindung — der preussischen Union — auszuscheiden. Sie haben diesen Entschluß nicht zu fassen vermocht, und der geschichtliche Verlauf hat unsern Vätern Recht gegeben.

Die Geschichte der Vereinslutheraner, deren lutherisches Wollen um die Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts doch eine zu großen Hoffnungen berechnende Stärke zeigte, ist eine Kette von Rückzugsgefechten geworden, bis ihre einstige Kraft gebrochen war und sie zur Bedeutungslosigkeit für das Ganze herabsanken.

Wir glauben, hochwürdige Herren, Ihnen ein ähnliches Zeugnis schuldig zu sein. Die Neubestimmung auf das lutherische Bekenntnis, die jetzt durch die Reihen Ihrer Kirchen hindurchgeht, wird jedes rechten Lutheraners Herz mit freudiger Bewegung erfüllen. Soll dieses bekenntnismäßige Erwachen auch einmal dem Schicksal der Vereinslutheraner in Preußen verfallen? Wir befürchten, es wird dazu kommen, wenn diese Kreise bzw. deren Kirchen innerhalb des genannten Unionskirchenverbandes verbleiben. Unmerklich wird dann in hundert Kanälen der Einfluß der kryptocalvinischen oder calvinischen Kraftfelder, welche die EKD in sich birgt, auf die grünenden Fluren bekenntnisfreudigen Luthertums sich ergießen, ihr zartes Wachstum hemmend und sie später wahrscheinlich verderbend. Die Kräfte innerhalb und außerhalb Deutschlands, welche den festen Willen haben, unser Vaterland, so weit es nicht römisch ist, calvinisch zu machen, sind außerordentlich stark. Wir brauchen Ihnen das nicht näher auszuführen. Diesen Kräften erfolgreich zu widerstehen, kann nur dann gelingen, wenn konfessionsbewußtes Luthertum nicht in falscher kirchlicher Verbindung kämpft.

Das Schicksal der lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands ist, hochwürdige Herren, weithin in Ihre Hand gelegt. Von Ihren Entscheidungen hängt es ab, ob — abgesehen von den lutherischen Freikirchen — noch einmal unionsfreie lutherische Kirche in Deutschland sein wird. Wir glauben zu wissen, wie schwer es für Sie ist, den Rahmen der EKD, hinter der ja die weitaus überwiegenden kirchlich lebendigen Kreise des deutschen Protestantismus stehen, zu sprengen. Wir verstehen daher auch den Versuch, die lutherische Kirche von der tödlichen Gefahr des Unionismus auf dem Wege zu befreien, daß man auf eine Umwandlung der EKD in einen ehrliehen Kirchenbund hinarbeitet. Allein nach allem, was die kirchliche Entwicklung nach Treysa gezeigt hat, müssen wir es für ausgeschlossen halten, daß dieser Versuch gelingt. Es bleibt nur der andere Weg. Ob die lutherischen Landeskirchen ihn gehen werden, steht nicht in unserer Hand. Wir können nur Gott den Herrn bitten, daß er allen Kirchenführern, uns in unserer kleinen Kirche, Ihnen in Ihren großen Kirchengebieten, schenke den Geist der Weisheit und Erkenntnis, des Rates und der Stärke, damit wir auf dem Grund, der uns gegeben ist, recht bauen: Gold und Silber und edle Steine.

In verehrungsvoller Begrüßung

Das Oberkirchenkollegium

gez. E. Ziemer.

* * * *

Mit diesem Bekenntnis hat sich Breslau gegen jede „bekenntniswidrige Union“ ausgesprochen und den Weg zu einer bekenntnistreuen Einigung mit

treulutherischen Freikirchen geebet. Den letzten Nachrichten zufolge sind die Lehrverhandlungen unserer freikirchlichen Brüder mit Breslau abgeschlossen. Ein Komitee ist erwählt worden, das die endgültigen Lehrsätze formulieren soll. Dann gehen die Sätze zur Annahme an die Gemeinden der beiden Freikirchen. Diese Mitteilung Präses Petersens vom 28. November schließt mit den Worten: „Gott wolle in Gnaden alles weitere zum Wohle der treulutherischen Kirche fördern.“ Diesem Gebet schließen wir uns von ganzem Herzen an.

P. Peters.

REVIEWERS' DESK

Here We Stand, Nature and Character of the Lutheran Faith, by Hermann Sasse, Professor in the University of Erlangen. Translated with Revisions and Additions from the Second German Edition by Theodore G. Tappert. Assigned to Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1946. Price: \$2.00.

This volume was written in 1934 and again in 1936 in a second edition under the title, "Was ist lutherisch" by one of the most outstanding Lutheran theologians in the Evangelical Church of Germany. It pictures nothing less than the "confessional struggle" peculiar to evangelical Christianity in the land of the Reformation. The author appeals to all churches, and especially to the Lutheran churches to consider and to reconsider the heritage of the Reformation, its "pure teaching" and its "pure doctrine." A valuable volume which gives one a deep insight into the dangers that beset Lutheranism today in the land of the Reformation.

P. PETERS.

The River Jordan. Being an Illustrated Account of Earth's Most Storied River by Nelson Glueck. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Price: \$3.50.

This book with its many references to Biblical sites and its extraordinary collection of photographs should be in every pastor's and teacher's library. Nelson Glueck, Director of the American School of Oriental Research at Jerusalem, leads the reader along the east and the west side of the Jordan, the "River That Goes Down," as it flows from the sweet waters of the Lake of Galilee into the bitter wastes of the Sea of Salt or Dead Sea. As a guide who has explored this whole region, especially that of Transjordan, with a thoroughness surpassed by none, he is able to give the reader a much more vivid view of the characteristics of the river, its valley and the ancient cities along its course than any other archaeologist of our day. To give our readers an idea of our author's archaeological discoveries and knowledge, we quote the following from his book: "I have examined archaeologically some seventy ancient sites on the

east side of the Jordan Valley, the presence of most of which was previously unknown. Over half of the number can be dated to the Israelite period. The Biblical editors were probably familiar with the locations of most of these sites, as well as with their histories and traditions, yet they mentioned only nine of them." (p. 129.)

While our readers will gladly and gratefully follow the author as guide along the banks of the Jordan, they will not be able to follow him, when he undertakes to guide them only to "the God of History" (pp. 130-143), but not to the God of Revelation in His Old and New Testament Gospel-Word (cf. p. 152).

P. PETERS.

The Papacy Evaluated, by E. G. Behm, Lutheran Pastor, Calvary, Wisconsin. Northwestern Publishing House, 1946. Price: \$1.25.

In a time when the Roman Catholic Church is making much ado about its great Bible-Reading Movement, it is necessary for all Protestants to gain and to retain a true evaluation of the papacy. This they can do by reading this book, especially the first three chapters that deal with the Catholic Church and the Bible. The following four chapters expose the false claims for Catholic authority, the idolatry in the Catholic Church, the papacy's record on the pages of history, and Rome's distortion of marriage. We advise our readers not to begin with the reading of the first chapter, before they have perused and pondered the timely warning of the Preface.

P. PETERS.

The Rebirth of the German Church, by Stewart W. Herman. Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York and London, 1946.

Your reviewer does not intend to review this book, but simply to urge his readers to peruse it. On the background of Germany's post-war dilemma and mass-death the author, who has had much to do with Germany in the last dozen years, has clearly painted much of what transpired between Church and State in Germany immediately before, then during, and finally after World War II. How both physical and spiritual need are found in Germany may be seen from the following instructive quotation: "The violent shocks to which Germans were subjected in the hectic months before and after the collapse led neither to a large-scale repudiation of, nor a violent revival in, the church. . . . Ten years of opposition to Christianity by National Socialism have not passed without a reaction. People have become indescribably materialistic, and spiritually blunted. When anyone goes calling today from door to door, the answer often is: Leave us alone! We don't want to know about anything except food and drink and fuel!" (pp. 211/2).

P. PETERS.

My Life, by William Dallmann. Personal Recollections of a Lutheran Missionary, Pastor, Churchman, Lecturer, Author. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Price: \$1.25.

In leafing through this book of reminiscences, which was hidden for a long time under a stock of papers on this reviewer's desk, he is again fascinated, as he was at the first reading, by the scintillating manner with which the venerable author presents his material to his public. For all who know Dr. Dallmann's unique style of expressing himself it would mean carrying coal to Newcastle to add anything to what has been stated so often. Even what in others would be regarded as boasting we are ready to accept from him. *De gustibus non est disputandum*. For in this biography he reveals himself to the embiased reader as a highly gifted but at the same time humble child of God, whose work as pastor and preacher, as lecturer and writer is done in the interest of spreading and defending of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, entrusted to his beloved Lutheran Church, and to the glory of his God. L.

The Challenge of Israel's Faith, by G. Ernest Wright. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. Second printing. Price: \$1.50.

Whether agreeing or disagreeing with the author, whose approach to the Old Testament is neither "liberal nor conservative," the readers of this book should read it with a pencil in their hands and underscore many of its statements, a few of which we cannot refrain from quoting: "History is no sad paean of woe, it is rather a reiterated call to repentance (p. 34). God the Redeemer of man the sinner is the concern of biblical religion from start to finish (p. 35). Punishment was no end in itself; it was only to bring man to his senses that he might be saved (p. 59). They (the prophets) knew of no abstractions like 'social order' or 'society'. . . . They called on the people to repent, but they knew very well that 'society' in the abstract cannot repent (pp. 93/4). The disuse and misuse of the Old Testament is a matter for concern but not for despair" (p. 105).

P. PETERS.

A Book of Protestant Saints, by Ernest Gordon. Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Illinois. Price: \$2.50.

All of the fifty-eight Protestant saints in this book are of the Reformed or Evangelical persuasion, many of whom will be little or not at all known to our Lutheran readers. Yet we shall do well to make their acquaintance, if for no other purpose than to see the power of the Word in their hearts. Evangelical philanthropists (Friedrich von Bodelschwingh a. o.), workers among prisoners (Mathilde Wrede a. o.), evangelical missionaries (Dugall Campbell, Paul Bettex a. o.), and martyrs (Miss Monson, Karin Jeppe and K. Marzinkowski) pass in array before us as soldiers of the Cross.

P. PETERS.

The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels, by Alexander Heidel. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. Price: \$3.50.

What has been said of the importance of a study of Babylonian parallels to corresponding portions of the Old Testament in our review on the author's previous work, *The Babylonian Genesis* (Quartalschrift, January, 1946, pp. 78/9), need not be repeated here. We only wish to add that the parallels discussed by the author in this his second work on a most important portion of the religious literature of the Babylonians deserve and demand our special study and attention. For in these parallels we find what the Babylonian has to say about sin and life, about death and burial, about the realm of the dead and the resurrection of the dead, subjects which go to make up the highly important parts of any body of religious literature. And only after we have gained a clear conception of what the Babylonians, and for that matter other peoples, have said and have not said concerning the principal things of life before and after death, can we think of comparing them with that which the Bible has to say on these subjects. Dr. Heidel succeeds in giving his readers a clear conception of what the Babylonians had to say on these matters in his introduction to *The Gilgamesh Epic* (pp. 1-16), in his translation of this Epic and of *Related Material* (pp. 116-136), and finally in his chapters on *Death and the Afterlife* (pp. 137-223), and on *The Story of the Flood* (pp. 224-267). No less does the author succeed in giving his readers a clear understanding of what the Hebrews believed according to the Old Testament Scriptures. The author's study of the Old Testament parallels is so thorough and painstaking that he soon convinces his readers that he does not intend to diverge one iota from the inspired word of the Scriptures in comparing Biblical parallels with those of the Babylonian Epic. Here Dr. Heidel's Lutheran background and theological training stand him in very good stead.

In his exhaustive study of *Shē'ōl* (pp. 270-291) the author informs us that "the etymology of this word is still obscure." Dr. Heidel offers no suggestions of his own. A valuable study, however, of the etymology of this word is found in the 1946 January-February number of the *Theologische Zeitschrift*, pages 71-74. In this article Ludwig Koehler, after listing all the different attempts at a solution, derives the word from the root word *shā'ā*, arguing that the last consonant in *Shē'ōl* does not belong to the stem, as can also be said of a number of other Hebrew words. Now *shā'ā* has the meaning of desolate and waste, whether used as a verb (Is. 6, 11) or as a noun (Is. 5, 14; 17, 13). *Shē'ōl* derived from *shā'ā* would then mean a waste place in which no man can live, of which all men stand in awe. Comparing this meaning with the synonyms listed by Dr. Heidel on page 177 of his book, one is disposed to view the above derivation and meaning of *Shē'ōl* with favor. It is also in full accord with the final findings of our author as to *Shē'ōl* being the habitation of the

souls of the wicked (p. 184) and not some place for both the sinners and the righteous.

A comparison of Babylonian and Biblical parallels always raises the question as to how far these parallels differ from one another. Dr. Heidel shows up these differences in such a manner that the reader is never at a loss as to how the parallels are to be evaluated. Even in *The Story of the Flood*, where we find "the most remarkable parallels between the Old Testament and the Gilgamesh Epic," the differences in their far-reachingness are no less remarkable and are clearly set forth by the author in his *Concluding Remarks* (pp. 268f.).

P. PETERS.

The Lutheran Ministrant, by Rev. Enno Duemling, D. D., Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1946. Price: \$1.50.

The author, the Rev. Enno Duemling, born in 1875, entered the ministry in 1896, after his graduation from Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, Missouri. While serving as pastor of a small flock in Detroit, Michigan, he began a mission among the deaf, preaching to them in the sign language. Six years later he was called to become the first institutional missionary in the Milwaukee area. After forty-four years of faithful services his Lord called him home, at the time when this book which he has written came from the press. In it he gives us an insight into the work of a pastor or missionary with the physically or mentally ill; with the physically handicapped, as the deaf and the blind. We learn of the proper relation of the pastor to the physician and nurse, of pastoral work in a penal institution, of the training of volunteer workers, and the like.

In the words on the "jacket": "For many years there has been a vacant space on the shelves of our pastor's libraries — reserved for a book that will serve as a practical and inspirational guide to the pastor in his daily and necessary ministrations to the spiritually, mortally, and physically ill. *The Lutheran Ministrant* is worthy of that space. It is a source book of valuable and reliable information concerning the methods, material and attitude to be employed in the institutional and congregational ministry."

We recommend the book to all those, especially young ministers, who find the pastoral "sick call" the most difficult work of their ministry, and we are sure that also more experienced men will find it profitable reading.

L.

The Northwestern Lutheran Annual — 1947.

Der Gemeindeblatt Kalender fuer das Jahr 1947.

Published under the auspices of the Ev. Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin a. o. S. by the Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin. Price: Single copies, 25 Cents.

Quartalschrift

Theological Quarterly

Volume 44

April, 1947

Number 2

IN MEMORIAM

"When He (our exalted Savior) ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men. . . . He gave some apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers: for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

These gifts the Church receives and employs with thanks to the Giver, and when He in His wisdom withdraws them, it deeply mourns the loss.

Thus our Synod is today mourning the death of Prof. August Pieper while it gratefully recalls to its mind the blessings he was, by the grace of God, permitted to bring to our Synod and to the Lutheran Church at large by his services throughout so many years.

Prof. Pieper, endowed with rich talents, will be remembered as a theologian who was determined to know nothing among us, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified; who held fast the faithful Word; and who was able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayer.

By the spoken and the written word he proclaimed the Eternal Truth and battled fearlessly against error in any form, always ready to give of his time and labor unstintingly for the building of the Church, particularly also in the field of Christian education.

He was a gifted teacher who was able to arouse the interest and to open the understanding of the classes that sat at his feet. It was his constant endeavor to lead his students into the Scriptures and so to make them theologians after the heart of the Lord whose "faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

Prof. Pieper has left his impress on the life of our Synod, and his work will bear fruit in the generations to come.

Thanking the Lord for the great blessings he bestows on His Church through the labors of His frail servants, we turn for comfort to His gracious promise: "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."

The Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod
of Wisconsin and Other States,
By JOHN BRENNER, President.

HERR, NUN LAESSEST DU DEINEN DIENER IM FRIEDEN FAHREN, WIE DU GESAGT HAST

Predigt von Pastor Arthur P. Bosh bei der Leichenfeier Professor
August Piepers in der St. James-Kirche, Milwaukee, Wisconsin,
den 27. Dezember 1946.

Lukas 2, 29-32

I. N. J.

„Herr, wie du gesagt hast,“ so spricht Simeon im Tempel. Und seine Worte stehen so recht im Einklang mit der Bezeichnung: Herr, dein Diener. Diese lassen sich nicht scheiden, der Diener des Herrn und das Wort des Herrn. Jeder Christ spricht mit David: „Dein Wort ist meines Fußes Leuchte, und ein Licht auf meinem Wege.“ Unser Herr Christus selbst beschreibt seine treuen Nachfolger mit den Worten: „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. Das muß aber in ausgeprägter Weise von den Dienern am Wort gelten, von Predigern und Hirten, die das Volk weiden sollen, die auf sich selbst und die ganze Herde, welche ihnen anbefohlen ist, acht haben sollen. Diese müssen **einen** Spruch auf dem Herzen und auf den Rippen tragen: „So spricht der Herr!“ Oder wie Simeon es zum Ausdruck bringt: „Herr, wie du gesagt hast.“ Und wenn wir auf Grund der Worte des Apostels Paulus an Timotheus: „Was du von mir gehört hast durch viele Zeugen, das befehl treuen Menschen, die da tüchtig sind auch andere zu lehren,“ nun auch besonders an unsere Lehrer denken, die berufen sind, junge Männer auf das Lehr- und Predigtamt vorzubereiten, so besteht ihr Amt und ihre Treue, ihre Fähigkeit in dem einen großen Stück, Gottes Wort zu lehren, den jungen Männern das Wort ans Herz zu legen, bis es heißt unter ihnen: „Brannte nicht unser Herz in uns, da er mit uns redete und uns die Schrift öffnete!“

Unter Christen, sei es im Hause, im Familienkreis, sei es bei versammelter Gemeinde unter der Kanzel, sei es in der Schule, in der niederen oder höheren Schule, in der Gemeindeschule oder im Seminar, muß es bleiben bei der Regel des greisen Simeon: „Herr, wie du gesagt hast; so spricht der Herr!“ Das liegt auch in der Be-

deutung der Bezeichnung: Herr, dein Diener. Sei es ein gewöhnliches Gemeindeglied oder der Pastor der Gemeinde, sei es ein Lehrer in der Gemeindegemeinschaft oder ein Professor am Seminar, wir sind alle ans Wort gebunden. Es heißt stets: „Rede Herr, denn dein Knecht höret.“

Wir haben uns heute hier versammelt, um unserm ehrwürdigen, entschlafenen Lehrer, Professor August Pieper, die letzte Pflicht und Ehre zu erweisen. Prof. Pieper bleibt uns unvergesslich. Nicht nur in seinem engeren Familienkreis, nicht nur in dieser Gemeinde, die er vor fünfundsiebenzig Jahren gegründet hat, sondern besonders auch in dem weiteren Kreis unserer Synode und darüber hinaus in der Synodalkonferenz, wird sein Gedächtnis in Ehren leben. Nicht nur seine langjährige Tätigkeit (er durfte mehr als vierzig Jahre als Professor an unserm Seminar wirken, und fast alle Pastoren, welche heute in unserer Synode im Amte stehen, haben zu seinen Füßen gefessen), nicht nur seine langjährige Wirksamkeit und der weite Kreis seines Wirkens, sondern der Mann selbst, der Lehrer im Klassenzimmer, in seinen Schriften und Referaten hat auf uns einen tiefen, bleibenden Eindruck gemacht und einen segensreichen Einfluß ausgeübt. Der Eindruck von ihm ist der eines eifrigen, furchtlosen Zeugen der Wahrheit. Und sein Zeugnis war klar, der Zeit, den Umständen, der Sache, um die es sich handelte, scharf zugeschnitten, nach dem Wort Simeons im Text: „Herr, wie du gesagt hast.“ Es handelte sich bei Prof. Pieper im Studium und in der Darstellung der Schrift um das klare Verständnis eines jeden Abschnitts, eines jeden Begriffs, eines jeden Wortes. — Sünde und Gnade, Gesetz und Evangelium wurden in aller Schärfe und Süßigkeit durch ihn gepredigt und ans Herz gelegt. Wir überschreiten mit dem Gesagten nicht die Grenze dessen, was sich ziemt in der Predigt. Gottes Wort ermahnt uns vielmehr: „Gedenket an eure Lehrer, die euch das Wort gesagt haben, welcher Ende schauet an, und folget ihrem Glauben nach.“ Hebr. 13. 7.

Wo alle Kunst und Weisheit der Menschen aufhört und aufhören muß, da hebt das Wort Gottes an und schafft Rat und Hilfe, Trost und Heil. Wie sollte das auch anders sein? Es ist das Wort Gottes, das Wort des Herrn. Simeon erinnert daran, wer der Herr ist, er nennt ihn bei seinem Namen, Herr, das heißt, der Allherr, der Gebieter: „Herr, der du bist der Gott, der Himmel und die Erde

und das Meer und alles, was drinnen ist, gemacht hat.“ (Apg. 4, 24.) Er ist nicht nur der Schöpfer aller Dinge, sondern der Erhalter, der Herrscher und Gebieter. Seine Macht erstreckt sich über alles im Himmel und auf Erden, und er regiert bis ins kleinste. Es fällt kein Sperling vom Dach, es fällt kein Haar von eurem Haupt ohne seinen Willen.

Nur **eine** Macht, will es uns scheinen, vermag es, der Macht des Herrn Widerstand zu leisten. Das ist die Macht des Todes. Der Tod herrscht in der Welt als Schreckensthron. Alle Menschen müssen sterben. „Unser Leben währet siebenzig Jahr, und wenns hoch kommt, so sinds achtzig Jahr.“ Der Keim des Todes ist die Sünde. Der Tod ist durch die Sünde in die Welt gekommen. Die Sünde ist der bittere Stachel des Todes; das ist es, was im Tode schreckt, die Sünde, die Schuld der Sünde. Angesichts des Todes ist der Mensch ganz hilflos. Hier hört alle Kunst und Weisheit der Menschen auf. Und die Sünde und der Tod spotten auch scheinbar der Macht des Herrn. — Aber hier hebt Gottes Weisheit und Macht an. Nicht sowohl in der Schöpfung und in der Regierung der Welt, sondern in der Rettung der Menschen aus der Gewalt der Sünde und des Todes beweist der Herr seine Kraft.

Das ist der herrliche Inhalt der Worte Simeons: „Herr, nun lässest du deinen Diener im Frieden fahren, wie du gesagt hast; denn meine Augen haben deinen Heiland gesehen, welchen du bereitet hast vor allen Völkern.“ Wir haben vor kurzem wieder die liebliche Weihnachtsbotschaft vernommen: „Euch ist heute der Heiland geboren, welcher ist Christus, der Herr, in der Stadt Davids.“ Warum heißt das Kind in der Krippe der Heiland, der Heiland Gottes? Das Kind ist, wie der Engel des Herrn berichtet, Gott der Herr selbst, der Herr der Herrlichkeit. Aber er ist Gott geoffenbart im Fleisch. Was bedeutet das, daß der große Gott ein elender Mensch wird, daß der Herr aller Herren ein Knecht aller Knechte geworden ist? Es bedeutet dies nichts anderes als dieses, so tief hat sich Gott selbst erniedrigt, um unsere Sündenschuld auf sich zu nehmen. In der Krippe hat er damit angefangen, aber er hat nicht geruht, bis er nach unsagbarem Leiden am Kreuz unsern Tod, unsere Verdammnis auf sich genommen hatte. Das ist der Heiland Gottes. Die Weihnachtsepistel lautet: „Es ist erschienen die heilsame Gnade Gottes allen Menschen.“ Merket, Paulus sagt nicht die Liebe, sondern die Gnade Gottes ist erschie-

nen. Denn vor der Heiligkeit und Gerechtigkeit Gottes muß selbst die Liebe schweigen. Und was hilft es einem bösen Schuldner, der seine Schuld nicht bezahlen kann, wenn er auch einen noch so gnädigen Richter hat? Muß nicht der Richter, wenn er nicht ungerecht richten will, einem Schuldner erst dann seine Schuld erlassen, wenn derselbe den letzten Heller seiner Schuld bezahlt hat, oder doch sichere Bürgschaft für die Bezahlung gestellt hat? Das ist, was Paulus predigt: „Es ist erschienen die heilsame Gnade Gottes allen Menschen.“ Es ist in Christo zugleich Bezahlung der Sündenschuld und darum Heil und Seligkeit erschienen. Wir kommen zurück auf die Bezeichnung „Herr“. In Christo Jesu ist der Herr erschienen in seiner ganzen, vollkommenen Herrlichkeit, in seiner Heiligkeit und Gerechtigkeit, in seiner Weisheit und Macht, in seiner Gnade und Barmherzigkeit.

Und es heißt im Text: „Herr, wie du gesagt hast.“ — „Meine Augen haben deinen Heiland gesehen, welchen du bereitet hast vor allen Völkern, ein Licht zu erleuchten die Heiden, und zum Preis deines Volks Israel.“ Gott ist und bleibt treu und wahrhaftig, barmherzig und gnädig. Paulus erinnert daran, wenn er schreibt, Römer 15: „Ich sage aber, daß Jesus Christus sei ein Diener gewesen der Beschneidung um der Wahrheit willen Gottes, zu bestätigen die Verheißung, den Vätern geschehen. Daß die Heiden aber Gott loben um der Barmherzigkeit willen.“ Gott hatte seinem Volk Israel den Heiland verheißten, und Israel hatte an Gott einen Hakt, um des Wortes willen. Und Gott hat sein Wort gehalten; um der Wahrheit willen, um die Verheißung, die den Vätern gegeben war, hat Gott in der Fülle der Zeit seinen Heiland gesandt. Zum Preis seines Volks Israel als Träger der Verheißung, hat Gott seinen Sohn zum Heiland der Welt geschenkt. Daß aber die Heiden Gott loben um der Barmherzigkeit willen. Gott hat vorzeiten die Völker ihre eigenen Wege gehen lassen, ohne Offenbarung seines Heilsplans. Was aber der Mensch ohne Gottes Wort ausrichten kann, aus eigener Vernunft und Kraft, das sehen wir an der Heidenwelt zur Zeit der Geburt Christi — das sehen wir an der Welt in unserer Zeit. Aber Gott hat sich der Welt erbarmt; auch ihr ist der Heiland geschenkt. Gott hat sich unserer Väter, er hat sich unser erbarmt.

Meine Augen haben deinen Heiland gesehen. Selig der Mann, dem der Herr den Heiland in die Arme und ans Herz legt! Der

hat einen gnädigen Gott; der stirbt nicht, wenn er stirbt, sondern er ist durch den Tod ins Leben hindurchgegangen.

Gott hat seinen Heiland für uns ins Wort gelegt. Darum brennt unser Herz in uns, wenn er mit uns redet in seinem Wort; darum tröstet Gottes Wort uns arme Sünder. Darum heißt es im Leben und im Sterben bei uns: „Herr, wie du gesagt hast.“ Amen.

I HAVE WAITED FOR THY SALVATION, O LORD

Sermon Delivered by Professor J. Meyer at the Funeral
Services of Professor August Pieper in St. James Church,
Milwaukee, December 27, 1946.

Genesis 49, 18

When Prof. Pieper contributed his last article to our theological *Quartalschrift* in July, 1943, he had been active in the Ministry of the Church for 64 years. Of these he spent 41 years as professor of theology in our Seminary. It is but fitting, therefore, that our Seminary take an active part in his funeral service.

The text which is to underlie our remarks was chosen by Prof. Pieper himself as an expression of his personal faith and as characterizing his work particularly in the Seminary. Through this text Prof. Pieper is, as it were, speaking to us himself on this occasion.

The words are taken from Jacob's solemn last blessing of his sons, in which he foretold them some future things. He spoke of perilous times that would befall them, of trials and temptations. Among others he spoke of the tribe of Dan, from which one judge should arise. This was fulfilled in Samson, the strong man of God, who, without the help of an army, personally dealt heavy blows to the Philistines. Jacob therefore aptly compares him to a serpent with its surreptitious and deadly attacks.

In immediate connection with this prophecy Jacob exclaimed: "I have waited for Thy salvation, O Lord." — Samson was not the real Savior, the true Savior was to come later. Jacob was waiting for Him. So was Prof. Pieper both in his personal faith and in his work.

Prof. Pieper Waited For the Salvation of the Lord

I.

If we ask Why? the first answer would be, because

He realized that he could not work out his own salvation

All those who knew Prof. Pieper, who heard him preach, heard him lecture, or read his articles, could not help but be deeply impressed with his keen and penetrating mind. He accurately grasped the doctrines presented in the Scriptures. Difficulties that turned up he would correctly analyze, and find an acceptable solution.

But his mind was not keen enough to find a way to salvation. Salvation to him, as to all of us, was shrouded in mystery. Only God could prepare salvation: only God could reveal the way to salvation. Hence Prof. Pieper waited for the salvation of the Lord.

Prof. Pieper would analyze our utter inability to lift the veil from this mystery. Why, we cannot even understand the physical things and processes of the world in which we live. Our five senses serve us only as five little windows through which we peer out at the world. And even thus we cannot get at the things themselves: all we get are the reactions of our sense organs to the stimuli reaching them from the world.

And what about the phenomena of the mind? our joys and sorrows, our grief and hope, love and hatred? We do not even understand our own soul, much less can we penetrate into a fellow man's soul. How then could we look into God's heart and understand His thoughts!

But worse than that. When we use our mind in an effort to solve the mystery of salvation, we cannot help but drift farther and farther away from the truth, because we are bound to start from a wrong premise. It is basic with natural man that he seeks his salvation by means of his own works, his own merits, his own sacrifices, his own character — an effort which is an abomination to God.

Prof. Pieper realized that in spite of his keen mind he was not able to find the way of salvation. He waited for the salvation of the Lord.

A second characteristic of Prof. Pieper's, that impressed every one who came into contact with him, was his strong will. With a strong will he controlled himself and forced himself to do things that others in his place would probably not have undertaken. When he recognized anything as right he would back it with his whole powerful personality, without fear of the opposition.

Yet in spite of his strong will he was not able to lift the load of his guilt, to break the power of sin, or the stranglehold which Satan had on him by nature.

What was the trouble? If his will power was still too weak, could he then not by constant application and training strengthen it? It is true, just like other abilities of a man so also his will may be strengthened and directed into certain channels. It may be trained so that it resists some desires and impulses, and does things toward which it feels a natural aversion. Yet no amount of training will enable it to reverse itself spiritually, to break away from selfishness, and to embrace a true faith in God and a love to God. Rather, the more the will is cultivated, the more intense will become its natural enmity against God, the more will it become entangled in the lie with which Satan has bound it.

Prof. Pieper realized this. Hence he did not trust in his own strong will to save himself, but waited for the salvation of the Lord.

This leads us to ask a second question. If Prof. Pieper knew that by his own reason and strength he was a confirmed rebel against God, that he merited nothing but God's wrath and eternal punishment, was he not thereby forced to abandon all hope for salvation? On what basis could he wait for the salvation of the Lord? It was, because

II.

He trusted in God's promise of salvation

Jacob, whom Prof. Pieper took for his example, certainly had rich promises of the Lord. Did not the Lord immediately after the fall of our first parents address the threat to the serpent: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman,

and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel"? There He promised to send a champion who, stronger than Samson from the tribe of Dan, would crush the power of Satan and bring salvation to the sons of man.

Had not the Lord in the course of history singled out the grandfather of Jacob, Abraham, and given him the promise: "Thou shalt be a blessing, and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed"? The Seed of the Woman should be born from the lineage of Abraham. Yes, did not God apply this promise to Jacob personally as he was fleeing for his life from his brother Esau: "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed"? Relying on these promises, Jacob might well wait for the salvation of the Lord.

All of these promises were fulfilled in Christ, who through His suffering and death atoned for our sins and thus crushed the head of the serpent, and in His glorious resurrection brought righteousness, life and immortality to light. We might think that now there is nothing to wait for any longer. But there is.

The final victory has not yet been made manifest. What do we witness in this life? Moses says about it that the strength of our years is labor and sorrow; temptations without and corruption within. We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God. No matter how comparatively free from suffering and pain in body and soul we may pass our days, no one can escape death. Sooner or later each one must succumb. It certainly does not yet appear that our Champion did secure salvation for us.

Prof. Pieper waited for the salvation of the Lord. Just as Jacob's heart was overpowered by the promises of the Lord to trust in those promises, so was Prof. Pieper's.

Although conditions on earth might lead one to assume that the salvation of the Lord is nothing but a fond dream, yet the promise of the Lord stands that death shall not end it all. There is to follow a glorious resurrection, when even our dead bodies shall be called back to life in a glorified form, when we shall be caught up into the presence of the Lord

there to enjoy life and immortality without interruption and without end.

This final promise, like all other promises of salvation, we have in the Word of God. That is where Prof. Pieper found it; that is why he cherished the Word with all his heart, as was evident in his work.

His special task at the Seminary was to introduce the future pastors of the Church to the study of the Scriptures, particularly of the Old Testament. There are many things that may be known about the Bible, and Prof. Pieper was well versed in them; but his chief interest centered in the content of the Bible, the promise of the Lord's salvation. This he taught his students to grasp first of all.

Nor did he study the Bible atomistically, merely selecting passages that speak directly about our salvation, and ignoring others. No, his method was to try to understand the line of thought of each book of the Bible, so that in this way every word was ultimately linked to the promise of salvation.

Nor did Prof. Pieper study the Bible only in a professional way, so that he might be able to teach it properly, to preach it correctly, and to apply it skillfully to the needs of others. No, he used his Bible, and he taught his students so to use it, first of all for his personal edification. His own faith needed strength and nourishment to survive the storms of life. For this purpose Prof. Pieper studied his Bible.

He studied it not to acquire information and instruction as such. To him the Bible was the power of God unto salvation, which not only announces salvation, but brings it and confers it to our hearts, by its promises creating the very faith with which we receive the salvation of the Lord.

With this faith in the promise of the Lord created by the promise itself, Prof. Pieper performed the duties of his office and accepted the vicissitudes of this life, waiting for the salvation of the Lord. Even now he is calling once more to us: Do wait for the salvation of the Lord. Amen.

THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD AND CIVIC RIGHTEOUSNESS

IV.

Before proceeding with the next part, a brief summary of the previous one will be in place, setting forth only the high spots.

We notice that, though Paul does not introduce his presentation of the natural knowledge of God as an issue in itself but merely in support of his main argument, yet he gives us a clear view of it and speaks of it in terms of high esteem. Twice he uses the word *alētheia*, once with direct reference to the natural knowledge of God. The natural knowledge of God is not a human assumption, perhaps honeycombed with error, it is correct in itself, it is truth. It is so because God Himself revealed it. It is not man-made, nor was it, like the Law of Moses, "ordained by angels" (Gal. 3, 19); no one but God Himself is the author and promulgator of it. This fact loses nothing of its importance even when we consider that man may, yes indeed should, develop his own grasp of the natural knowledge by a contemplation of the works of creation and preservation, and by his logical thinking: analysing, comparing, combining its various elements. Although our theologians rightly speak of a *notitia Dei insita* and *acquisita*, yet even man's advancement in his grasp of the truth is possible only on the basis of God's revelation, direct and in nature.

The natural knowledge of God in man is not a bare realization that there is a God, it embraces much more. Paul mentions first the *aidios dynamis*. Power, overwhelming power, this is probably the first impression anyone will receive when confronted with the vast universe. And a little reflection will add the further thought that, since this power called the universe into existence, it must itself antedate the universe, and further, that it cannot in turn have been called forth by a previous power. It must be an everlasting power (*aidios*). All the world is dependent for its very existence on this ever-

lasting self-sufficient power. Compare Schleiermacher's definition of religion as a feeling of absolute dependence.

The natural knowledge does not stop with ascribing everlasting power, eternal omnipotence to God, it includes more. Paul sums it up, without going into details, in the one word *theiotēs*, which means God as viewed in His majesty with all His glorious attributes.

The natural knowledge of God as revealed by God to man, is so thoroughly sound and so grand that God can make it the basis of His judgment and the deciding factor in His condemnation of man. Because of its presence man is without excuse. If man did not properly use the knowledge of God so richly granted to Him by God Himself, he has only himself to blame for his loss. He cannot plead ignorance, nor accuse God of having left him with insufficient information.

Though Paul did not set out expressly to present to the Romans the doctrine concerning the natural knowledge of God as a separate article, though he mentions it only incidentally in elaborating the more important doctrine of the Gospel of Christ, which he is preaching, yet he presents a clear and pretty comprehensive view of the matter.

With the natural knowledge of God which God has granted to man, and which He has preserved to him even in the state of sin, as a background, Paul proceeds to set forth the utter corruptness of human nature by showing how men reacted to this self-revelation of God, a revelation which, moreover, was far from being hazy or indistinct, though impaired by sin, but rather *phaneron*, very plain, thus depriving man of every pretext.

The natural revelation was granted to men in order to stimulate research; they should seek God in the hope that they might feel after Him and find Him. Though true in itself (*alētheia*, v. 25) it pointed beyond itself to a higher truth, to the truth of God as it appeared in the revelation of His Son. Yet so utterly corrupt is human nature that, instead of heeding the incentive coming from their natural knowledge of God, they suppressed for themselves this truth of God in every form by the wickedness of their heart. Though it requires only a

little reflection to realize that a God whose offspring we are cannot be like silver or gold shaped by the fancy and art of man, yet they degraded the glory of the unchangeable, immortal God into a likeness of mortal man, yes of birds, of fourfooted beasts, and of reptiles.

Even when they followed their inborn urge to acquire a better understanding of God, when in their philosophy they began to speculate about Him, or in their poetry mused on Him, their thoughts became vain; what they paraded as profound wisdom was nothing but foolishness.

Such is the "ungodliness and wickedness" of natural man.

What must happen when God's wrath and righteous judgment is revealed against it, Paul states in three shocking sentences, each one of which contains the verb *paredōken*. He gave them up to something: to impurity, v. 24; to disgraceful passions, v. 26; to a reprobate mind, a mind so distorted in its views and so warped in its judgments that they though "knowing the judgment of God that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them" (v. 32).

It was a terrible revelation of God's wrath and judgment when He sent the flood: it is a much more devastating and appalling judgment, though not so spectacular, when He withdraws His Spirit and turns men over to their own devices. Then there is no halting any longer of the mad downward rush till the lowest depths have been reached: that men not only practice all sorts of self-destructive vices, perhaps against the protest of their conscience, but approve of them that practice them, and advocate such practices as the normal life.

This is the situation as Paul saw it. This was the condition of the world to which Paul was called to administer the Gospel. There is no remedy outside of the Gospel. The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, the only power of God. It is futile to try to stem the tide in any other way, perhaps with the aid of the natural knowledge of God. The world had this knowledge before Paul came, but they neglected it in their vanity, brushed it aside, and ruthlessly trampled it under foot. Hence if any person in any system

of training pins any hope on the natural knowledge of God for building up a God-pleasing moral character, he merely shows that he does not understand the seriousness of the situation nor the complete inadequacy of the natural knowledge of God to be of any help. First a rescue of the person will have to be effected through the Gospel, a new birth, then also the natural knowledge of God will be rescued and restored to its rightful position as a useful hand-maiden. But to attempt to integrate the natural knowledge of God into any system of education without previous repentance and regeneration spells utter ruin.

To return once more to v. 32, we notice not only that the lowest depths have been reached when men, driven by their unbridled lusts, drop to the stage where with an unchecked corrupt mind (*adokimos*, one that failed in the test) they attempt to justify their ruinous and shameless practices; we note further that, in spite of all this, their keen realization (*epignontes*) of the righteous judgment of God (*dikaiōma*) has not been lost, they cannot shake it off. "Yet here's a spot"; and no "Out, damned spot! out, I say" will remove it (Lady Macbeth). The judgment of God, namely, that people who practice such things are worthy of death, is bitterly felt by them as fully justified in every respect: it is a judgment established once for all, it is *God's* judgment, it is a *righteous* judgment. They may hold it down, prevent it from exercising its influence; they may employ their rotten mind to argue against it: they cannot erase the *gnōston tou theou* from their heart. They not merely perceive it, they feel its power and influence; *epignontes*, Paul says. — And yet they persist in their depravity.

If that is the case, of what help may the natural knowledge of God be? It has demonstrated its absolute insufficiency as long as man remains in his unregenerate state. A complete change of heart, *metanoia*, repentance, is called for. If any one still insists on using the natural knowledge as a starting point for improvement, if he tries to build up any kind of God-pleasing righteousness on it, he is guilty of double condemnation, a condemnation which may not at once manifest

itself in a catastrophic destruction, but which will work in a less noticeable, yet none the less effective way by God's relinquishing him to his own devices.

With this presentation of the righteous wrath and judgment of God as here briefly outlined, Paul connects the next chapter by means of the conjunction *dio*. This word expresses a causal relation, not quite as specific as, e. g., *hōste*, but more general, somewhat like our English *accordingly*. Our King James Bible has "Therefore" (so also the R. S. V.): "Therefore thou art inexcusable" etc.

The question arises to what specifically *dio* may refer. Does it refer only to the statement contained in the last verse of ch. 1? or does it refer to the entire section beginning with v. 18? The fact that Paul in ch. 1, 18-32, uses *dio* or similar connectives to introduce new subparts, thus building one conclusion on the other, might lead one to assume that here also he is merely adding a new part on a level with the foregoing, basing this one on v. 32. Note the "wherefore" (v. 24), "for this cause" (v. 26), "as they did not" (v. 28). Does Paul add another link to this chain by his "therefore" in ch. 2, 1?

It does not seem so. Not only does the repetition of the term "inexcusable" hark back to the identical word used in ch. 1, 20 ("without excuse"), but the very thought introduced in ch. 2 does not look like a new subpart, on a level, as such, with the various subparts in ch. 1. The three small paragraphs in ch. 1, indicated above, are joined together by the repetition in each one of the common term *paredōken*, each one of them thus denoting a new stage, a more intensified form of the judgment of God, till the climax is reached in v. 32. But in ch. 2 an entirely new element is introduced, totally different from anything said before, by referring to a man who judges, *ho krinōn*. The method also in which the *krinōn* is introduced is striking. While in ch. 1 Paul had used the third person, descriptively, throughout, he here addresses the *krinōn* directly, in the second person.

What Paul has to say to the *krinōn* is, as the *dio* shows, based squarely on what he had said in the previous chapter concerning the righteous judgment of God. Moreover, Paul

assumes that the *krinōn* does not deny this presentation in whole or in part; he rather takes for granted that the *krinōn* by the very nature of his position must subscribe to all that had been said so far. He could not pose as a *krinōn* if he were in agreement with those who try to justify the unnatural and shameful course of men as depicted in ch. 1. On the basis of ch. 1, 18–32, to which the *krinōn* subscribes, Paul now points out to him that by implication his course is just as inexcusable as that of the others.

Who is this *krinōn*? There are many *krinontes*, in fact, as Paul indicates by his *pas ho krinōn*, “whoever thou art that judgest.” In ch. 1, 16, Paul had very formally declared that he was speaking of the Jew as well first as of the Greek; and in the second chapter he twice repeats that formal expression: v. 9: there will be distress for every man that persists in doing evil, for the Jews as well first as also for the Greek; and v. 10: there will be a grand reward for every one that practices the good, the Jew as well first as also the Greek. Add to this the fact that Paul addresses the *krinōn* merely as *man, ὁ ἀνθρώπος* — and we have the answer to our question. To pose as judges is not limited to any particular class or nationality; it is human, found as far as human society extends.

This cannot be otherwise, as long as what Paul said about the *gnōston tou theou* remains true. As long as the *gnōston tou theou* cannot be eradicated from the human heart, there will always be men who in the midst of the mad rush of moral degeneration will assume the role of judges.

What does Paul mean by *judging*? The verb denotes an act which is neutral in itself, meaning no more than to evaluate. In itself it expresses neither condemnation nor justification, though, naturally, it may result in either, as the case may be. Having in itself such rather pale meaning, *krinō* conveniently lends itself to many occasions. It then receives its coloring from the particular case to which it is applied. We must therefore always very carefully scrutinize the context in order to discover what particular turn may be indicated, what in the given situation may be the connotation of *krinein*.

It seems clear from the outset that Paul is not thinking

of a man who is judging merely for the purpose of exercising his mind, his analytical and critical faculties. This man is doing his discriminating, in the midst of the mad rush of the mob, for very practical purposes. Paul himself is dealing, not with academic questions, but with the most practical problem of life and death; and so is the *krinōn*.

A little farther down, where Paul is speaking of the Jew specifically, in v. 19 and 20, he uses words like "guide," "light," "instructor," "teacher." The *krinōn* by his *krinein*, whether he condemns or commends any one for his behavior, is aiming to improve conditions, to strengthen the more virtuous and to deter the offenders.

Should not Paul then commend the *krinōn*? Is he not upholding the *gnōston tou theou*? is he not trying to make this force morally and religiously effective? He certainly is trying to curb vice and to foster civic righteousness by making men conscious of their duty to God. Is he not thereby doing a most valuable work? Should Paul not join hands with him? Or should he not at least adopt his program and incorporate it into his own?

Paul does nothing of the kind. Rather, he tells the *krinōn* that with all his efforts at reform and at training people in civic righteousness he is "inexcusable." And naturally, if Paul in any way joined hands with him, he would be in the same condemnation.

Paul, of course, is speaking from the standpoint of the Gospel. He knows that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation. He preached the Gospel for more than a decade, and it never failed him. He is not ashamed of it. In his youth he had been educated in the Law. He had himself been an ardent advocate of the Law. He had scrupulously tried to observe the Law. Outwardly he had succeeded in building up an unimpeachable righteousness. Yet in reality he had failed, failed miserably, until the Lord in His mercy called him to faith in the Gospel. Did he now in this new light continue to build on the old foundation? In the light of the Gospel he realized that all attempts at righteousness based on the natural knowledge of God, or even on this knowledge as reenforced

by the revealed Law of Moses, are doomed to failure. They produce a righteousness which outwardly may glitter, but which in fact is worthless rubbish, yes, detrimental to the true righteousness of God. In the light of the Gospel he must tell the *krinōn* that he is without excuse, that he stands condemned for his efforts.

A few verses farther down, in v. 4, Paul tells the *krinōn* what is needed in order to check the crime wave and the vice wave that threaten to engulf human society. In one word it is "repentance," a complete change, a radical change of heart; a process which is not helped, but hindered, by cultivating civic righteousness on the basis of one's honor and by training a boy so to perform his duty toward God.

Paul begins to elucidate his verdict by stating: "for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself." The relative *en hō(i)* is an abbreviation, but it may here hardly be resolved, as customary, into *en toutō(i) en hō(i)*, rather the text demands *en toutō(i) hoti*. Paul wants to say that by the very fact that the *krinōn* evaluates the deeds of others as to their ethical worth, and tries to guide and steer people in the proper course, he stands condemned himself. He is keeping himself on the same level with those whom he is trying to correct, and from their standpoint and with the knowledge and the powers at their disposal he is attempting his reform. Paul, moreover, tells this reformer straight to his face that he, the would-be instructor, is guilty of the very same offenses as those whom he is correcting. Paul does not try to prove this charge, he is not afraid that any one will dare to deny it. He knew what happened when Jesus said to the pious men who brought the adulteress before Him: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her" (Joh. 8, 7). He knew that "convicted by their own conscience" they all went out (v. 8). Paul knew that every one of these self-appointed reformers would stand convicted by his own conscience when he charged them with practicing the very things which they tried to correct.

It is important that we learn to feel the full force of Paul's charge; and it is really an alarming symptom when it becomes

at all necessary to make a special effort in this direction. Does it not belong to the abc of our Christian faith that we accept the total depravity of natural man? that we realize how every effort on his part to extricate himself can have no other effect than to sink him deeper into his sin and guilt? "Deeper and deeper still I fell." Yet in spite of this it seems that we easily permit ourselves to be blinded by the glittering outward results achieved through man's own efforts at righteousness on the basis of the natural knowledge of God. We laud civic righteousness as something good and valuable in itself — so long as only a man does not go to the extreme of blaspheming in direct words the redemption of Christ, nor claims that his own righteousness has real spiritual value and is something meritorious before God. Forgetting in the meanwhile the caustic remark of Augustine that the virtues of the heathen are nothing but glittering vices, and the devastating judgment of our Savior that the publicans and harlots will enter the kingdom of God before the self-righteous Pharisees: we stand ready to accept the program of modern *krinontes*, as far as it goes, as valuable for our own Gospel work, and on that foundation to continue with our Gospel superstructure.

Do we not feel the force of Paul's words? He says that the mere attempt of the *krinōn* to improve conditions by applying the law and the natural knowledge of God is sufficient to condemn him as being outside the kingdom of God. It is a disturbing symptom if we do not at once recoil in horror from the very idea of integrating a method which uses one's own honor and sense of duty for eliciting a decent conduct, into our Christian system of stimulating a life of sanctification by appealing to the rich mercies of God. When Paul wrote to the Romans concerning the *krinōn* that by the very fact of his judging others he was condemning himself, he had the confidence in their good Christian judgment that they would readily understand and agree with him.

Since, as the conscience of the *krinōn* will testify, he is not one whit better by nature than those who have sunk to the lowest depths of sin and vice, he will have to admit that he fully deserves the righteous judgment of God. And we know,

Paul continues with a progressive *de*, that the judgment of God is pronounced and executed without bias, without fear or favor, strictly according to the facts in the case, according to *alētheia*, upon those who practice such things.

But the judgment of God has so far swallowed up neither the reckless vice monger nor the self-appointed reformer of the same mind. Might this, after all, indicate that God approves of the latter's effort in spite of the fact that he too is standing on the same ground with the sinner and is guilty of the same misdeeds? Paul voices this question in the following words: "Thinkest thou this, O man that judgest them which do such things and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" In the Greek the form of a question is missing, but the sense of at least a mild question is unmistakably present. Paul assumes that the *krinōn* is deluding himself with the vain hope that perhaps by his efforts at reform he may escape the judgment of God.

This gives Paul an opportunity for the smashing blow, and at the same time for a striking statement of the only proper remedy. He begins with *ē*, thus marking this statement as a second alternative. If the *krinōn* is not so blind as to expect an escape from God's judgment, then only the following assumption remains to account for his attitude, namely, that he despises the forbearance of God, that he harbors contempt for God in his heart. "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and (His) forbearance and longsuffering?"

We bear in mind that Paul is reprimanding the apparently callous *krinōn* on the basis of his natural knowledge of God, which includes also a taste of God's goodness. This *notitia Dei insita* the *krinōn* should develop with all the means at his disposal "that he should seek the Lord, if haply he might feel after him, and find him" (Acts 17, 27). His opportunity for doing so is exceptionally good. He realizes, on the one hand, that he is guilty before God, his conscience tells him so. By the very act of judging others he is condemning himself. The fact that God's judgment was held in abeyance so long, that it did not yet strike home in his case, is no proof that he deserves eventually to escape altogether. Yet for the moment

he is being spared. His time of grace is thereby extended. Hence in his own case, on the other hand, he has an outstanding example of God's goodness. Why then does he neglect this opportunity? Why does he not ponder the goodness of God? Why does he not develop his inborn knowledge of God in this respect to its highest possible perfection? From a meditation of the manifest forbearance and longsuffering of God in delaying the execution of His righteous judgment, long past due in his case, he should come to a sensing of the overwhelming goodness of God, or, as Paul calls it, "the riches of His goodness."

From his own experience he should get to feel that he will never succeed in reforming the world by his judging, no matter how fair and impartial it may be. Not only does his conscience condemn all his efforts at achieving an acceptable righteousness, his experience should show him that God Himself is employing a different method in his case. His trouble is that he is not paying due attention to God's method, evidently not considering the matter as worthy of serious thought. He does not permit it to sink in, entirely through his own fault, that God is trying to lead him to repentance. God's overwhelming manifestation of His goodness in extending the time of grace for him is a token of His method of effecting a change of heart in man. But he misconstrues (*agnoōn*) God's goodness. Just as men in general hold down the truth of God in their unrighteousness, so he holds down in particular the goodness of God, which is leading him in the direction of repentance, by his contempt.

Paul is here speaking about *metanoia* in the full Biblical sense of the word. It is not modification of one's judgment in some minor detail, while the basic principle of judgment remains unaffected; it is not a slight correction here or there in one's conduct; it is a complete change in the basic attitude of the heart, an about-face, as our Augsburg Confession describes it. "Now, repentance consists properly of these two parts: One is contrition, that is, terrors smiting the conscience through the knowledge of sin; the other is faith, which is born of the Gospel, or of absolution, and believes that for Christ's

sake sins are forgiven, comforts the conscience and delivers it from terrors" (Art. XII, 2-5). The goodness of God in merely deferring the due, perhaps long overdue, punishment cannot effect true repentance, but it points in that direction (*agei*), so that the *krinōn* is without excuse if he despises God's act of goodness.

Paul takes up this fact in the next verse with the term *sklērotēs*, hardness, which manifests itself in an impenitent heart. Having turned down, by the hardness of his heart, God's urging to repentance through a manifestation of His goodness, the *krinōn* must realize, so Paul warns him, that he is achieving no more than a treasuring up of the wrath of God against him, to be revealed with full force on the day of wrath and of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God.

With these words Paul practically rests his case concerning the natural knowledge of God. In the following he carries out some details about the day of judgment, and then speaks particularly about the function of conscience with regard to it. This we must defer to a later study.

We may well pause here for a brief review of some of the outstanding truths in Paul's argument.

He announced himself as a messenger of the Gospel, in which the righteousness of God is revealed through faith in Christ Jesus. The natural knowledge of God has no place in the message of the Gospel. The natural knowledge of God is *phaneron* among men, while the Gospel, according to 1 Cor. 2, 9, is something that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man." The natural knowledge of God belongs into the revelation of the wrath of God from heaven.

The natural knowledge of God has various stages. It was written by God into the hearts of men; He revealed it, *ephanerōsen*. Man may develop it by a study of the works of God in creation and preservation. He must be impressed by the goodness of God through a study of history, where he will see how God time and again defers an over-due judgment. "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering toward us, not willing

that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. 3, 9).

What is the reaction of man to the natural knowledge of God? In general, Paul says, they suppress it. They neutralize it, so that it should not interfere with their licentious living. Some, indeed, turn moralists, trying to curb by their judgments the reckless living of their fellow men. But in doing so they only condemn themselves, particularly since they harden themselves over against the revelation of God's goodness as it appears even in their own personal history.

Of what value, then, is the natural knowledge of God? Of no positive value whatever in spiritual matters; and those are the only matters about which Paul is concerned as a messenger of the Gospel. Those are also the only values that dare be of interest to us as ministers of Christ. The *krinōn*, whether a private citizen, whether a lecturer on ethics in some university, whether an official of government, may impress his fellowmen, he may have some influence on their outward moral conduct, but he never can bring them even one hair's breadth nearer to the kingdom of God. No one, unless he is tinged with Pelagianism, can hail the endeavors of men centering in the natural knowledge of God as preparing souls for sanctification in the wider or in the narrower sense of the word; much less can he even remotely think of integrating the work of the *krinontes* in the Christian program of education. The only value that the natural knowledge of God has in spiritual matters is a negative one: to make a sinner realize to his consternation that he is without excuse.

The only use that we can make of this knowledge is the one Paul makes of it: to force a sinner to a realization of his damnableness and to drive him to despair. Paul does so here in the Romans passage, he did so in his mission work, as witness the two cases on record in Acts, in Lystra and in Athens. That is the only legitimate use before repentance is effected. After repentance, in a Christian's sanctification, the natural knowledge of God will play a similar role to that of the Law in its third use.

We do well to mark also particularly the following,

although some things may be in the nature of a repetition. Paul is not speaking about the natural knowledge of God in the abstract, as it would appear by itself, he is interested in it only in the concrete, as it is found among men. It is not a purely academic truth which we may handle in an impersonal, disinterested fashion; coming from God, it is like the Word of God filled with divine power, forcing man to give attention (*motus inevitabiles*). The reaction of sinners — it is with sinners that Paul is concerned; as a practical realist he does not waste any time on theoretical speculation — with sinners the reaction is twofold: the ones suppress it and plunge recklessly into a life of vice and shame, the others instigate reform movements. Both are without excuse.

God has given us two kinds of Word: Law and Gospel. From the way Paul handles the natural knowledge of God it is evident that it is a part of God's Law revelation, and has the killing effect of Law. Can we make use of it? Not like the *krinōn*, who by means of it tries to curb crime and vice in the world and to stimulate decent living among men. That is not our business as ministers of the Gospel. We may use it to bring men to a knowledge of their sin, and reduce the haughty sinner to despair. We can use it as a rule or guide only after true repentance has been effected through the Gospel. To use it in any other way, perhaps as a summary of something that all religions assumedly have in common, on which each one then can build its own specific system, would be a plain confusion of Law and Gospel.

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

(Conclusion)

V. Episcopal Creed

It remains to say a few words about the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Episcopal Church. Though leaning definitely in the direction of Calvinism, they are not strictly to be termed Calvinistic, or rather let us say, they are not strictly Calvinistic. They do teach predestination, but carefully avoid committing themselves on reprobation; while they teach with the Lutheran Church that Baptism is a washing of regeneration, they as plainly teach Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Just as certainly, however, the Anglo-Catholic bent toward transubstantiation, to say nothing of adoration, finds no doctrinal basis in the Thirty-nine Articles. In fact, the latter is condemned in the XXVIIIth Article. Neither do the Articles themselves go beyond Scripture concerning the natures and person of Christ. As we remarked elsewhere, their doctrine calling for ordination in a direct line from the Apostles, called apostolic succession, hails from a much later date: that of the romanizing Charles I and Laud. In church polity the authority is asserted for the Church "to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith." So then the decision of the church remains final.

Taken by themselves, the Thirty-Nine Articles deviate from Lutheran positions less than any other Reformed creed; judged by what the Episcopal Church of today teaches and practices, however, scarcely any Reformed Church has departed so far from us in every direction, doctrinally, practically, and into modern liberalism. But through our change to the English language, our regrettable stepping toward high church ritual ourselves, coupled with the growing wealth

and social station of the Lutherans here in America, a steady pull is being exercised on our people toward joining the Episcopal Church, the more so since their priests have a training in doctrinal matters that reminds one of Lutheran training.

VI. General Recapitulation

At the risk of appearing repetitious, let us now quickly recapitulate the general heads under which deep differences appear as between the Reformed and the Lutheran. Beginning with the central doctrine of justification by faith, while it may appear that both communions are here on common ground, there obtains a fundamental cleavage. Since the Lutheran harbors a deep sense of sin and guilt, he underscores justification as the ultimate desideratum. For if he be justified, then he also shall be glorified, as it is written, "Whom He justified, them He also glorified." The Lutheran seeks above all the assurance of forgiveness of sins; and this is made sure to him in the judicial and forensic process of justification. Be he what he may, let his sins be ever so black, yet he knows himself included in the general justification wrought and pronounced by God. Rom. 5, 16. 18. As he appropriates this to himself the justification becomes particular, particular to him, to each believer, by faith and concomitant with faith. But the accent lies on the objective work of God, on God's promise, on His Word, on His sacraments. Hence justification becomes so sure a thing to the Lutheran believer, and anxiety turns to peace.

We have seen, however, that the Reformed theology looks upon justification as resultant from and consequent to faith. Faith comes first, then justification. Your Reformed Christian is therefore under necessity of being sure he believes. He becomes a spiritual introvert, continually examining into the state of things within. Hence the broad line of subjectivism in Reformed religion, in every direction. His hymns, form of worship, haranguing sermon, prayers, restless individual activity: all reflect it.

In conversion your Calvinist again harks back to predestination, to the eternal will of God. No conversion is

thinkable to him unless God has decreed it from everlasting. It now falls to him to find assurance that he is converted, and again he seeks it in himself. Romans 10 furnishes him with a criterion: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." And in the same chapter, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." These are then chief marks of conversion to him: to confess with the mouth; to pray: if he does both, and that devotedly, he may be reasonably assured that he is in the faith and converted. For a certain sense of satisfaction with himself must appear, a contentment, a conscious joy; and this completes his conversion. Again we have a subjective turning in on one's self, the center of attention not being the Word and promise of God, but that which goes forward within. Action, to be active, activity; to whip up enthusiasm; to prod, excite; to rouse to abandoned singing; to create the atmosphere of joy and a 'good time': these are not just froth, but rise from the desire to make their calling and election sure. They are the assurance of his conversion: It finds its extreme in the hysteria of the Pentecostalist. Because he shouts, dances, tingles all over for joy, he believes himself surest of all of his salvation.

For the Reformed therefore the substance of conversion is placed within himself, in his activity, in the operation of emotions and works. How much surer, how sober-minded, and how deep is the assurance of the Lutheran. For with him the substance is that constant good, God's promise, God's mercy: let the state of his heart be what it will, exalted, ecstatic, sorrowful, depressed, even despairing, God's Word abides the same. For your Lutheran bases his conversion on the operation of the Holy Spirit through Word and sacrament.

It may be countered: "But the Reformed also honor the Word." Quite true. They also agree that the Holy Spirit operates by and through the Word. But they also teach and believe that the Holy Ghost can and does work without the

medium of the Word, directly and immediately. This activity of the Holy Spirit can take place only within. To apprehend it he again has to turn inward upon himself. This explains why, although he is a great reader of the Bible, he lacks respect for the Word, doctrine is less important to him; and creeds — he abhors the word. The Baptist Convention of the state of Arizona has the unique distinction of being the only one in the Northern Baptist Church that is completely fundamentalist; no modernist is found among them. Yet at their convention, in which they were discussing the issue of modernism in their body and what they in Arizona stood for and believed, one of the leaders got up and counselled the group not to use the term "creed," but to revert to the expression of the fathers who had called what they believed their "confession." This did not spring only from the fear of ridicule that seems to attach to 'creed' in those circles, but from a belief that the Holy Spirit operates immediately, without the Word, in individual Christians. While it is true that the Holy Spirit leads each individual Christian a particular path of sanctification, one must never carry this truth over into the field of doctrine: doctrine remains constant. And far from being ashamed of creed, or of cringing when the term is hurled at us in opprobrium, we should stand to it and manfully confess our creed as being the banner under which we serve.

To the Calvinist therefore the means of grace are really not so much *means* of grace as *signs* of grace, a grace that has been conferred not by their means, but previously, or subsequently, by the direct-working Spirit. As a result one can scarcely find a Calvinist who is not given in more or less degree to speculation. Because the Spirit, as he believes, works independently of the Word, he harbors a disregard for the finality of the Word. Lutheran it is to bow under the authority of the Word. For the Lutheran the Holy Spirit identifies Himself completely with the means of grace.

In a resumé on the person of Christ one is struck by the over-emphasis the Reformed indulge in on the human in the God-man to a point where Jesus almost loses His deity. The

theory of the locality of Christ's body and human nature fastens the attention upon the limitations of humanity and tends to assign them to the person of Christ as well. The way is thus prepared for the next step, which so many have already taken: to make Jesus all human. The modernist has found the Reformed theology a much easier springboard to leap from than the Lutheran offers. And so the Lord Jesus, having become nothing more than a man, has been pulled down off His throne and made no better than the common run of sinners, while sinners in turn have been elevated to the same plane with Jesus: and we have salvation by character, a fine phrase that covers up the old term salvation by good works, a doctrine that even Pelagius might have refused.

Reformed teaching also insists that the exalted Christ is not yet perfected. For it argues — and this again shows us the intellectual and speculative side — that Christ in His two natures is not the complete Christ: Christ is the head, the Church His body. Christ is therefore approaching perfection through what we as His members contribute through our works and life till the consummation of all things brings the process to a close. Hence again the restless activity to help bring about this consummation, an activity that showed itself, for instance, in an eager interest in missions. But it is Lutheran and Scriptural to insist that the exalted Christ has been perfected when He sat down at the right hand of God, ruling all things.

In regard to the Church the Reformed press on its visible character. True, Calvin in his introductory letter to his "Institutes of the Christian Religion" tells Francis I that the Church is invisible. This must be understood of that which the Apostles' Creed confesses as "the Holy Christian Church." To the Calvinist "the Holy Christian Church" constitutes "the whole number of the elect," from the beginning of the world to its consummation, and is therefore invisible. But "the Communion of Saints" are only those elect, and their children, who at any given time live here on earth. They make up "the visible Church, which is also catholic and universal." A curious intellectual and speculative twist to what every

child rightly understands to be an appositively explanatory relationship between the two phrases. To this 'visible church' Christ has given the ministry, oracles, ordinances, etc. So then the Calvinist, as is the case with the Roman Catholic, underlines the visible church, underscoring outward organization of the church in congregation, synod, polity, and discipline. He joins the papacy in looking askance at the invisible character of the Church, upon which the Lutheran, in accordance with the teaching of Scripture, insists. Yet do we not here also mark the influence Calvinism has lately exercised on American Lutheranism in the more frequent mention in our circles of "the visible Church," a term loosely used, tending to become hazier, if not confused, in its conception? And does not the growing emphasis on organization of congregation and synod alike, of polity and discipline blow from the same direction?

We have already mentioned that the Reformed idea of *communicatio idiomatum* includes that Christ emptied Himself according to the divine nature. In fact, they could not teach, as Scripture and the Lutheran Church do, that Jesus emptied Himself of His divine attributes not according to His divine nature, but according to His human nature. For they never conceded that the divine properties were communicated to the human nature at all. Sad to say, some of the more modern Lutheran dogmaticians have abandoned the Lutheran stand, among them Kahnis, Thomasius, and Liebner; and at least Kahnis is definitely on Reformed ground here. Let us state it once more here "in duerren Worten": Christ's *kenosis* is according to the *logos ensarkos*, that is, his emptying of His divine prerogatives was according to the human nature, to which the divine nature had communicated them in His becoming man.

In the broad field of sanctification it has appeared in the course of our discussion that the Calvinist is less concerned about doctrine, theology, and knowledge, more insistent upon life, piety, and doing. He looks more to the holiness of God, less to the love of God; more to the law, and less to the Gospel. He brings to God, the Holy and Demanding, himself

and his activity. Even in worship he comes to *serve* God. He therefore exercises strict control over himself, carrying it to the point of asceticism, another line of kinship with Catholicism, as his worship also is. Your Lutheran, on the other hand, comes in worship *to be served* of God. His great need has brought him there; he has come to Him, Who alone can help: His loving Father through Christ Jesus. The Lutheran therefore confesses his sins, cries for mercy, thanks God for forgiveness; the Calvinist praises God, offers his services, his time, and his goods. The Lutheran attitude is aptly reflected in his liturgy: in confession of sins, absolution, and gloria. Wherever the Calvinist employes liturgical worship he characteristically leans toward reciting the commandments.

The Reformed believes that Christ works immediately through him in good works. The idea is fruitful in activity, much of which, to be sure, is aimless, external, and of fantastic invention, limned at the same time by cocksureness. The Lutheran credits the Christian with working along with Christ, so that he looks less to the activity itself, but more to the guiding hand of Jesus and the power and encouraging voice of Christ. Your Reformed will therefore be edified and make the most popular book in America outside the Bible, Sheldon's "In His Steps"; he will have a yen to step out of his calling in life toward some form of ministry, or to testify or preach. Your Lutheran is given to contemplation and acceptance of what God has done for him, in that Christ suffered and died for us. That explains the Lutheran love of Lent, the Reformed aversion to it. When the Reformed see the success of Lutheran Lenten observances and conclude to imitate it — for they love the display of numbers and of external success — they make a sorry failure of it, for they don't know what to do: when they try to pour their type of religious observance, with its coloring of entertainment and enthusiastic activity into the mold required for solemn Lenten meditation, it turns out grotesque. It is like pouring cream into lemonade: it curdles. But because your Lutheran is seriously contemplative and passive, he also will remain in the calling in which God

has found him; and in it he will serve God. It is as one said, "I am first of all a Christian, then I am a carpenter; but because I am a Christian I am a very good carpenter."

We have not the time to follow the Reformed slant on sanctification into the extreme of perfectionism, further than to remark that your perfectionist, who believes he has the second blessing and therefore cannot sin, cannot hide from himself the fact that he does sin; but he gives it a new name: it becomes only a "mistake."

We must not disparage the piety of the Reformed completely. There is much that is very fine. Genuine is not a little of their love for men; and we could learn somewhat from their warm ecumenicity without also drinking in with it any admixture of unionism. For it remains true that unionism originates with the Reformed theology, which, because it does not lay the proper weight on doctrine and the principles that derive from it, leans toward an easy fellowship not only with everyone who seems to profess Christ, but also with anyone who exhibits no more than a general religious spirit. Far more of the spirit of unionism than can be absorbed without grave deterioration, both within our own church as well as in our stand over against the world, has already entered into the Lutheran Church in America. I am not now going to discuss the proposed mergers in American Lutheranism. But I will say that Lutheran churches and ministers who enter in on joint worship with other denominations, as it is the general practice in some synods, are not a whit removed from those Reformed folk whom they profess to disdain because they make their fetish the word "fellowship." None will deny that by this door all kinds of disintegrating influences are let in. It should be well guarded. But let this guard be the Gospel. It will not do to bar the door with Pharisaism, with the planking of legalistic rule and regulation, of traditionalism and externalism. That would be to reject both the evangelical and the Lutheran, borrowing instead from the lumber of the ultramontane. Finally the salvation of the individual soul — in the ultimate the sole business of the Church — must take precedence over every rule and regulation, tradition and

organization. If any of these be permitted to get into the way of any soul's welfare, we have a true case of giving offense. All Lutherans should make earnest with the return to the Galesburg Rules, "Lutheran pulpits for Lutherans only; Lutheran altars for Lutherans only," not forgetting the other two articles Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr., put forward about chiliasm and lodge membership.

In concluding this section of the essay we gather up the items we have found and condense them into a few heads. Calvinism and Reformed theology and practice can be grouped in three main rubrics:

1. Intellectualism: the desire to reduce faith to a set of propositions grasped by reason, picking the flesh and the beauty of the mysteries of the Christian religion away and leaving dry bones;
2. Legalism: reducing the Gospel to a set of rules and regulations to be imposed on men, robbing the Gospel of its character of being glad good news of salvation and changing it into a galling duty;
3. Radicalism: which sets up a destroying principle, an influence continually undermining, gnawing away, and working disintegration because it does not humbly bow under the sole authority of the Word of God.

VII. General Classification of Religious Movements

The Calvinistic churches have always been sharp and active in their opposition to the Roman Catholic Church. Because of the noise of the conflict and the Reformed cry of battle many have been misled to classify after this manner: the Catholic on one extreme, the Reformed on the other, with the Lutheran in the middle. If one looks closer, however, it will be seen that the opposition between Catholic and Reformed is really a rivalry. For both have much in common, pursuing the same ends by much the same means. Both seek to establish the kingdom of God here on earth; both have the stripe of "Diesseitigkeit"; both are tarred with the brush of legalism; both lay great store by tight and authoritative

church government *iure divino*; they have in common the acceptance of authorities extraneous to Scripture: the church, and reason and feeling. For the one the authority of the church heads up in the pope; for the other in the decisions of synods, general assemblies, and convocations of bishops. For the Roman Catholic reason and feeling harden into the form of canons and decrees; for the Reformed they appear in radical individualism. Both also have the door wide open for speculation to enter in, a type that in Catholicism not infrequently descends to the credulous, the ridiculous, and the superstitious; in Reformed circles it mounts into the fantastic. I think here of amulets, brotherhoods, scapularies, the cult of Mary; of millennial vagaries, prophetic guessing, and the like.

In this rivalry Catholicism has secured a decided advantage by virtue of its centralized organization, Calvinism being split up by its radical individualism and subjectivistic separatism. Calvinism tries to bridge its fissures, opened by continual strife, largely about externals, by a futile unionism. Hence their love and veneration for the term "fellowship," a fellowship they attempt to exhibit to the world in the practice of union services, whose shallowness and hollow ring their own people cannot hide from themselves, nor do they succeed in deceiving the world. For the world asks, "If they can worship together, why don't they join together?" Or they gather in ministerial alliances, in whose meetings the address "brother" is stretched to cover fundamentalist and modernist, even the Unitarian and rabbi, where thanks are rendered to God for fellowship, but where care is taken to avoid mentioning what in doctrine, practice, or church government divides them. At best they strive together in some political movement or pressure, too often designed to force others to their way of thinking; or they stand shoulder to shoulder to meet the challenge of the Catholic powers. Over against this futility the pope with his closed ranks marches along in solid, purposeful array. Though the Reformed churches possessed the combined might of the United States, Russia, and the British Empire, and assayed to use it against Rome, they would lose

out. For, as Prof. Koehler pointed out to us, "The power of the Papacy lies in the sway over conscience. Whoever cannot free the consciences by means of the Gospel must go down to defeat in a contest with the Papacy, let him and his means be what they may."

So then the proper classification calls for placing the Catholic Church on one extreme, the Reformed just this side the Catholic, and over against both the Lutheran Church. This observation will help explain why it has been that voluntary conversions from Protestantism to Catholicism have taken place from the Reformed churches: Newman and Manning and many others in the last century, Chesterton and others in the present century, and the recent wave of American celebrities including Heywood Broun, Clare Booth Luce, Henry Ford II, and Grace Moore, to name a few. It will also explain why Catholic priest and Reformed minister appear on the same platform with the Jewish rabbi. Contrary to the practice of both Catholic and Reformed the Lutheran Church, if it still be Lutheran, does not employ external force nor pressure to bring about its ends, neither does it resort to fuss and bustle, still less to political action, not to say intrigue, either over against the world, or within its own ranks. (Or has the present movement toward union in the Lutheran Church sent one of its tap-roots into Calvinistic soil, out of which grows the desire to present a united Lutheran front to the world, to put the Lutheran Church on the map, and to be in position to bring powerful political pressure to bear?)

The mark of true Lutheranism will always be to meet every issue, and to further all its work, by means of the Word of God. Luther manifested his greatness, becoming the most important and influential personality in history since St. Paul, because he lived in the Word and acted out of the Word of God. Of purpose he met each burning issue with the Word, rightly applying it. Having done so, he calmly leaned back and permitted the Word to operate. Hence his enemies found nothing with which they could effectually answer him; and the world through Luther emerged into a new and wholesome light. On the other hand, every concession that the Lutheran

Church makes to Calvinism carries her a step closer to the domain of the Anti-Christ. We need therefore to be on guard against anything that tends toward appeasement, or opens the door to Reformed influence. Hand in hand with this vigilance should go a revivifying among us of the Lutheran article of faith that the pope is the true Anti-Christ. In short, consciously cultivate that which is truly Lutheran.

This brings us to the survey of the protective, counteracting, and progressive measures that should be adopted to meet the menace of the pressures bearing down on the Lutheran Church here in America.

VIII. Protective, Counteractive and Progressive Measures

There can be no doubt that Lutheran doctrine and practice under God's guidance in America remained healthy in the past century partly because of the protective cloak of language thrown about them. For the Lutheran Church, especially in the Middle West, grew up in the clothing of German and Scandinavian vernacular. Warp and woof of the Lutheran gospel had been originally woven in it; and the German and Scandinavian synods were not ashamed of the 16th and 17th century styles in doctrine. What could happen to Lutheranism when the language frame was removed was clearly demonstrated to these synods by the unravelling that had taken place in the case of the General Synod in the East. That Synod, though it called itself Lutheran, had neither weave nor pattern of doctrine, but was at loose ends, neither Lutheran nor Reformed. The reaction that crystallized in the withdrawal and formation of the General Council beyond doubt sprang largely from the fact that its ministry still read German, and also did much of its preaching in that language, and so was acquainted not only with Lutheran literature, but came under the influence of the German Middle Western synods and thus was led to reorientate its position.

Within the last quarter century, however, the language barrier has been largely removed. Almost all our preaching employes English speech. Though the older ministers read the German and Scandinavian, they do less of it with the

passing years. Not many who have gone into the ministry in the last 15 years are really master of the mother tongues of Lutheranism, and so they do little, if any, reading of original Lutheran literature. Since there is almost no Lutheran literature in English, our ministry is literally in grave danger of Lutheran starvation. And because Reformed, Calvinistic, and modernistic religion has been served up in abundance on the English and American table, our ministry can scarcely avoid sampling, if not devouring, some of it, with more than a chance that it will set up an intestinal disturbance, causing doctrinally what Luther would say was something "Das die Leutē nicht gerne riechen."

How are we going to avoid losing our Lutheran heritage? How shall we protect ourselves and the Lutheran Church against the impact of Calvinistic and Reformed doctrine and practice? Frankly taking over Reformed practice and the Reformed Gospel would mean to surrender all. Any degree of appeasement is also out! Or should we confine our singing to the gospel hymns of the English churches, as some do? Or by way of contrast set English hymns with familiar English tunes to German chorale tunes, as has happened? By increasing and amplifying ritual? By adopting a more closely knit organization, perhaps taking over the episcopal form of church government, as some seriously suggest? By insisting on stricter outward discipline? Or shall we meet it, as general assent seems to wish, by uniting all Lutherans in one great body? One needs but to ask the questions to know the answers to them.

There arises in block letters the short solution to the problem, an answer in two words, "BE LUTHERAN!" But then it also means to know what it implies to be Lutheran. It is more than just appropriating a name. First and foremost it calls for not only according Holy Scripture supreme authority in doctrine and practice as the inspired Word of God, but also to be at home in the Word, to read and study it. For reading the Bible Dr. Riley has set up five excellent rules: 1. Read it. 2. Read it prayerfully. 3. Read it bookwise. 4. Read

it consecutively. 5. Read it repeatedly. That program should keep us busy till our last breath.

No doubt Reformed folk read their Bibles more zealously than the Lutherans do. This derives partly from the Reformed accent on piety, partly from intellectual interest, partly from speculative lines, partly because Lutheran instruction in Bible history and catechism, while giving our people a fine foundation, seems not to lead them into private reading and study of the Bible. There is room for great improvement among both Lutheran ministers and lay folk in Bible reading and study.

I have often wondered whether we Lutherans, when we came out from using the German and Scandinavian tongues, did not miss an opportunity as far as selection of an English text of the Bible is concerned. For accuracy of text — and that must be a chief consideration where the Word of God is concerned — the American Standard Version left all other translations into English far behind. I fear the adverse publicity given that translation among us a quarter of a century ago has prevented many an one from having a far better understanding and knowledge of the Scriptures than is now the case.

Concomitant with the study of the Bible should go for the Lutheran ministry reading and study of the Book of Concord. Indeed, not only the ministers, but our laymen should also be urged to read it. An inexpensive edition in English translation only should be put on the market and commended to our people. (None of the present English texts is wholly satisfactory. Jacobs tries to translate both the Latin and German texts simultaneously, instead of in parallel, and so clutters up the English text; while the Triglotta, to mention only one little item, quite consistently stumbles over the little word "also".) For the Lutheran minister it should be a rule to read through the Confessional Writings at least once a year, as well as to have them lying next to hand at all times. The pope requires his priests to read the breviary daily; the Lutheran Church should urge its ministers to read consistently in the Book of Concord. We need a decided reemphasis on

the study end of our ministry in general, and I mean *study*, study of theological character, not magazine reading.

As a third step in the direction of preserving and augmenting our distinctive Lutheran heritage I should plead reading Luther. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the epigram, "Quo propior Luthero, eo melior theologus." No Lutheran pastor's study should be without Luther's works. The young minister might do well to postpone his wedding a half-year, if by so doing he can add Luther to his library. And he must be read in the original German. When thirty years ago Prof. Pieper expressed fear that with the advance into English and its accompanying loss of the command of German the Lutheran Church in America ran the grave risk of losing its Lutheran character, I put that down as a manifestation of his love for things German. Today I agree with him. The next twenty-five years are going to be exceedingly critical ones for American Lutheranism. For I fear we shall lose Luther almost completely as a teacher, since many will be unable to read him, and those that can will scarcely take the trouble to do so. Even now he is grossly neglected. I am told that Catholic priests are chief subscribers to the excellent St. Louis Edition of Luther's Works, which can be had for an extraordinary price if bought by the set. One must be astonished at the zeal of the English and Scotch divines, who, though they are Reformed, are at home in Luther, reading him in the original, and quoting him copiously in their books. Should not we Lutherans make a real effort to master him in the German, seeing so much depends upon it for the welfare of our church?

A word of caution to the earnest young student of Luther. To know him and to be at home in his writings brings with it the risk of being misunderstood in the Lutheran Church of today in America. Quoting Luther, or applying measures to a concrete matter in accordance with Luther's free and evangelical spirit, may cause the eyebrow to be raised askance, or even draw down censure on one. Perhaps here also ignorance is bliss? But it remains true: as one draws away from the spirit of Luther, one will fall victim more and more to religious subjectivism, as well as to its companion,

this-worldliness. In the attempt to keep this subjective 'liberty' within bounds the fetters of legalism tighten down. All three are marks of Calvinism. Do they not too frequently toast themselves at the hearthstone of American Lutheranism?

Though subjectivism with its individualistic 'liberty' went bankrupt in World War I, and in consequence of the recent World War is suffering liquidation, the world has learned nothing; it never does. As Luther says, "Welt bleibt Welt." The world will always reject Christ; on the other hand, in the pinch it always takes up with some principle Christ has pronounced, and tries to apply it in completely misunderstood, biassed, and twisted form to the kingdoms of this world: an effort foredoomed to ultimate failure; for sin ruins everything. Now the attempt is already under way to establish the kingdom of heaven on earth by means of Marxism, that is to say, by group action and internationalism. And to this both Catholicism and Calvinism will lend their aid, for it runs down their alley: both believe in establishing the kingdom of God on earth. Any opposition to Marxism now on their part flows largely from rivalry. Catholic hatred of Russian Communism erupts from the rivalry of one dictatorship with the other, both being religious in character and fervor; whenever the pope can force concessions out of Russia he will join Calvinism in favoring the communistic ideology. Do we recall how the pope of the late decades of the nineteenth century cursed socialism? Today he has taken it to his benign bosom; he has become confederate with Western European Socialism.

And we Lutherans? Let us be sure that we know what Communism believes and what it seeks to do before we open ignorant mouths too wide. Above all let the Lutheran Church guard against a desire to scramble on the same bandwagon with the Catholic and the Calvinist, blaring forth a social gospel cut to the tune of this world, beating the drum in the political arena, or straining to display the bright colors of its trappings to the world; not a proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, but an unworthy bent amounting to a passion for publicity, to exhibit the glories, numbers, and power of

the Lutheran Church to the world. Let us return to Luther and his manner of proclaiming the Word. "Sagen will ich's, predigen will ich's, schreiben will ich's; and wenn ich und Philip bei einer Kanne guten Torgauer Biers sitzen, oder schlafen, wird der Herr das Gedeihen geben." Thou Lutheran, preach the *Word of God*, preach the Gospel; it alone is the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth.

The Lutheran Church in America suffers from an alarming dearth of sound Lutheran theological literature in English. The hurly-burly of the age has kept us from doing an original type of work in that language. For the sake of our people, if not equally for our ministers, there should therefore be an accelerated program of translation of good Lutheran literature from the German and Scandinavian into the English language. Very little has been done along these lines. It is high time to take up the pen. Another generation and we shall have no one who knew the writers of the past years personally; and we may have few who will be able translators. Why is it no one has englished any articles, to say nothing of the books, of Dr. Stoeckhardt? (Since this was written one of the Doctor's articles done into English has reached my desk, and very ably done.) Should not the Synodical Conference place the translation of good theological works high on its program?

We need also to build up an original library of American Lutheran works as well. Here the Missouri Synod has a growing collection of books, but especially a large library of synodical essays, available to layman and minister alike. We have next to nothing. Joint Synod and district synod reports furnish the bare proceedings, seldom printing the essays. Are the budget figures more important than the Word of God, than theological literature and a historical record of doctrine? Has it been a case of trying to serve God and mammon? Most of the intensive theological work of our Synod lies in a single manuscript in some pastor's or professor's study, to be lost or destroyed in the course of years. Is it not imperative for us to augment our material, using our synodical reports as the most convenient and widely spread medium? The cry rises the more urgently in that much of what is now being published

under Lutheran copyright in Lutheran journals carries the hallmark of Calvinism without it being recognized as such.

In connection with doctrine we do well to remind ourselves once more of true and false authorities in the Lutheran Church, thereby avoiding on one hand the Scylla of Roman Catholicism, on the other the Charybdis of Calvinism. It has always sounded abroad, and in our day cannot be trumpeted too loudly, that the only authority and norm of doctrine, faith, and life in the Evangelical Lutheran Church must be the Word of God: *Sola Scriptura*. We subscribe to the Book of Concord, not so far as, but because it reflects the teaching of Scripture. Yet even the Book of Concord must submit to the scrutiny and control of Holy Writ, not turned about. Already the expression, as it lately saw print in one of our periodicals, appears doubtful: "The Synodical Conference recognizes but one standard of doctrine, to which there must be *absolute* accord, namely, the Bible *as interpreted . . . in the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church.*" (Italics mine.) Absolute accord dare be given only the Bible; certainly to no "interpretation," not even that of the Book of Concord, for interpretation at once introduces the human element. Should there be the shadow of a conflict between the two in any point, the latter must bow to the former. If this be true of the Book of Concord, how much more in the case of synodical resolutions, the opinions of faculties, and the like? This reminder is always in place and should be gratefully heeded. For there will always remain the danger, increasing as we approach the last day (Luke 18, 8; Mark 13, 33ff.), of bowing to the weight of ecclesiastic authority, of building up alongside of Scripture a human tradition, fearing men rather than God. Vigilance here is commanded by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. And let us not bridle up when our attention is drawn to this grave danger; to do so is already a warning sign.

The Lutheran Church has always led the Protestant field in the matter of instruction of the young. If we would hold this lead, or rather if we would meet our obligation to our children and to the Gospel, we shall need to widen and deepen this channel of salvation. Fascism and Nazism applied this

principle of educating youth and even the children and grew strong on it, almost conquering the world. Communism is employing the same motive. But far and away in the lead in religious circles runs the Roman Catholic Church. And contrary to what seems general belief, the church of the Anti-Christ makes no formal mistakes. It numbers its parochial schools in America by the thousands, its high schools and academies by the hundreds, and its colleges and universities by tens. Think of Notre Dame, Marquette, Holy Cross, Fordham, Tulane, Gonzaga, two Loyolas, San Francisco, St. Mary's, Catholic University, St. Thomas and others. We need therefore to emphasize once more parochial education, and to stem the drift toward contentment with the Sunday School and instruction classes, leaving the rest of our children's education to the state.

Extremely important lies Christian education on the level of the high school. We need to fill in this gap in our educational system. One can only be happy to hear of the interest the laymen are taking in the matter in various cities. I have, however, heard a complaint that many of the clergy seem opposed to undertaking high schools. Here also there must be vigilance lest our type of teaching be influenced by, or reflect, the intellectualism, legalism, and radicalism inherent in Calvinism round about us, the warp and woof of American education in general. Let us above all be Lutheran in this most important respect.

The pulpit remains the most important single influence in Lutheranism. But in late years it has been receding from its commanding position, not to say surrendering it, or even being forced from it. I frankly have reference to the rising tide of ritualism within our church. We shall discuss that trend later on. Why is the pulpit losing out? The answer will be found multiform. Men have turned against the pulpit in protest against the misuse it has been suffering at the hands of many preachers in Reformed circles. We need not mention the sensationalism, the haranguing, the political and social pressure it has lent itself to. But the results have spilled over into the Lutheran Church as well. On the other hand,

we also seem to note a waning in power of Lutheran preaching in general, at least, a lack of results. Whence does it come? From a decreasing love of the preacher for Christ? Can the Lutheran ministry of today claim the fervor, the deep faith, the cordial faithfulness, the familiar companionship with God of the ministry of yesteryear? Or have our people begun to trade their citizenship in heaven for a few years of economic security and material well-being here on earth? Have their ears become dull of hearing? Probably both are true. In the past fifteen years I have had opportunity to hear repeatedly a minister in one of our larger congregations. I have yet to hear a sermon that I could honestly class second-rate. What shall be done about the situation?

Shall we say, "Our people are tired of the old doctrinal preaching, so let's give them something new"? Not a few who call themselves Lutheran are therefore introducing what they call "evangelism" into the pulpit, which steps in the direction of revivalism, a form of approach with which the Reformed churches are breaking as being on the artificial, mechanical, and frothy side. Or shall we use the sermon as a vehicle for agitation, or propaganda? Or follow those who are frankly turning to the social gospel? Or shall we cover the poverty of our preaching by shortening the sermon? The answer must always be, "Preach the Gospel! Be evangelical! Be Lutheran!"

The sermon must be a living message. It must bring some *news*, good tidings from God. It must preach sin and salvation. Not indeed a stereotyped device of thundering the law in all its terror in the first part, following it in the second part with the Gospel in all its sweetness — one has but to say it to be aware of the critique that lies in the words themselves. For the thundering tends to become a reverberating beating on an empty gasoline barrel, and the sweetness of the gospel a young betty reading a novel and munching chocolates. And let us always remember that although a minister cannot add to the Word of God, he can decidedly place hindrances in the way of the Gospel by his manner of

handling the Word, preparation, delivery, or his own lack of faith.

Let us not abandon doctrinal preaching. Let us also take care to let the text speak. But when we say "doctrinal preaching," we by no means think of a wooden orthodoxism that would insist on binding its devotees in slavish fashion to a set expression for a certain truth, as some would seem not only to infer, but baldly to state when they quote the passage in Paul (I. Cor. 1, 10), "I beseech you, brethren, . . . that ye all speak the same thing." Indeed, speak the same thing, preach the same doctrine, but certainly Paul does not mean to say 'always using the same words and the same expressions'. The thing remains constant; the means of expressing may change in free utterance. For the Gospel remains the power of God to salvation, freely coining its own expressions, informing and bending them to its purpose, yet always in essence remaining the same. Of course, it would be just as wooden of purpose to seek some new expression for an old truth just for the sake of change.

We have mentioned ritualism. None can deny that ritualism has experienced an upsurge not only in the Lutheran Church, but in Calvinistic circles as well. It has been the genius of the Reformed Church to sacrifice everything which Scripture does not directly sanction and justify, while that of the Lutheran Church reflects itself in sparing all that Scripture does not expressly forbid. The first roots in legalism, the other in the liberty of the Christian. In no place has this appeared more patently than in the forms of worship. Luther conservatively retained what he could of the ancient liturgy, as well as leaving altars, vestments, and other furniture in the Church. These things the Reformed violently removed, leaving scarcely more than the bare walls and a stark formlessness of worship. Though in direct contravention to this historical fact today we find the Presbyterian, Methodist, and even Congregational churches introducing altars and clothing their ministers in gowns, ritual itself has not found its way into their services.

But the trend toward high church ritualism in the Lu-

theran Church stems partly from a reaction against the radical formlessness of Calvinistic worship, a species of protection against influences to which our people have become more exposed since our church has been going over into the English language; partly as a compensation for the loss we feel in depth and warmth of faith; partly, I fear, as an unconscious step leading to a return to the church of the Anti-Christ. As to the second point, externals in the form of solemn ritual are apparently calculated to compensate for the growing void within, or to fill that void with a new approach to God. As ritualism lays hold the altar begins to elbow the pulpit; the weight of importance begins to shift from what God has done for me, proclaimed from the pulpit, to what I am doing by way of worship toward God; from the inwardness of faith toward the externals of ritual manipulation. It is contended, therefore, that more ritual does not afford the answer to the question, "What shall we do to meet the menace of Calvinistic influence on Lutheran doctrine and practice?" Indeed, the medicine may prove as menacing to true Lutheranism as the malady itself.

It is true that our confessions declare, "To the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, and ceremonies, instituted by men, should everywhere be alike." This stands indeed upon Scriptural grounds of freedom. But the other face of true liberty also bears looking at, when Scripture repeatedly says, "All things are yours, but all things are not expedient." This holds true in introducing the novel into our form of worship. The question is raised whether the introduction into certain of our churches of stole and cassock, altar boys and cross and banner, processional and recessional, of lengthy ritual increasing in length and volume, conforms to this principle? Are we not gratuitously borrowing the issue that has split the Episcopal Church since its inception, the issue of high church polity? Ought not some earnest and brotherly steps be taken to curb a tendency that has not stopped at introducing into Synodical Conference sanctuaries

the perpetual lamp, a definitely Catholic device — I know of at least two churches in which it is kept burning; where a breadless and wineless communion service was solemnly celebrated for men absent in war and featured in the "American Lutheran"; where vestments and vessels and altar cloths are kept by lady custodians, who are instructed to cross themselves before exhibiting the 'holy vessels' to visitors; where the congregation is required to kneel and stand a great space of time for liturgical exercises. At a district convention service I attended a visiting high church brother claimed to have noted 53 liturgical errors in the course of evening worship. One could not help but wonder what benefit was his from the fine Gospel sermon, to say nothing of the celebration of Holy Communion. The pendulum has swung so far with some that there can be no doubt that they will have well paved the way back into the Roman Catholic Church for such of our people who lay less stress on what they hear in doctrine, and much more on what they see in worship.

To illustrate. In the early days of the War a young man by the name of Steinbeck, son of a former Missouri Synod minister, and his wife worshiped with us. They were regular in their attendance. He was a sergeant. In the course of time a Lt. Steinbeck's presence was announced. But he failed to attend worship, and I thought he had been transferred. On Good Friday I received a telephone call. It was Lt. Steinbeck asking about Communion. In the day's rush it didn't click with me that this was Lt. Steinbeck of Cleveland, not Sgt. Steinbeck of Chicago. Knowing the latter well, I was clipped in my answers to his inquiries, telling him that our communion services for Holy Week were past. As he was hanging up the receiver it flashed across that this was the lieutenant, not the sergeant. It was too late to explain.

Ten days later I had an air mail letter from his pastor telling me that the lieutenant, son of the president of his congregation, had returned his communion card with the curt note that he was finished with the Lutheran Church. The Tucson pastor had been short and brusque in treatment of his inquiry; he had therefore gone with a buddy to the

Catholic Church for Easter and liked it very well. Enclosed with the pastor's letter to me was his Sunday bulletin. In it he remonstrated with those in the congregation who were criticizing the length of the liturgical service. The foregoing Sunday they had been required to kneel only eleven minutes, to stand only 47 minutes! I began to understand the young man's feeling at home in the Catholic Church.

In respect therefore of ritual let us be truly *Lutheran* in the measure we employ it, taking into brotherly consideration the interest and practice of other congregations in the Lutheran Church also. Let us beware lest an excess in this respect not only crowd the sermon, or force a contraction of it, but also curtail the use of hymns by the congregation. For sermon and hymn have been historically and rightly central in Lutheran worship, not ritual. To make ritual central is doing Lutheranism in America a disservice.

On the other hand, let us also not abandon ancient and wholesome Lutheran customs. We must eschew any radical tinge, following after the conservative. In America that means favoring the customs generally that have grown up through the past century in American Lutheran free church circles. They have lent themselves, rightly used, to the maintenance of an evangelical and free spirit. Yet just to be conservative for the sake of conservatism is of little merit: that ends up in stagnation. True conservatism finds its best definition in the life and work of St. Paul: *progressive* in a sober-minded way. I commend to you his letter to Titus as an excellent guide in this direction. Note his accent on sound doctrine and sober-mindedness.

A prominent role has always been assigned in Lutheran worship to the singing of hymns. The knowing ones in the churches today acknowledge the Lutheran chorals as being the crown of hymnology and envy us. The late Ralph Adams Cram, dean of American architects, declared that since the time of the Greek classic but two new things had appeared in the world of art: Gothic lines of architecture, and the Lutheran chorale. The chief merit of our new Hymnal lies in its emphasis on the Lutheran chorale. Grateful it is to note that

a general movement has set in in the Lutheran Church of America toward the old Lutheran hymn, in some cases where one should least expect it. A possible exception to this trend may be the United Lutheran Church. Two hundred years of keeping company, and too frequently fraternizing, with the Reformed churches has led the U. L. C. into singing almost nothing but the English hymn.

In some quarters of the Lutheran Church voices have been raised calling for the introduction of 'gospel hymns', a broad hint of which we have in the weakest section of our Hymnal under the title "Invitation"; but these voices are still few in number. Let us indeed not think that good Lutheranism requires us to slight the better English hymns, to say nothing of eliminating them completely. Let us, however, be Lutheran in a proper accent on the use of the Lutheran hymn in worship. Without in any wise attempting to insinuate anything bordering on uniformity one might say that among four hymns sung in a Lutheran service at least two should be Lutheran chorales. By employing such we shall help to ward off the subjectivism of Reformed Christianity, which has found so powerful a lever in its subjective, not to say shallow hymnody. As an example of this Reformed subjectivism creeping into our new Hymnal we may cite the 3rd and 4th verses of hymn 392, the product of the generally excellent Isaac Watts. Both these verses, as well as the note on them in the 'Handbook', are definitely off-color.

There are those who insist that publicity answers the chief need of the Lutheran Church of today. The more publicity, the more we shall put the Lutheran Church 'on the map' and so help to stem the influence of Reformed religion. How many souls, do you suppose, will be saved by 'boiler-plate' the 'glories of the Lutheran Church' into every newspaper of America? How does this rush into blatant print agree with the spirit of Christ, of which the Holy Spirit speaks with high approval in Matthew 12, 15 to 21, especially verse 19, where He says, "He will not strive, nor cry aloud; neither shall any one hear His voice in the streets"? Proper publicity in the Church can mean nothing more than publish-

ing the Gospel, coupled with a sober and restrained account of its progress. Today's spread of the Lutheran Church in America roots in the sober-minded and simple preaching of the Gospel by its fathers of yesteryear. In sermon and in private they praised the grace of God and pointed to the blood of Christ. And God blessed their pious simplicity. But as the Jews were drawn away from the worship of Jehovah to pride in the temple amounting to worship of it, crying, "The temple, the temple, the temple!" (Jer. 7, 4. Hos. 8, 14); so the members of the Lutheran Church in our land stand in grave danger of shifting praise and worship from God to their own church, what with our growing numbers and opulence and influence.

Our Church periodicals pave one avenue of publicity. They should be of popular pattern. Too many Lutheran periodicals are not cut to the design of laymen's reading, being less papers and more theological magazines. Or why fill our church papers with sermons, when most of the subscribers have their own church worship? Our periodicals should be of a type so that our people will want to subscribe to them, and having done so, would wish to miss never a number. Brief, timely editorials; short, pithy articles; a good, concise sermon; a running, popular commentary; brisk news items while they are still news; news and comment on the religious movements round about us: these represent the mosaic of a popular church paper. Means could be found to generate such periodicals; but it will never be done by adding this burden to the shoulders of an already busy pastor. No one will accuse me of endorsing its content when saying that the Reformed press has succeeded to no little extent in this endeavor. In Lutheran circles one fortnightly has risen to spectacular circulation largely because it has approximated the desideratum in popular form.

I shall also but mention the local use of radio. God has opened this avenue to us; though Satan is busy attempting to block it off, preempting radio time for colorless ministerial associations. My own experience with it proved how many outside the Lutheran Church made it a purpose to tune in to

hear — of all things unexpected — succinct statements of Scriptural doctrine.

If we are to meet the impact of the Reformed spirit round about us without ourselves giving ground, then the spirit in which we go about our calling must be sober-minded, sound in doctrine in a world given to radical change. But let us beware of high-mindedness, of spiritual pride. Nothing will lead us more quickly than that to disaster. True humbleness: God give it to us. True repentance: God keep us in its ways. It is not just by chance that the first of the 95 Theses opens with, "When our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, cries, 'Repent ye,' He calls for the whole life of believers being repentance." (Matth. 3, 2. 4, 17.) God give us this spirit, for only out of soil broken by sorrow for sin and watered by the warm and refreshing showers of forgiveness can true love spring. And such love will seek diligently the salvation of the sinner, the welfare of the Church, and that which is good. God bend us aright; may the Holy Spirit guard us against the false on every hand and guide us into all truth; let Jesus Christ take us by the hand. (Eph. 6, 13, 14.) And poor, miserable sinners though we be, let us humbly, gratefully, happily walk with our God, rejoicing in our salvation. Living in this frame of mind we shall be found vessels made fit for use in the household of God.

In conclusion to this long and angular treatise let us say this: we shall meet the powerful impact of Reformed and Calvinistic influence, not by compromising or fraternizing with it — that would be, as said before, taking a long step away from Lutheranism back toward the dominion of the Anti-Christ — but only if we of the Lutheran Church address ourselves faithfully to the chief duties of its ministry. These will always be the ensuing: preach the Gospel; administer the sacraments; care for souls; maintain evangelical discipline; and suffer with Christ. These call for steeping ourselves in the Word, in the Confessions, and in Luther, studying them diligently; living in the fear of God and praying constantly, being always watchful; and letting our light shine before all

men by purity of life coupled with Christian circumspection. In fine, the Lutheran Christian and pastor can best serve the kingdom of God here in America by — *being Lutheran*.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Missouri and the American Lutheran Church. — Under date of March 4, the *Lutheraner* presents a preliminary report of the Committee for Doctrinal Unity of the Missouri Synod. This report brings some information with which the Committee wants to acquaint the members of its synod before the coming convention. We quote from this report:

„In der Versammlung unseres Komitees mit dem *Fellowship Committee* der Amerikanisch-Lutherischen Kirche erklärten die Vertreter dieses Kirchenkörpers, daß unser *Brief Statement* . . . und die *Declaration* der Amerikanisch-Lutherischen Kirche, . . . zwei verschiedene Anschauungen zum Ausdruck bringen, daß diese beiden Bekenntnisschriften die Lehrunterchiede darstellen, die zwischen der Amerikanisch-Lutherischen Kirche und unserer Synode bestehen. Solche Lehrunterchiede bestehen nach dem Urteil des *Fellowship Committee* in der Lehre von der ewigen Erwählung, von der Bekehrung, von der Kirche und in den Lehren betreffs der letzten Dinge. Das *Fellowship Committee* ist der Meinung, daß man in Rücksicht auf die Amerikanisch-Lutherische Kirche und unsere Synode nicht von bestehender Lehreinheit reden sollte, weil Lehreinheit nicht vorhanden ist. Trotzdem hält das *Fellowship Committee* dafür, daß das Vorhandensein solcher Lehrunterchiede die Kirchengemeinschaft nicht verhindern sollte.“

We wish to commend the frankness with which the A. L. C. Committee speaks of doctrinal differences which exist between their Declaration and the Missouri Brief Statement and calls it a mistake to speak of doctrinal agreement between the synods, since such doctrinal agreement does not exist. In offering fellowship nevertheless, it is simply true to the well-known Iowa Synod position of many years ago. We also appreciate the frankness of the Missouri Synod Committee in making this information available. It certainly must have a vital bearing on this whole problem of the proposed union between the two synods. The Missouri Committee then continues:

„Unser Komitee ist ein Komitee für Lehreinheit und ist einstimmig der Meinung, daß derartige Aussprüche eine wichtige Aussage der *Declaration* in Abrede stellen und aufheben. Im drittletzten Paragraphen der *Declaration* versichert uns die Ameri-

fänisch=Lutherische Kirche, daß sie sich der Uebereinstimmung mit den Lehren, die in unserm *Brief Statement* dargelegt werden, bemüht ist. Auch in bezug auf die Lehren, die in Artikel I—IV der *Declaration* besprochen werden — und das sind die Artikel von der Heiligen Schrift, von dem Erlösungsratschluß, von der ewigen Erwählung und der Befehrung, von der Kirche und von der öffentlichen Verwaltung der Gnadenmittel —, auch in bezug auf diese Lehren versichert die *Declaration*, daß dieselben im *Brief Statement* richtig dargestellt werden ('the doctrines stated in the *Brief Statement* are correct')."

We can understand how the Missouri Committee has come to read the *Declaration* in the above sense. It has always seemed to us, however, and we have consistently said so in our comment on these union negotiations, that the *Declaration* does not constitute an unreserved acceptance of the *Brief Statement*. It does not actually say in so many words that the American Lutheran Church is in conscious agreement with the doctrines of the *Brief Statement*. It limits this statement. The *Brief Statement* of Missouri contains 19 doctrinal articles. The *Declaration* of the A. L. C. carefully discusses six of them and then states: "With the *other* points of doctrine presented in the *Brief Statement* of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod we are conscious of being in agreement." (Emphasis in this and the following is ours.) This surely specifically excludes from this blanket endorsement the six articles which are treated in the *Declaration*.

Nor should the next statement, "We also believe that in regard to the points touched upon in Sections I—IV the doctrines stated in the *Brief Statement* are correct," be quoted without observing that the *Declaration* carefully goes on to say: "*However*, we are of the opinion that it would be well in part to *supplement* them . . . , in part also to *emphasize* those of its points which seemed essential to us." This surely makes the favorable verdict of the *Declaration* contingent upon the interpretation which the A. L. C. representatives had first placed upon these articles of the *Brief Statement*.

Finally, the *Declaration* says: "*If the honorable Synod of Missouri will acknowledge* Sections I, II, IV, V, and VI, A, together with the statements following after VI, B, concerning our attitude toward the *Brief Statement*, as correct, and declare that the points mentioned in Sections III and VI, B, are not disruptive of church fellowship, *the American Lutheran Church stands ready officially to declare itself in doctrinal agreement* with the honorable Synod of Missouri and to enter into pulpit and altar fellowship with it." The *Declaration* certainly makes it very clear that it does not mean to accept the *Brief Statement* without a number of specific reservations and qualifications. The Sandusky Convention was only saying it with different words when it declared that for the A. L. C. the *Brief Statement* is to be read "*in the light of the Declaration*."

We are well aware that the Declaration has made some notable concessions with regard to the doctrines that have been in controversy between the synods of the A. L. C. and the Synodical Conference. But we point to these stubborn facts because we believe that there is even now a definite danger in closing one's eyes against the existence of these significant reservations. This danger looms particularly in the position taken by the *Lutheran Witness*, March 11, 1947, page 75, when it says of the St. Louis Agreement: "that the resolution was soundly Scriptural by which our Synod declared in 1938 amidst tremendous rejoicings by a three times unanimous vote that the matters in controversy with the American Lutheran Church had been settled and a God-pleasing basis for future fellowship had been offered and accepted at this meeting." "The prospects are that this doctrinal basis of 1938 will continue to stand as an orthodox pronouncement of the Missouri Synod."

We believe that the A. L. C. Committee as reported in the *Lutheraner* has given a far more realistic picture of the entire situation, and that this must be recognized clearly by all who would have dealings with it. The A. L. C. states frankly that there is no full agreement. It holds, however, that this should not prevent fellowship. It offers fellowship, but on its own terms. Now it is the responsibility of Synodical Conference Lutheranism to recognize that these terms can not be met. E. REIM.

"A Statement" Withdrawn. — Under date of January 18, 1947, the President of the Missouri Synod has announced the withdrawal of a statement which was originally released over the signature of forty-four members of the Missouri Synod. The announcement contained an agreement which had been arrived at in a meeting with the representatives of the signers. This agreement will be of considerable interest to our readers and we therefore reprint it verbatim:

"An earnest evaluation of the discussions involved in 'A Statement' has demonstrated that we are agreed on many of its assertions, even though agreement has not been reached on some of the specific questions raised. The discussions have also shown that interpretations of some of the expressions in the accompanying letter and in the deplorations have been made which were not intended by the Signers. The language is not always clear to everyone. Nothing has developed, however, which is divisive of church fellowship.

"The longer discussions of this nature are drawn out, especially if the basis of the discussions is not understood by all participants in the same sense, the greater looms the danger of misunderstanding and the injection of personalities, temperament, personal experience, and emotion where calm objective judgment should prevail.

"It has therefore been agreed in a meeting of the Praesidium and of the representatives of the Signers that in the interest of peace and harmony in our midst and for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God at large 'A Statement' and 'The Accompanying Letter' be withdrawn as a basis of discussion so that the issues involved may be studied objectively on the basis of theses prepared under the auspices of the President of Synod.

"The withdrawal of 'A Statement' as a basis of discussion shall not be interpreted as a retraction; nor shall it mean that the issues involved shall now be glossed over or ignored. They shall become the topics of special study and prayerful consideration which will lead us, with the help of God's Holy Spirit, to an ever more consecrated adherence to the Word and will of God."

We understand that this represents the outcome of difficult and delicate negotiations within our sister synod. We also understand that any attempt at interference or at exerting pressure on our part would be definitely out of order, especially since the announcement makes it clear that the issues are not yet finally disposed of.

Since such negotiations are still going on, however, it may not be out of place to point to one phase which in our judgment has not been covered in this agreement. In a previous issue of the *Quartalschrift* (January, 1946, page 62), we drew attention to the fact that according to its content "A Statement" must be considered a partisan document, representing 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 Romans 16:17 to the problem of Lutheran Union, and similar matters. For this reason we held that the judgments voiced in the "Accompanying Letter" would be read as applying to those who do not share the views of the signers on this closely related group of issues. This has actually been the result. Any withdrawal of "A Statement" and "The Accompanying Letter" as a basis of discussion should therefore also include a specific declaration by which the stigma of uncharitableness and legalism is removed from those who may hold different views on this particular group of issues which, after all, are still before the Church for discussion. Only thus will the offense be removed.

E. REIM.

Dr. Behnken at the American Lutheran Conference: — In our last number, we presented the major part of Dr. Behnken's address on "Fellowship among Lutherans" on the occasion of the American Lutheran Conference convention at Rockford, Illinois. In commenting

on this address, we expressed our support of his position on the prerequisites of Lutheran union. Herewith we present the remainder of his address.

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

"I have mentioned these things because I deeply feel the spiritual distress of the people in the land where once stood the cradle of the Reformation. I shall never be able to erase from my memory the classic welcome address delivered to us by Bishop Meiser before a

group of fifty Pfarrer and many laymen in which he referred to the help given our Lutherans by Pfarrer Loehe and the Bavarians about a hundred years ago and how he then turned to me and said, 'Now the tables are turned. Now we are begging; and we plead that you do not fail us.' What a fervent touching plea! Can we, dare we fail them? I might as well ask, Is the cause of Lutheranism dear to us? If it is we Lutherans in America should unite on the basis of sound Biblical doctrine and Scriptural practice. That is the only proper kind of Lutheran unity. Then we would be able to enjoy wholehearted fellowship among Lutherans in America. Then we would be in a position to cooperate wholeheartedly and could unitedly help fellow Lutherans in Europe to withstand the avalanche of Calvinism which threatens such destruction in this hour of crisis."

* * * *

In our previous issue we stated that we completely support Dr. Behnken's position, namely, that doctrinal unity must remain the indispensable pre-requisite for Lutheran Union (page 70). We do feel constrained, however, to make a number of specific observations. These are not meant to nullify our previous approval of Dr. Behnken's basic position, but are called for by the circumstances under which these words were spoken.

1. While some church papers, particularly of the American Lutheran Conference, have criticized this address for its content, others have simply spoken of the fact that this was the first occasion when the presidents of three major Lutheran bodies appeared on the same platform and have hailed this as an evidence of progress. For this reason we feel that a testimony of silence would have been even more effective than the correct statement which was made at Rockford. It would have stood for everything that is sound in this address and would not have lent itself to this misinterpretation which has been applied to the action of President Behnken.
2. While we endorse President Behnken's position that doctrinal unity is the indispensable pre-requisite for Lutheran union and agree with him that cooperative efforts among Lutherans may spell compromise, we feel that some of the matters which he counts only as cooperation in externals and of which he says that they are "not to be interpreted as a step toward fellowship, or a method of bringing about fellowship," nevertheless, are having precisely this effect. We refer, for instance, to cooperation among Lutherans in welfare work, in the field of church publicity, the Inter-Seminarian movement, the Scout Program, editors' conferences and the like.

- 3 We can understand the closing plea that Lutherans in America should unite on the basis of sound biblical doctrine and scriptural practice in order to be in a position to exert a joint influence against Calvinism in Lutheranism's hour of crisis in Europe. But we feel that against the background of the preceding paragraph, particularly the letter from Dr. Bodensieck, the representative of the American Lutheran Conference in Europe, this plea for the proper kind of Lutheran unity will appear as something that ought to be effected almost immediately in order to be of value for this particular situation. Realism will compel one to recognize that the achievement of true Lutheran unity involves so much in the way of removing false doctrine and practice, that we can not hope to reap the fruits of it for this immediate situation. To force this development for the sake of the immediate aim, would be to defeat its own purpose. E. REIM.

The President's Promise. — In reply to a petition adopted January 22 by the Baptists' Executive Committee urging President Truman to fulfill his promise at the earliest possible date concerning the termination of Myron Taylor's mission to the Vatican the U. S. Department of State advised the Southern Baptist Convention through its Executive Committee as follows:

"At his press conference on June 14, 1946, President Truman corrected reports to the effect that he had told the group of Protestant leaders that Mr. Taylor's mission would be recalled after the signing of the Italian peace treaty. He indicated the mission was temporary and when its purpose in assisting in the establishment of peaceful conditions throughout the world has been accomplished, no official representing the President of the United States would be sent to the Vatican. Mr. Taylor has never been appointed as ambassador or other diplomatic officer of the United States nor has his presence at the Vatican as personal representative of the President established a United States embassy there."

In releasing the text of the letter to the Baptist press, Dr. McCall, executive secretary of the Baptists' Executive Committee, noted, according to "Religious News Service" (March 3, 1947), that "this interpretation eliminates all definite means of dating the termination of Mr. Taylor's mission to the Vatican." P. PETERS.

A Tribute to Luther. — Professor John Sherren Brewer was an editor of the monumental "Letters and Papers" and thus knew the raw material from which histories are written, and he put forth "The Reign of Henry VIII", from which we cull the following uncommon tribute to Luther.

There is a profound remark by Lord Bacon on the inefficiency of the scholastic method, and its tendency to propagate error. "Were it not better," he says, "for a man in a fair room to set up one great light . . . than to go about with a small watch candle into every corner? For," he observes, "as you carry the light into one corner you darken the rest." As the candle travels in succession from question to question, the ghosts of dead errors revive in the dark, and are invested with gigantic proportions. That central light which reason could not supply, Luther claimed for faith, as the sun of reason. And here I may be allowed to remark on the close analogy in the mental pose of Luther and Bacon; with this difference — that whilst the latter was exclusively interested with the relation of man to nature and her kingdom, Luther's sole concern was the relation of man to God and the Kingdom of Heaven. In both there was the same intense dislike for abstract speculation, however ingenious: the same distrust of the mere intellectual powers; the same hatred of Aristotle and the habits of thought engendered by the study of the Greek philosopher. That *nuditas animi*, which Bacon considered indispensable for the successful prosecution of natural knowledge, was with Luther a necessary condition for religious truth. "Knowledge," says Bacon, "is the double of that which is"; and the highest perfection of man is to reflect exactly, not his own thoughts, but the external realities of nature. So in Luther's conception, the perfect righteousness of man is the mere and passive mirror of the righteousness of God, which is revealed in those who are willing to accept it by faith. But though both of these philosophers insisted upon the worthlessness of our human powers *per se* — though both asserted that man has nothing but what he receives, and God's goodness and grace are infinite — they never supposed that it was indifferent how that goodness was sought; or that a wrong method of seeking it, however laborious or conscientious, could be crowned with success. Wrong methods of investigation in the natural world lead only to error and confusion. So it is in the world of grace. "Claudus in via antevertit cursorem extra viam" (The lame on the track beats the runner off the track), observes Lord Bacon; a truth which Luther repeats in his own particular phraseology again and again. It was this conviction, and his strong sense of the mischief occasioned by the opposite error, which lent such force and energy to his language. It was the wrong method of the popular religion, more than the barrenness, despondency, and immorality engendered by it, which seemed so heinous to him, and worthy of the severest denunciations.

If this account be true, he must be accorded the position of a great and original thinker. He was not, like many of his contemporaries a denouncer of errors merely — a Thor with a hammer of destruction of more than usual power and pretension, as he is so often represented; but the constructive side of his teaching is not less important than the rules of inductive philosophy are to his scientific well-being.

Popular writers are fond of insisting on the more obvious side of his character — on his courage, his homeliness, his broad humor — overlooking the influence of his scholastic training, his logical acuteness, his love of foiling his opponents with their own weapons — weapons which he had learned to wield with more ability than they. For no man was better versed than he in the writings of the schoolmen, none knew better than he their weakest points, their most flagrant contradictions. For the few grains of precious ore that might perchance be found he had, with unslaked thirst and unbiassed assiduity, turned over and sifted the controversial dust-heaps of the day. Everywhere he shows himself much better versed in that learning he is accused of impugning than his opponents who undertake to defend it. He is more at home with the Canonists than the cardinals themselves; more familiar than the most approved teachers of his time with the subjects of their teaching. For between him and them there was this vital difference — of men who had painfully toiled with no higher motive than professional responsibility, or desire of fame, and the fainting wretch, sick with the love of truth, who must die to find it, indifferent to all other considerations. That truth exists, that it is to be found, that it passes all price, is the spur to exertion in such men. It is the sustaining energy against their own weakness and hesitation, the opposition of the world, the serried ranks of prejudice and error, the clouds and darkness which seem to settle down at midday on their plainest path. That is the faith of all great pioneers for truth — a faith afterwards enunciated by Luther in terms more precise and theological, but which was working in him, perhaps unconsciously, long before his controversy with Tetzel or his rejection of the papal authority.

It is clear from the writings of Luther himself during these three years, and still more his most celebrated work *De Captivitate Babylonica*, that he did not rest his teaching on the moral, but the theological aspect of the questions in dispute. To the latter, not to the former phase, was it indebted for its popularity. It might be a more than Babylonish captivity, that the Church should disfigure the doctrine of the Sacraments; that it should determine of its own authority their nature, and the mode of their administration; should give them here, and withhold them there, as a tyrant over God's heritage: but the immorality consisted in the slavery, not in the consequences to which that slavery had led — in the confusion between things divine and human, with which the Pope for his own purposes had succeeded in perplexing the consciences of men.

The dispute with Tetzel might have been forgiven; the burning of the Pope's bulls might have been attributed to the rude and rough extravagance of the German; but Luther's attack on the cardinal doctrine of Sacrifice — interwoven as it was, not merely with the accepted theology of the day, but with all that was lovely and attractive, in the self-abasement, loyalty, and devotion of the old world — could not be mistaken, or its purpose overlooked. The sentence had gone forth to the world that all

sacrifice had been abolished in the one great sacrifice, all action absorbed in one great suffering and satisfaction. It was more blessed to believe than do, to receive than to give; for the empty hands of faith were more acceptable in God's sight than the full hecatombs of charity. Christendom stood aghast; its deepest emotions were roused. Not only was the veil rudely torn away from the sanctuary it had hitherto regarded with distant awe and unquestioning reverence, but that sanctuary itself and its services were now held up to the world as no better than a whited sepulchre, the court of Death, the stronghold of Antichrist. Vol. I, pp. 598-601.

W. DALLMANN.

Illusions of Liberal Protestantism. — According to the *Lutheran Standard* for September 14, 1946, Dr. Latourette, professor of missions at Yale, thinks that Christianity is on the threshold of its greatest period in its history. He bases his illusion on the 'wonderful spirit of cooperation among the liberal Protestants'. He wrongfully deduces the following: "All this leads one to feel that we are living in the youth of the Christian Church and that great days are ahead. The stream of Christianity is more and more flowing through the Protestant rather than the Roman Catholic Church. The reason for this is that the main strength of the Roman Catholic Church is in western Europe. But western Europe is in a state of decay from which it will never fully recover."

This is a purely historical interpretation and deduction based on false premises and not on the clear truths of Scriptures. Here we have the full fruit of evolutionistic liberal Protestant thinking. If the professor of missions had merely analyzed the history of missions correctly he already would have had to come to a different conclusion. He would have had to admit that the main forces of Protestantism are on the decline because they are not united due to their drifting away from their original source. Liberal Protestantism is hopelessly adrift in the seas of worldly endeavors seeking to rebuild this world according to a false social gospel. There are as many opinions prevalent as there are liberal theologians. They admit that they do not agree in matters of doctrine and try in vain to agree in matters of life, and the Devil sees to it that they remain in disagreement so that his harvest may be the more plentiful.

Dr. Latourette above all reveals that he is woefully ignorant of the truths of Scriptures concerning the Church, the invisible as well as the visible. To him the Bible is a book sealed with seven seals. He draws false conclusions from misleading premises and symptoms within visible Christendom. From a mere study of church history of today he ought to know that Rome may have to yield to Soviet predominance in western Europe for a time and that its real sphere of influence lies in the Western Hemisphere. Even though Rome may have to contend for the 'Eternal City', the seat of the Papacy, in its struggle with the Soviets for power, its main sphere of activity is in the West with its many material

resources to fill the coffers of the insatiable Roman clergy and with its possibilities of missionary expansion and worldly influence. Rome is gaining in impetus in our United States in numbers as well as in politics. Influential positions in public life are filled by Romanists, and Catholic Action, that powerful force of the Roman Catholic laity and sad counterfeiter of the royal priesthood of all believers, is exerting its disastrous influence everywhere while the Protestants in the main are fast asleep and do not even believe that there is any danger, when aroused out of their drowsiness. They prefer to believe in the harmless nature of Romanism. Rome is exerting a strong influence in our country through its widespread system of education from the graded school to the university. Italian saints are transported to our shores, and our public is led to believe that our country, too, has a real saint now to be proud of. Catholic Action strongly influences legislation as we see it in their propaganda for bus service for their children at the expense of the taxpayer.

In spite of all of these undeniable facts, Latourette is of the opinion that the influence of Rome is waning because it is seemingly not as strong in Europe today as formerly. He is not aware that the pope at present is very busy in seeking allies to help him fight his battles against Sovietism. Both England and our own United States are again being drawn into this struggle for supremacy. Religious issues are in the background of the struggle that is in the making. It is not a struggle for truths of Scripture, which need no sword for their defense. It is a struggle of worldly church powers for supremacy against the ungodly powers of this world. It is a sad illusion of liberal Protestantism to underestimate the claims and the power of Roman Catholicism in Europe and elsewhere. The Pope is endeavoring to harness western imperialism to his political cart to fight Soviet expansion, which is a real threat to his own sphere of influence in Europe and also in the rest of the world.

Latourette, of course, is blind to the fact revealed in Scripture that the Church of the Antichrist will remain till the end of time and finally be destroyed by the coming of Christ for judgment (2. Thess. 2:8). Rome will continue to exist and play a dominant role in world politics not because of any intrinsic superiority which it always claims to possess, but because it is the Church of the Antichrist. Since Latourette does not believe this, he cannot interpret the history of the Church and of the world correctly. He lacks the true key to the understanding of both. Rome, to be sure, is not passing out as some liberal Protestants would have us believe. It is as strong and as deceitful as ever.

While Rome will continue because it is the Church of the Antichrist, Protestantism will definitely not be heading for greater days. It will not supersede the Church of Rome in the West, neither in Europe nor in our country. Unionistic endeavors and outward cooperation are no signs of strength but rather of inner weakness and decay. The attempt for instance to unite the Low Church Movement of the Episcopal Church with the

Presbyterian is no sign of strength. The former doctrinal strength of the older church bodies has disappeared. Otherwise they would seek no fusion.

Similar endeavors between the liberal Lutheran church bodies reveal the same inner weakness. Outward cooperation of such bodies is a definite sign of inner weakness. It is a regrettable fact that even the Lutheran Church in our country, to which God granted such a fine opportunity to unfold in our land of religious liberty and separation of church and state, is showing grave signs of inner weakness and decay. Must we not be alarmed at similar symptoms within our conservative Lutheran Church? The world is growing old, but not better. According to God's clock it is the hour of midnight and not the dawn of a new era of successful and dominant Protestantism. The wishful thinking of liberal Protestants lacks Scriptural ground. Dark days lie ahead for the true visible church. The liberal visible churches will keep on busying themselves with ever new combinations of church groups to make themselves and the world believe that they are a living and potent force. The true church will always be a small, despised, and even hated flock. Let us steer clear of enthusiasm and dangerous illusions and beware of the Fata Morgana of greater days ahead.

H. A. KOCH.

„Gottes Werk in Deutschland“. — So wird eine Reihe von Berichten überschrieben, von denen wir den dritten vor kurzem erhalten haben, der am 3. Februar 1947 verfaßt und von dem Stellvertretenden Präses der Evgl. Luth. Freikirche in Deutschland unterzeichnet worden ist. Dieser Bericht gründet sich auf die Verhandlungen der **Wiesbadener Tagung**, die vom 21. bis 31. Januar d. J. in der teilweise zerstörten Stadt Wiesbaden stattgefunden hat. Ueber 50 Personen, Pastoren und Delegierte, haben an dieser Tagung teilgenommen. Wegen der außerordentlich schwierigen Verkehrs- und Wohnungsverhältnisse sind in diesen 10 Tagen drei geplante Tagungen zusammengelegt worden. Zum ersten Mal seit Ende des Krieges konnte der Allgemeine Präses, Pastor P. G. Petersen, Berlin, die Reiseerlaubnis von der Besatzungsbehörde erhalten, um an einer Synode in einer der westlichen Zonen Deutschlands teilzunehmen. Nachdem diesem Bericht zufolge über die finanzielle Lage der Freikirche, das Allgemeine Flüchtlingswerk, das Kollegium für Lutherisches Schrifttum, wie auch über die neue Theologische Hochschule berichtet worden war, wurde die übrige Zeit der Tagung mit Einigungsverhandlungen zugebracht. Hierüber schreibt Pastor Stallmann wie folgt: „Die meiste Zeit unserer Wiesbadener Tagung war durch die **Einigungsverhandlungen** ausgefüllt. Ein Teil der kleineren lutherischen Freikirchen, die Hannoverische, die Hamburg-Hermannsburger und die Hessische Freikirche hat sich vor Weihnachten zu der ‚Selbständigen Ev.-Luth. Kirche in Hessen und Niedersachsen‘ zusammengeschlossen. Dadurch sind die Verhandlungen mit diesen drei Freikirchen z. Bt. ins Stocken geraten. Wir hoffen jedoch, daß, sobald unsere Verhandlungen mit der Ev.-Luth. Kirche Altpreußens (Breslauer Freikirche) zu einem günstigen Abschluß gekommen sind, wir auch wieder zu Besprechungen mit ihnen kommen.“

„In den westlichen Zonen war es uns wegen der günstigeren Verhältnisse möglich, im Laufe des vergangenen Jahres in wiederholten Zusammenkünften und Konferenzen zahlreicher Pastoren beider Freikirchen die wichtigsten Lehren des göttlichen Wortes durchzusprechen, besonders diejenigen, über welche im Lauf der Zeit Lehrunterschiede bestanden haben. Wie sich immer mehr herausstellt, war auf beiden Seiten ein Verlangen, sich in dieser Zeit gemeinsamer Trübsale näherzutreten und die Wände, welche vor langen Jahren zum Teil bestanden hatten und zerrissen waren, wieder anzuknüpfen. Der Gründer unserer ersten Gemeinde, der selige Pfarrer Friedrich Brunn in Steeden, hat 13 Jahre lang von 1852 bis 1865 der Breslauer Freikirche angehört. Nur mit schwerem Herzen und unter großer Gewissensnot hatte er sich damals von dieser Kirche getrennt. Die Wurzeln, aus denen die beiden Freikirchen erwachsen sind, nämlich der entschiedene Kampf gegen die falsche Union und den kirchlichen Rationalismus, sind dieselben gewesen, und die längst heimgegangenen Gründer beider Kirchen haben dasselbe Ziel gehabt, reine und gesunde lutherische Gemeinden zu bauen auf dem Grunde des unverbrüchlichen Gotteswortes. Deshalb ist es natürlich, daß jetzt auf beiden Seiten der Wunsch besteht, eine Einigung herzustellen. Daß es dabei infolge der verschiedenen Stellung zu den lutherischen Landeskirchen, der verschiedenen Vorbildung der Theologen und der mancherlei Gefahren irriger Lehre zu Schwierigkeiten bei den Einigungsbestrebungen kommt, die nur mit Gottes Hilfe und gründlicher, sorgfältiger Vertiefung in Gottes Wort überwunden werden können, ist klar. In den westlichen Zonen ist es möglich gewesen, diese eingehende theologische Arbeit zu tun. Sonderlich sind folgende wichtige Lehren des göttlichen Wortes eingehend erörtert worden: Von der Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift, dem einzigen Erkenntnisprinzip aller Theologie und christlichen Wahrheit, von Befehring und Gnadenwahl, von Kirche, Kirchenregiment und Predigtamt und von den letzten Dingen. Gott hat zu den Verhandlungen Gnade gegeben, daß wir in diesen Lehrstücken einig wurden. Die Aufgabe der Wiesbadener Tagung war es nun insonderheit, ein ausführlicheres Lehrodokument zusammenzustellen. Diese Arbeit wurde von je drei Theologen aus jeder Kirche in sechs Tagen in Angriff genommen; von der Breslauer Kirche waren es die Kirchenräte Dr. Günther, Elberfeld, Liz. Schulz, Berlin, und Pastor Heingelmann, Essen, von unserer Kirche außer Präses Petersen, der auf allseitigen Wunsch teilnahm, Vizepräses Stallmann, Pfarrer W. Desch und Pfarrer G. Herrmann. Das ausgearbeitete Lehrodokument, die sogen. ‚Wiesbadener Sätze‘, wurde in den letzten Tagen, als die meisten Pastoren beider Freikirchen aus den westlichen Zonen versammelt waren, öffentlich verlesen und soll allen Gemeinden und Pastoren zum eingehenden Studium und zur Stellungnahme übersandt werden.

„In der soeben erwähnten größeren gemeinsamen Konferenz, mit der die Wiesbadener Tagung abschloß, wurde weiterhin in mehreren Referaten von Vertretern beider Kirchen über die Stellung der Freikirchen zu der EKD, der Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands, in welcher alle Landeskirchen, die

unierten, reformierten und — leider Gottes — auch die ‚lutherischen‘ zusammengeschlossen sind, ausführlich gehandelt. Das kirchliche Verhältnis der lutherischen Freikirchen zu den lutherischen Landeskirchen, sowie zu den in ihren Gebieten bestehenden Missionen, Bünden und kirchlichen Werken ist von großer Bedeutung für die Bekenntnisstellung der Freikirchen. Es wurde volle Einmütigkeit darüber erzielt, daß jeder schriftwidrige Unionismus nicht nur eine offenbare Sünde, sondern auch ein folgenschwerer Irrweg der Kirche ist, den keine bekennnistreue lutherische Kirche einschlagen darf. Von dieser Grundüberzeugung aus müssen die im einzelnen oft schwierigen Fragen behandelt und gelöst werden.

„In der russischen Zone konnten die Einigungsverhandlungen noch nicht in demselben Umfang durchgeführt werden, weil die Schwierigkeiten des Verkehrs und der Unterbringung ungleich größer sind. Doch sind in Berlin und an einigen anderen Orten schon erfreuliche Ergebnisse erzielt worden. Die sogenannten ‚Berliner Thesen‘, welche dort von beiden Seiten angenommen wurden, und zu denen unser seliger Rektor Martin Willkomm, D. D., seine trefflichen ‚Erläuterungen‘ verfaßt hat, bringen die klare lutherische Lehre in den oben angeführten Schriftwahrheiten zum Ausdruck und wurden bei der Ausarbeitung der ‚Wiesbadener Sätze‘ als Grundlage verwendet. Herr Kirchenrat Liz. Schulz erklärte, daß er sich mit aller Kraft dafür einsetzen wolle, daß auch in der russischen Zone alle Amtsbrüder zu Besprechungen zusammengerufen würden und sie miteinander mit Gottes Hilfe zu demselben Resultat zu kommen gedächten.

„Im Anschluß daran wurde noch darüber gesprochen, wie eine Zusammenarbeit der beiden Freikirchen in den dringend notwendigen allgemeinen kirchlichen Werken (Kirchenblatt, Hochschule, Waisen- und Altersheime und dergleichen) möglich sei.

„Am Schluß der Wiesbadener Tagung wurde mit großem Nachdruck ausgesprochen, daß all unser Tun und Vornehmen umsonst sei, wenn nicht der barmherzige Gott seinen Segen dazu gebe, und daß deshalb neben dem entschiedenen Festhalten an Gottes Wort und Gebot vor allen Dingen das fleißige, unablässige Beten und Flehen zu Gott um seinen Beistand das Entscheidende sein müsse.

„So durften wir mit Dank gegen Gott unsere Besprechungen in Wiesbaden schließen und wieder heimkehren zu neuer vermehrter Arbeit, mit neuem heiligem Eifer und neuer fröhlicher Zuversicht, daß Gott trotz unserer Schwachheit und unserer Sündhaftigkeit mit seiner Gnade bei uns war und auch in Zukunft bei uns sein wird.

Erhalt uns nur bei deinem Wort und wehr des Teufels Trug und Mord!
Sib deiner Kirche Gnad' und Guld, Fried', Einigkeit, Mut und Geduld!

— Nikolaus Selmecker

Mit glaubensbrüderlichen Grüßen

Eure im Herrn verbundene Evangelisch-Lutherische Freikirche.

Im Auftrag

H. r. Sta I l m a n n, Stellv. Präses.“

Wir erwidern hiermit diese Grüße unserer Glaubensbrüder in Deutschland, können wir doch seit einiger Zeit unsere Kirchenblätter und unsere theologische Zeitschrift durch die Post nach drüben schicken, und wünschen ihnen Gottes weiteren Segen zu ihrer vielseitigen Arbeit. P. Peters.

„Der Zukunftsweg der lutherischen Freikirchen.“ — Unter dieser Ueberschrift hat uns Pastor W. M. Desch aus Hörpel, Hannover, die Abschrift eines Vortrages zugesandt, der am Reformationsfest 1946 von Lizentiat Martin Künke aus der Breslauer Freikirche gehalten wurde. Er bietet eine sehr willkommene Ergänzung zu dem Schreiben des Breslauer Oberkirchenkollegiums an die Bischöfe der lutherischen Landeskirchen in Bayern, Hannover und Mecklenburg, das unter der Ueberschrift „Breslaus Bekenntnis“ in der vorigen Nummer der *Quartalschrift* erschienen ist. Hatte dieses die gegenwärtige Stellung der Ev.-Luth. Kirche in Preußen zu den drei „lutherischen“ Landeskirchen klar zum Ausdruck gebracht, so enthält der folgende Reformationsfestvortrag Breslaus Bekenntnis zum „*Unreilutherium*“, welches sich seiner eigenen Glaubenshaltung kraftvoll bewußt ist“. Mit diesem Bekenntnis will Breslau mit den übrigen reallutherischen Freikirchen Deutschlands und in enger Zusammenarbeit mit dem konfessionsbewußten amerikanischen Luthertum eine konfessionelle Front gegen die „Entchristlichung und Entkirchlichung“ Deutschlands einerseits und gegen eine „bekenntniswidrige Union“ andererseits bilden. Ueber diesen Zukunftsweg der lutherischen Freikirchen unterrichtet uns aufs klarste dieser Vortrag von Liz. theol. Martin Künke.

1.

Der Zukunftsweg der lutherischen Freikirchen.

Es war im Jahre 1842, da wurde Wilhelm Hengstenberg in Berlin durch eine Aufsehen erregende Neuerung innerhalb des deutschen Luthertums so bewegt, daß er dazu nicht nur den Kopf schüttelte wie viele gut lutherisch Gesinnte in damaliger Zeit, sondern seine Feder zur Hand nahm und sein zornbeladenes Gemüt durch einen Schriftsatz erleichterte. Er schrieb in seinem angesehenen Blatt, der Evangelischen Kirchenzeitung:

„Das Oberkirchenkollegium der Ev.-Luth. Kirche in Preußen hat jüngst die Beschlüsse der . . . 1841 zu Breslau gehaltenen Generalsynode zum Druck befördert und in dieser vor irgendwelcher Anerkennung der ordentlichen Obrigkeit erfolgten Promulgation eine Anmaßlichkeit an den Tag gelegt, die seiner Sache nur Schaden kann, weil, wer sich selbst erhöht, sich mehr erniedrigt als erhöht. Von diesen neuen Lutheranern wird bekanntlich nicht, wie von sämtlichen altlutherischen Theologen, die Obrigkeit neben dem geistlichen und häuslichen Stande (*ordo*) in der Kirche anerkannt. Sie erkennen gegenteils (wie namentlich auch Rudelbach) nur zwei Stände, den der Lehrer und Hörer, der Geistlichen und Laien an, unter welchen letzteren die obrigkeitlichen Personen sich als In-

dividuen verlieren; ja, eine einseitige Ulgierung des neueren Kollegialsystems und Opponierung gegen das Stimmrecht der Obrigkeit des Staates auch in der Kirche gehört zu den charakteristischen Abzeichen dieser „Lutheraner“. (Evangel. Kirchenzeitung 1842, Sp. 727.)

Stengstenberg erlebte die Freude, daß von Bayern her, wo damals das Luthertum zu neuer Größe aufstieg und man die Ereignisse in Preußen zumeist ein wenig anders ansah als er, eine maßgebende Stimme sich erhob, die seine Gemütsaufwallung zu einem Schrei der Entrüstung steigerte. Professor der Theologie **Diskhausen** in Erlangen ließ sich zu derselben Materie also vernehmen:

„So ist also, was wir als möglich besprochen, bereits wirklich geworden! Die lutherische Kirche hat sich, ohne irgendeine Behörde um Erlaubnis zu fragen, zu einem besonderen Körper im Staat konstituiert, hält Generalsynoden — vergibt die Stellen sogar in der Hauptstadt, an wen sie will, kurz regiert souverän! Wer hätte die Steigerung des Fanatismus bis auf diesen Grad für möglich gehalten!“ (Kocholl, Gesch. d. Ev. Kirche in Deutschland. S. 487f.)

Man wird diesen beiden Kirchenmännern des 19. Jahrhunderts ihre unsanften Neuerungen nicht allzu sehr anrechnen können. Denn was die sogenannten schlesischen Lutheraner damals unternahmen, war in der Tat für Deutschland etwas völlig Neues. Dreihundert Jahre hatte die lutherische Kirche ihre kirchliche Organisation — also ihre Leiblichkeit — unter steigender Mithilfe der weltlichen Gewalt empfangen, bis zuletzt die Kirche in den meisten Gebieten geradezu eine Sektion des Staatskörpers geworden war. Man mußte es nicht anders, als daß die lutherische Kirche der Staatsgewalt zum mindesten einen weitgehenden Einfluß auf die Gestaltung ihres Kirchentums einzuräumen hatte. Es war das fast ein ungeschriebenes Dogma. Schon der Gedanke, Kirche gestalten zu wollen, ohne den Staat vorher um Erlaubnis zu fragen und seine Organe in Anspruch zu nehmen, erschien daher als glatter Bruch mit der Geschichte, als etwas ebenso Unerhörtes wie Ungehöriges. Und nun hatten die preußischen Lutheraner gleich nach Beendigung ihres leidvollen Kirchenkampfes dieses Unerhörte und Ungehörige zur Wirklichkeit werden lassen und ein eigenständiges Kirchenwesen aufgebaut, für welches sich die Bezeichnung „Freikirche“ einbürgerte. Das war freilich eine Neuerung, die auf Widerstand stoßen mußte.

Ihre führenden Männer haben sich aber durch all die Stimmen der Warnung und Entrüstung, die sie ertönten, nicht irre machen lassen. Und war das nicht gut? Hat nicht die Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands seit jenen Tagen es mit großer Evidenz gezeigt, daß die lutherische Kirche sich mit ihrem Bekenntnis im eigenen Raum nicht durchsetzen kann, wenn sie gleichsam zur Miete wohnt; wenn sie keine eigenständige Lebensform besitzt, die, von außerkirchlichen Gewalten unabhängig, nur aus den Motiven des Be-

kenntnisses heraus und um des Bekenntnisses willen gestaltet ist? Und hat nicht die allgemeine Entwicklung dazu geführt, daß seit einiger Zeit auch die Landeskirchen sich mehr und mehr der freikirchlichen Lebensgestalt — freilich unter allerlei Schmerzen — annähern müssen? Die Äußerungen des Kirchenmannes Hengstenberg und des Theologen Olshausen sind unter die vielen Kuriositäten der Kirchengeschichte eingegangen, über die man heute lächelt. Was aber die gering geachteten preußischen Lutheraner seinerzeit unter so heftigem Widerspruch Neues gestaltet haben, hat sich als wirksamer Faktor in der Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands erwiesen und gilt längst nicht wenigen als selbstverständliche Forderung der Kirche.

2.

Heute ist wiederum eine kirchliche Lage entstanden, welche für das deutsche Luthertum die dringende Nötigung enthält, ein Neues werden zu lassen, eine neue Stufe in der Entwicklung des kirchlichen Lebens zu erreichen. Warum? Nicht so sehr darum, weil tiefgreifende Wandlungen auf dem Gebiet des staatlichen Lebens sich vollzogen haben — das erfordert freilich auch manches Neue. Auch nicht so sehr darum, weil die Kirche in Deutschland allerlei Erfahrungen gesammelt hat, welche chaotische Zustände durch Irrlehren, die von politischen Mächten getragen sind, in ihr angerichtet werden können — auch hier gilt es freilich, die Konsequenzen daraus zu ziehen. Was aber mit viel stärkerer Nötigung das deutsche Luthertum zur Gestaltung eines Neuen drängt, sind zwei andere Dinge.

Erstens die ungeheure Entchristlichung und Entkirchlichung in dem Lande, in welchem die lutherische Kirche geboren ist und eine mehr als vierhundertjährige Arbeit getrieben hat. Diese Christusfremdheit im Lande der Reformation müßte ja weit mehr als Problem empfunden werden, als das der Fall ist. Sie bedeutet doch eine furchtbare Anklage gegen die Kirche der lutherischen Reformation und ihre Wirksamkeit in vier Jahrhunderten. Oder wollte sich jemand mit der Anschauung beruhigen, daß eben der Geschichtslauf immer schneller dem Ende der Welt entgegensteilt und es darum nicht anders sein kann, als daß das Antichristentum ständig größere Kreise an sich zieht? Diese Einrede wäre doch allzu bequem. Hat nicht die Kirche unter anderen Völkern weit mehr das Vordringen der antichristlichen Geistesmächte und vor allem das Eindringen des Glaubensabfalls in die eigenen Reihen aufzuhalten vermocht als in Deutschland? Es muß doch im deutschen Luthertum etwas nicht stimmen, wenn große Kirchengebiete dieser Konfession zum überwiegenden Teil aus christusfremden Massen bestehen und lebendige, glaubenserfüllte Gemeinden sich nur in geringer Zahl in ihnen befinden. Die wenigen Ausnahmen, die gewiß vorhanden sind, ändern hier nicht viel an dem Gesamtbild. Was fehlt dem deutschen Luthertum, daß solche Verhältnisse sich eben herausbilden können?

Was in gleicher Weise gebieterisch eine Neugestaltung im deutschen Luthertum verlangt, ist das Vordringen des **Calvinismus**, wobei hier unter Calvinismus nicht nur die reformierte Kirche im engeren Sinne, sondern alle

kirchlichen Gebilde und Richtungen verstanden sind, welche ganz oder zum großen Teil in reformierten Glaubensanschauungen und Kraftfeldern ihre Wurzeln haben: die Barthianer und Kryptocalvinisten in den lutherischen Landeskirchen, die B. K. mit ihren Bruderräten, die zahlreichen pietistisch oder methodistisch orientierten Kreise mit ihrem Drängen zur Union und schließlich die Menge der Sektten, der kleinen und der großen.

Eigentümlich, wie wenig man im deutschen Luthertum die ungeheure Gefahr sieht, die hier droht. Hat nicht die lutherische Kirche in Deutschland im Laufe der Jahrhunderte bereits einige Invasionen des Calvinismus im großen Stil erlebt und dadurch schwerste Verluste erlitten? Welche Fortschritte hat reformierte Lehre und Kirchentum in den Jahren vor und nach 1600 gemacht, als Pareus und Ursinus in Heidelberg lehrten, als Anhalt und Hessen durch ihre Fürsten reformierte Professoren und Prediger erhielten und ein wenig später die Hohenzollern den lutherischen Glauben mit dem calvinistischen vertauschten, um das Erbrecht auf Jülich, Cleve und Berg zu erhalten! Zahlreiche Calvinisten hatten sich in jenen Jahrzehnten in rein lutherische Gebiete von Kurpfalz bis nach Pommern, von Bayern bis nach Holstein und Hamburg eingeschlichen und verfolgten dort von ihren Schlüsselstellungen aus mit Zähigkeit ihre Ziele. Und was war denn im Grunde die Aufrichtung von Unionskirchen in Preußen, in Hessen, in Baden, Anhalt und der Pfalz im ersten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts anderes als eine Folge von Siegen reformierten Denkens und reformierter Kirchenpolitik auf dem Hintergrund der zu Ende gehenden Aufklärung! Denn das Reformiertentum profitiert von der Union, das Luthertum aber stirbt daran. Ist es nun wirklich so schwer zu erkennen, daß der Calvinismus heute, ja schon zwischen dem ersten und zweiten Weltkriege, zu einer neuen Invasion größten Ausmaßes angeferzt hat? auf dem Gebiete der Theologie, nicht minder auf dem der Kirchenpolitik und der Neugestaltung der kirchlichen Verhältnisse?

Was will der Calvinismus (immer in der oben angegebenen umfassenden Bedeutung des Wortes) heute? Er hat ein großes, ein edles Ziel! Die Wiedergewinnung Deutschlands für den christlichen Glauben, die Stärkung der evangelischen Kirchen unseres Landes in jeder Beziehung, die Lebendigmachung der einzelnen christlichen Gemeinden. Und es ist nicht etwa nur der Calvinismus Deutschlands oder der Schweiz, der hier eifrig arbeitet; auch die großen calvinisch bestimmten Kirchenkörper Amerikas gehen mehr und mehr daran, ihren Einfluß und ihre wahrlich nicht geringen Kräfte in Deutschland geltend zu machen. Die Ueberzeugung, von der diese Bestrebungen getragen sind, ist ganz deutlich die: wenn Deutschland — so weit es nicht Gebiet der römischen Kirche ist — wieder christlich werden soll, muß es calvinisch werden!

Die Aussichten aber, mit denen der moderne Calvinismus seine Invasion begonnen hat, sind durchaus günstige. Daß er von Haus aus eine Affinität zur demokratischen Staatsform besitzt, ist ein Plus, welches er heute in seiner Kirchenpolitik natürlich nicht ungenutzt läßt. Daß er in dogmatischer

Sinicht viel weitherziger zu sein und dem Denken des modernen religiösen Menschen mehr entgegenzukommen vermag als konfessionelles Luthertum — man denke etwa nur an die Frage der Abendmahlsgemeinschaft oder die Anschauung von Wort und Sakrament, die den Geist Gottes nicht an diese äußeren Mittel bindet, oder an die Vermengung von Gesetz und Evangelium, welche der begehrten gesellschaftlichen Frömmigkeit weiten Spielraum läßt — gibt ihm einen erheblichen Vorsprung. Vor allem aber ist es die religiöse Aktivität, diese auf Ausbreitung der eigenen Glaubenshaltung gerichtete Anlage und Fähigkeit, die ihm bei der Wiedergewinnung der christusfremden Deutschen und bei der Aufrichtung der evangelischen Kirchentümer zugute kommt.

3.

Von diesen beiden Gegebenheiten aus also: der Entchristlichung und Entkirchlichung unseres Volkes einerseits und der Invasiön des modernen Calvinismus andererseits ergibt sich die Notwendigkeit einer Neugestaltung im deutschen Luthertum. Denn das ist doch wohl klar: wenn es die mannigfachen Gruppen und Kräfte des Calvinismus sein sollten, welche die Wiedererweckung des christlichen Glaubens und des kirchlichen Lebens in der Hauptsache vollziehen, dann würde das deutsche Luthertum seine Rolle im Heimatlande der Reformation so ziemlich ausgespielt haben. Der geschichtliche Verlauf gäbe dann dem recht, was die anderen Konfessionen schon längst urteilten: die lutherische Kirche ist im Grunde überflüssig, sie mag verschwinden und denen das Feld überlassen, die es besser können als sie. Soll es so kommen, daß die Kirche, die unser Volk einst nach den äußeren und inneren Verwüstungen des Dreißigjährigen Krieges wieder aufgerichtet, mit neuem Lebensmut erfüllt und durch die Kräfte des Evangeliums hat gesunden lassen, heute anderen Konfessionen diese Aufgabe überlassen muß, weil ihr die Fähigkeiten dazu abhanden gekommen sind?

Vielleicht wird mancher nun einwenden: so groß kann die Gefahr nicht sein. Denn die lutherischen Kirchen in Deutschland umfassen weite Gebiete und zählen nach Millionen von Gliedern. In solchen Kirchenkörpern aber liegt ein natürliches Schwergewicht, das ihnen ihren Einfluß auch anderen Konfessionen gegenüber sichert. Wer so sagt, übersieht ein wichtiges Moment. Die calvinische Invasiön bedroht die lutherischen Kirchen ja nicht nur von außen, sondern vor allem von innen her. Um 1600 arbeiteten die Calvinisten noch mit Gewalt und Zwang. Wo sie an den Höfen die Oberhand gewannen, wurden lutherische Professoren und Pastoren ihres Amtes entsetzt und des Landes verwiesen. Die lutherischen Gemeinden wurden von den päpstlichen Greueln der Bilder in ihren Kirchen und von ihrem lutherischen Gottesdienste gewaltsam befreit. Bei den Siegen, die das Reformiertentum durch die Unionen des 19. Jahrhunderts erfocht, ging es nicht mehr so roh und wild zu, wenngleich der der reformierten Kirche zugehörige Friedrich Wilhelm III. es an allerlei moralischem Druck und schließlich auch an Zwangsmaßnahmen nicht fehlen ließ. Heute erreicht der Calvinismus vollends seine Ziele in feineren Formen. Ihm steht eine Theologie zur Ver-

fügung, die in geschickter Anpassung an das moderne religiöse Empfinden ihres Eindrucks nicht verfehlt. Und seine Kirchenpolitik ist beherrscht von der meisterhaft geübten Kunst, die lutherischen Kirchen in kirchliche Verbindungen hineinzuziehen, die man bislang „Union“ nannte, die man aber, weil dieser Name allmählich als belasteter empfunden wird, gern bereit ist, auch anders zu bezeichnen. Diese calvinisch bestimmte Kirchenpolitik weiß z. B. sehr genau: wenn lutherische Kirchen sich zu Ranzel- und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft zwischen Lutheranern und Reformierten bekennen oder sie auch nur dulden; wenn sie kirchliche Gemeinschaft mit unierten Kirchenkörpern zu pflegen bereit sind, dann sind die Einfallstore für die allmähliche Durchsetzung reformierter Anschauungen und Ziele bereits geöffnet. Eine solche kirchliche Verbindung ist die in Treysa ins Leben gerufene Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland (EKD). Sie hat von vornherein die Sympathie eines kirchlichen Zeitalters, das sich im ökumenischen Denken zu bewegen gelernt hat und die Frage nach der Einheit um ein Vielfaches höher stellt als die Frage nach der Wahrheit. Diese Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland soll keine Kirche sein (ihr Unionscharakter würde sonst vor aller Augen sichtbar), sie soll nur ein Kirchenbund oder eine kirchliche Gemeinschaft sein, die so großzügig ist, daß sie den Einzelkirchen gestattet, sich zu konfessionellen Gebilden zusammenzuschließen. Aber eins wird dabei streng festgehalten: ein bekenntnismäßiger Zusammenschluß von Teilkirchen darf immer nur unter der Voraussetzung sich vollziehen, daß die Einheit der EKD dadurch nicht zerstört wird, also die in ihrer Geburtsurkunde verkündete „kirchlich gegründete innere Einheit“, wie sie „zuerst auf den Bekenntnisynoden in Barmen, Dahlem und Augsburg sichtbar geworden“ ist, sich in jeder Weise entfalten kann. Wann wird man erkennen, daß dies die Form der Union in der Mitte des 20. Jahrhunderts ist, durch die der moderne Calvinismus sich die breiteste Basis für seine Invasion geschaffen hat und noch schafft?

Im Zusammenhang mit der über Deutschland hereingebrochenen Katastrophe ist der große Kirchenkörper der altpreussischen Union insanken geraten. In nicht geringen Teilen der lutherischen Landeskirchen scheint man dieses Ereignis dahin zu verstehen, daß nun die von der Union her drohende Gefahr keine ernstliche mehr sei. Aber ist denn mit der Schwächung eines Kirchenkörpers, der in besonderem Maße Exponent der Union war, oder — wenn es dazu kommen sollte — mit der „Auflösung“ der Union in Preußen die Geistesmacht der Union selbst geschwunden? Das kann doch nur der meinen, dem es an Tiefe des geschichtlichen Denkens fehlt. Was seit 400 Jahren die deutsche Kirchengeschichte in Wellenbewegungen begleitet hat: dieses Ringen der calvinischen Mächte und Gruppen, sich irgendwie das Luthertum zu assimilieren, um es dadurch seines eigentümlichen Evangeliumsverständnisses zu berauben, das verschwindet doch nicht plötzlich aus der religiösen Geistesgeschichte eines Volkes. Es sucht sich vielmehr eine dem Wandel der Zeiten entsprechend umgeformte Gestalt, in der es weiter lebt und wirkt. Diese neue Gestalt des Unionsgedankens haben wir in einer das ganze evangelische Deutschland umfassenden Einheitskirche, wie sie bereits

1933 unter Beimischung politischer Motive errichtet wurde und heute nach 1945 in anderer Form wiederholt wird, vor uns. Es hat sich hier also mit dem Wandel der geschichtlichen Erscheinungsform zugleich eine Ausdehnung der Union auf die Kirchengebiete der lutherischen Landeskirchen vollzogen. Kein Geringerer als unser D. Kocholl hat diese Entwicklung bereits um die Jahrhundertwende aus seinem tiefinnerlichen Verstehen der treibenden Kräfte der Kirchengeschichte heraus vorausgesagt.

Wie unzureichend aber muß dieses Verstehen heute sein, daß eine ganz harmlose Beurteilung des Unionskirchenverbandes der EKD in den lutherischen Landeskirchen so weit um sich greifen kann! Man sieht offenbar gar nicht, daß die lutherischen Landeskirchen durch ihre Mitgliedschaft in der EKD noch mehr zum Aufmarschgebiet bekenntnisfremder, vor allem calvinischer Einflüsse werden müssen, als sie es bisher schon sind. Man erkennt auch nicht, daß der erfreulichen Neubeginnung auf das lutherische Bekenntnis, die jetzt gewisse Teile dieser Kirchen erfaßt hat, die Entfaltung in der Zukunft verbaut und sie von vornherein dem Schicksal einer Uebergangsercheinung ausgesetzt wird. Dabei zeigt die Kirchengeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts mit eindringlicher Deutlichkeit, was einem bekenntnisbewußten Luthertum bevorsteht, wenn es in einem Unionskirchenverband sich bewegen muß. Waren nicht um die Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts die von der Erneuerungsbewegung herkommenden lutherischen Kreise innerhalb der preussischen Union so stark, daß sich kühne Hoffnungen für die Umgestaltung dieser größten deutschen Landeskirche daran knüpften? Und was ist daraus geworden? Die Geschichte der sogenannten Vereinslutheraner zeigt das traurige Bild eines ständigen Zurückweichens vor den bekenntnisfremden Gewalten, mit denen man in einem Kirchenverband weiter leben zu müssen glaubte, und als Folge davon ein bedauerliches Versickern oder Verkümmern der eigenen einst so siegesgewissen Glaubenshaltung. Echtes Luthertum kann nun einmal in einem von calvinischen Einflüssen irgendwelcher Art durchströmten Kraftfeld — und das ist jeder Unionskirchenverband — nicht gedeihen. Das geht ihm ans Leben. Wenn vor einiger Zeit die Landeskirche Württembergs sich ganz auf die Seite der EKD gestellt und darum sich endgültig von den Bestrebungen, ein corpus Lutheranorum in Gestalt der VELK aufzurichten, distanziert hat, so nimmt das nicht wunder. Ist doch das einst treu lutherische Württemberg seit langem Heimat pietistischer und anderer unionsfreundlicher Interessen geworden. Wenn aber Landeskirchen wie Bayern und Hannover, die den Anspruch auf Führung in dem Ringen um lutherische Kirche in Deutschland erheben, ihre positive Stellung zur EKD in unerträglicher Spannung mit ihrem eigentlichen kirchlichen Ziel beibehalten, ja in amtlichen Erklärungen festlegen, dann fragt man sich doch verwundert, wie man von dieser Basis aus den Kampf gegen die bekenntnisfremden Kraftfelder zu bestehen gedenkt, denen man sich zu gleicher Zeit mehr oder weniger ausliefert. Auf solche Weise kann das deutsche Luthertum die Invasion des Calvinismus jedenfalls nicht abschlagen.

Daraus ergibt sich die eine Seite dessen, was mit gebieterischer Not-

wendigkeit Neues zu gestalten ist. Wir haben endlich ein lutherisches Kirchentum nötig, das gegen jeden Unionismus und dem hinter ihm stehenden Calvinismus *i m m u n* ist; ein **Oneioliuthertum**, welches sich seiner eigenen Glaubenshaltung kraftvoll bewußt ist, so daß es bekennniswidrige Union auch unter Tarnungen sogleich erkennt und sie entschlossen abweist; ein Luther-tum, welches das nicht aus konfessioneller Streitlust tut, sondern aus tiefem Verantwortungsbewußtsein dafür, daß dem deutschen Volke das Verständnis des Evangeliums nicht allmählich genommen werde, welches ihm einst als größte Gnadengabe durch den Dienst Luthers geschenkt ward und das doch nach unser aller Ueberzeugung im Unterschied zu dem römischen oder calvinischen allein der Heiligen Schrift voll gerecht wird.

4.

Solch bekennnisfestes lutherisches Kirchentum aber muß zugleich eine ganz bestimmte Haltung gegenüber der Umwelt einnehmen. Und hier liegt das **eigentlich Neue**, was zu gestalten ist. Wenn die Wiedergewinnung der christusfremden Deutschen für das Evangelium und die kirchliche Gesundung des gleichgültigen Kirchenvolkes wenigstens zu einem erheblichen Teil von der lutherischen Kirche geleistet werden soll, dann muß das deutsche Luther-tum sich die Fähigkeit aneignen, das eigene Glaubensgut ganz anders als bisher in seine Umwelt hineinzutragen, *m. a. W.*, es muß das Missionarische-Evangelistische als einen Wesenszug in sich wieder aufnehmen, nachdem es ihn bald nach der Reformation verloren hat.

Steht es nicht bislang im deutschen evangelischen Raum etwa so: da, wo man für das Evangelium wirbt und mit Eifer und Geschick sich an die dem Glauben Entfremdeten außerhalb und innerhalb der Kirche wendet, nimmt man es mit der Lehre nicht genau und hat kaum Verständnis, eher Abneigung für das Wahrheitsanliegen der lutherischen Konfession; dort aber, wo man von dem Eifer für die Wahrheit des Evangeliums durchdrungen ist und das lutherische Bekenntnis hochhält, fehlt Verständnis, Fähigkeit und Geschick, den unbergleichlichen eigenen Besitz in das ungläubige oder halbgläubige Volk hineinzutragen? Wenn das so bleibt, dann muß ja — man möchte fast sagen: zwangsläufig — die Neuchristianisierung Deutschlands ein Werk der anderen Konfessionen werden.

Es ist darum nicht nur eine Frage der praktischen Theologie, sondern geradezu eine Existenzfrage für die Kirche der lutherischen Reformation in Deutschland, ob es gelingt, diesen neuen Typus zu entwickeln, der beides in sich vereinigt: einen **Konfessionalismus**, der nie vergißt, daß reine Lehre stets mit Eifer und Leidensbereitschaft gegen die Mächenschaften des Feindes aller Wahrheit, des Waters der Lüge, geschützt und erhalten werden muß, und zugleich einen religiösen **Aktivismus**, der es ebenso wenig aus den Augen läßt, daß gerade das reine Evangelium dazu verpflichtet, es mit höchster Dienstbereitschaft unter die Leute zu bringen und denen anzubieten, die in der Christusfremde ihren Weg gehen. Daß bei dem Zweiten nicht an eine flache Betriebsamkeit gedacht ist, die der Glaubensstiefe ermangelt, sondern

an das Anliegen, auf welches uns das Neue Testament mit seiner Mahnung zum missionarischen Handeln weist, braucht wohl nicht besonders betont zu werden.

5.

Wer aber soll damit beginnen, diesen neuen Typus lutherischen Kirchentums, der natürlich nicht nur von den Pastoren, sondern gerade auch von den Gemeinden eine andere Haltung, eine tiefgreifende innere Umstellung verlangt, zu gestalten? Die lutherischen Landeskirchen? Sie haben Aufgaben vor sich, die nach menschlichem Ermessen an sich schon ihre Kräfte übersteigen dürften: die schweren Schäden der Vergangenheit in ihren eigenen Kirchengebieten zu heilen, Lehrzucht einzuführen, die Mehrzahl ihrer Gemeinden allmählich dahin zu bringen, daß die Bezeichnung evangelisch-lutherisch wieder einigermaßen sinnvoll für sie wird. Aber auch, wenn sie neben dieser Niesenarbeit noch Zeit und Kraft für anderes freimachen könnten, so würde es über ihr Vermögen gehen, aus sich heraus zu dem bezeichneten neuen Kirchentum zu gelangen. Sie haben ja mehrere hundert Jahre, vor allem in Folge der drückenden Last und Fessel des Landeskirchentums, in einem staatlichen Lebensgefühl sich bewegt. Ihre Pfarrer nahmen mit einer gewissen tragischen Notwendigkeit in einem oft erschreckenden Maße den Charakter des Kirchenbeamten an, die Gemeindeglieder tragen allermeist solche Unselbständigkeit an sich, daß nur ganz wenige für kirchlichen Dienst an der Umgebung überhaupt in Frage kommen. Die lutherischen Landeskirchen können also den Anfang mit der Gestaltung des neuen kirchlichen Typus nicht machen. Sie müßten denn eine ganz andere Geschichte hinter sich haben.

Können es die lutherischen Freikirchen?

Sie haben es in einem wesentlichen Punkt leichter. Sie brauchen nicht erst zum lutherischen Bekenntnis zurück. Die eine Seite des Neuen: der bekenntniswidrige Union abweisende Konfessionalismus ist bei ihnen — wenn auch in verschiedenem Grade — entwickelt. Ihre Kirchenkörper sind nicht nur de iure, sondern de facto lutherisch. Auch haben sie seit ihrem Entstehen eine Geschichte durchlaufen, die von der der Landeskirchen in bedeutungsvollen Punkten abweicht. Sie mußten sich selber als zahlenmäßig kleine Kirchen mit in der Regel kleinen Gemeinden ohne jede Hilfe des Staates durchkämpfen und aus eigenen Mitteln für all das Neuzere sorgen, was nun einmal zu einem Kirchentum gehört. Das hat ihren Pastoren eine gewisse Beweglichkeit und ihren Gemeindegliedern nicht selten eine gewisse Selbständigkeit gegeben, die wenigstens zum Dienst für die eigene Kirche oder die eigene Gemeinde oft unter erstaunlichen Opfern an Zeit, Kraft und Geld willig war. Hier liegen also die Voraussetzungen für die Gestaltung des Neuen erheblich günstiger. Und doch wird man sagen müssen: auch die lutherischen Freikirchen werden aus sich heraus nicht imstande sein, dieses Weieinander und Miteinander von Konfessionalismus und Aktivismus zu gewinnen. Ihre Pastoren und Gemeindeglieder haben eben auch Teil an der seelischen Haltung, wie sie dem deutschen Lutheraner eigentümlich ist.

Allgemeine Entwicklungen des religiösen Seelentums üben meist eine solche Gewalt aus, daß man sich ihnen nur sehr schwer entziehen kann und zu einer veränderten Haltung überzugehen vermag.

6.

Und doch gibt es das in der Kirchengeschichte immer wieder, daß Kirchen ihre innere Struktur verändern und eine neue Seite ihrem Wesen einfügen. Wodurch? Durch intensive Verührung mit anderen Kirchen, die das haben, was der eigenen fehlt. Hier liegt der einzig mögliche Weg, wie es zur Gestaltung des neuen Kirchentypus im deutschen Luthertum kommen kann.

Und hierin besteht nun die große und verantwortungsvolle Aufgabe der lutherischen Freikirchen Deutschlands, diesen Weg als erste zu gehen. Allzu lange hat man in Deutschland den Blick von den lutherischen Kirchenkörpern Amerikas ferngehalten. Man begriff nicht recht, daß die wesentlich andere Geschichte, welche diese Kirchen durchlebten, auch besondere Gaben in ihnen erwecken und dem europäischen Luthertum fremde Fähigkeiten entwickeln mußten. Man sah zumeist nur, daß die amerikanischen Lutheraner mancherlei nicht hatten, worüber das deutsche Luthertum mit einem gewissen Stolz verfügte. Heute zeigt es sich nun, daß das deutsche Luthertum das nicht entbehren kann, was das amerikanische auf seinem geschichtlichen Wege gelernt hat: die missionarisch-*evangelische* Aktivität als seelische Haltung und Bestimmtheit des kirchlichen Handelns und diese in enger Verbindung mit strenger Konfessionalität. Zwar nicht alle lutherischen Kirchenkörper Amerikas haben das in gleicher Weise. Bei einigen hat das Konfessionsbewußtsein den schwächeren Akzent. Bei anderen aber, so der Synodalkonferenz, in welcher die Missouri-Synode steht, ist dieser kirchliche Typus in seiner Doppelseitigkeit deutlich und markant ausgeprägt.

Wenn die lutherischen Freikirchen die Verührung und Zusammenarbeit mit diesen Kreisen Amerikas suchen und pflegen, dann wird es ihnen auf organischem Wege und unter Gottes gnädigem Beistand gelingen, das Neue zu gestalten, was die kirchliche Zukunft gebieterisch fordert. Das strenge Konfessionsbewußtsein haben sie zumeist; das Moment der kirchlichen Aktivität aber werden sie sich, je länger die Zusammenarbeit währt, desto mehr innerlich aneignen. Nicht äußerlich übernehmen werden sie es als etwas Fremdes, sondern eine ganz in der sachlichen Aufgabe begründete Synthese vollziehen, so wie die preußischen Lutheraner einst die Synthese zwischen strengem Luthertum und freikirchlicher Lebensgestaltung vollzogen. Entspricht es nicht den Grundgedanken des Neuen Testaments, daß eine Kirche der anderen mit ihrer besonderen Gabe dienen soll? So lasse sich deutsches Luthertum dienen mit den Fähigkeiten, die die amerikanischen Glaubensgenossen entwickelt haben, wie das amerikanische Luthertum so manches vom deutschen empfangen hat und noch empfängt. Es zeugt daher weder von Weite des Blickes noch von tieferem Verständnis des neutestamentlichen Kirchengedankens, wenn man sich meist aus allerlei Gefühlsmomenten heraus gegen die Zusammenarbeit der lutherischen Freikirchen mit den genannten

Kirchen Amerikas süräubt und stemmt. Es bedeutet das auch nichts anderes als einen Verzicht darauf, konfessionelles Luthertum mit der werbefreudigen Haltung zu verschmelzen, die ihm nun einmal notwendig ist, um an der Neuchristianisierung des eigenen Volkes den gebührenden Anteil zu nehmen. Mit diesem Verzicht kann sich aber nur der zufrieden geben, dem es entweder an der Liebe zu seinem Volke fehlt oder der von der Größe des lutherischen Evangeliumsverständnisses nicht tief genug durchdrungen ist, oder dem es an beidem mangelt.

Wenn die lutherischen Freikirchen den Anfang damit machen, einen neuen Wesenszug lutherischem Kirchentum in Deutschland hinzuzufügen, so heißt das nicht, daß es genüge, wenn sie allein das tun. Dazu sind sie zahlenmäßig zu schwach. Aber dennoch ist solch ein Anfang von entscheidender Wichtigkeit für das Ganze. Es mußte im vergangenen Jahrhundert im deutschen Luthertum eben erst einmal der Anfang damit gemacht werden, daß eine lutherische Kirche sich in Form der „Freikirche“ ihre eigenständige Lebensgestalt gab. Andere sind dann nachgefolgt. Und kein Mensch befreit heute mehr, daß die Landeskirchen allerlei davon gelernt haben und davon zu übernehmen weiter im Begriffe stehen. So können auch erst dann größere Kreise des deutschen Luthertums es lernen, den neuen kirchlichen Typus zu gestalten, wenn die lutherischen Freikirchen in aller Bescheidenheit es ihnen zeigen, daß das auch in deutschen und nicht nur in amerikanischen Verhältnissen möglich ist: engste Verbindung von Konfessionalität und Aktivität; und nicht nur, daß es möglich ist, sondern daß es einfach unerläßlich ist, um der Kirche der lutherischen Reformation wieder Boden zu gewinnen in eigenen Volk.

7.

Wir wollen uns aber nun nicht etwa der Täuschung hingeben, als ob man in den Kreisen der Landeskirchen diese Neugestaltung auf kirchlichem Gebiet begrüßen werde. Das wird nur in geringem Maße der Fall sein. Zumeist dürfte das Gegenteil eintreten: man wird sie zunächst als höchst unbequeme Neuerung, als ein störendes Element empfinden. Obwohl die Zusammenarbeit von zwei der lutherischen Freikirchen mit dem amerikanischen Luthertum erst anhebt, läuft man von verschiedener Seite bereits Sturm dagegen. Man redet davon, daß eine deutsche lutherische Freikirche mit ihrer ganzen Geschichte bricht, wenn sie die Zusammenarbeit mit der amerikanischen Missouri-Synode und den ihr verbündeten Synoden vollzieht, mehr sagt, daß dann das lutherische Freikirchentum in Deutschland nichts anderes als eine amerikanische Filiale werden müsse, ja man scheut sich nicht, es so hinzustellen, als ob diese lutherische Freikirche nur um der materiellen Hilfe aus Amerika willen solchen Schritt täte. Nicht wenige schütteln den Kopf: wie kann man nur in solche geistige Enge sich begeben! Andere rufen entsetzt aus, daß dann ja die lutherischen Freikirchen jede Brücke zu den lutherischen Landeskirchen abbrechen müßten, und was der Schreckgespenster mehr sind, die man zu sehen meint. Das alles darf uns nicht verwundern. Wo ist etwas Neues in die Kirchengeschichte eingetreten, das sich nicht erst einmal

mancherlei Mißdeutung hätte gefallen lassen müssen? So wie weiland die grotesken Mißdeutungen des Kirchenmannes Hengstenberg und des Theologen Olshausen über die Neugestaltung dahingegangen sind, welche die preußischen Lutheraner mit ihrem Freikirchentum wagten. Nicht viel anders ist das zu bewerten, was man heute gegen die Zusammenarbeit der lutherischen Freikirchen mit dem konfessionsbewußten amerikanischen Luthertum sagt und unternimmt. Das dürfte auch einmal durch den künftigen Geschichtsverlauf, also die Tatsachen selbst, ad absurdum geführt werden, und vielleicht wird schon die nächste Generation über den „Bruch mit der Geschichte“ und all die anderen Argumente, die man ins Feld führt, lächeln, lächeln, wie wir heute bei den Urteilen Hengstenbergs und Olshausens über die preußischen freikirchlichen Lutheraner uns eines Lächelns nicht erwehren können.

Zu verstehen ist es ja, daß man dem genannten Weg lutherischer Freikirchen sich entgegenstellt. Man spürt das Neue, das sich hier gestalten will, und möchte doch so gern, daß es möglichst in den alten Bahnen weiter ginge. Aber es geht nicht in den alten Bahnen weiter. Es kommt anders, als es heute ist. Entweder kommt es so, daß calvinisch bestimmte Aktivität mehr und mehr Raum gewinnt und das Luthertum trotz seiner teilweisen Neubefinnung sich eines Tages überflügelt sieht, oder aber so, daß das deutsche Luthertum sich aufrafft und das lernt, was es in geschichtlicher Fehleentwicklung unter dem landesherrlichen Kirchenregiment mehr und mehr verlernt hat: den eigenen Glaubensbesitz gegen jeden Unionismus unerbittlich festzuhalten und zugleich ihn mit frohem und eifrigem Herzen unter die Leute zu bringen und damit anderen zu dienen, so viel man immer kann. Hoffen wir zu Gott, daß es in dem zweiten Sinne anders kommt — und daß die lutherischen Freikirchen die Wegbereiter dazu sein dürfen.

Am Reformationsfest 1946

Martin Rünke, Viz. theol.

Möge „das Neue, das sich hier gestalten will“ zur Ehre dessen dienen, der von sich sagt, „Siehe, ich mache Alles neu“, Offb. 21, 5.

P. Peters.

A Correction: My attention has been called to the fact that in commenting on an editorial by Dr. W. G. Polack I omitted the important word “additional” in quoting his remarks on the Appleton Resolution of the American Lutheran Church. The sentence occurs on page 71 of our previous issue of the *Quartalschrift*. It should read as follows: “attaining Lutheran unity by way of *additional* doctrinal formulations and reformulations.”

This omission is particularly regrettable because it changes the sense of the quotation materially, and thereby attributes a view to Dr. Polack which he obviously does not hold.

I would like to ask all our readers to make this correction in their copies of our January number and herewith tender my sincere apologies to Dr. Polack and also to the American Lutheran Church, whose resolution I misquoted.

E. REIM.

REVIEWERS' DESK

From Heaven's Glory, by Kenneth S. Wuest, Teacher of New Testament Greek at Moody Bible Institute. — Moody Press, Chicago 10, Illinois.

The author attempts to answer the question what the first Christmas meant for the Lord Jesus, not what it meant to Him. For this purpose he expounds what he calls the Christmas scripture in Philipians 2, 1-8 from the Greek text. "To you and to me it means salvation. The Christmas season means so much to us because the first Christmas meant so much for Him. The phrase 'to us' means *enjoyment*, the words 'for Him' mean *suffering*."

Whether or not we agree with every statement the author makes does not matter. The sincere love of the Savior, the child-like faith of the writer the pages of this booklet unfold are like a breath of fresh air, invigorating and strengthening one against the stench arising from the foul vaporings of the so-called Christian literature of the modernists. It is truly heart-warming to find oneself in full agreement with a non-Lutheran scholar concerning the cardinal doctrine of the Gospel, e. g., the virgin birth and the preexistence of Christ, His full equality with the Father and the Holy Ghost, His incarnation, and His substitutionary atonement. All in all, an exquisite little study, scriptural and deeply devotional! L.

Heroes of Faith on Pioneer Trails, by E. Myers Harrison. Price, \$2.00.

Radio The New Missionary, by Clarence W. Jones. Price, \$1.25.

Both books are published by the Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Illinois.

The first of these is telling in a compelling manner the history of the lives of ten outstanding British missionaries of the 18th and 19th centuries, whose zeal in the winning of souls for Christ in far-off heathen lands make them shining lights in the world. For they readily demonstrate what miracles of grace the Holy Spirit will work in the face of seemingly unsurmountable obstacles through the self-effacing labor of such as devote themselves unstintingly to the service of their God. These stories are told by a man who himself is filled with the love for his Savior and with pity for all that are still sitting in darkness and the shadow of death.

The second one is the story of the creation of a radio station, known as *La Voz de los Andes* (The Voice of the Andes), near Quito, the capital city of Ecuador in South America, for the express purpose of bringing the message of salvation through the blood of Christ to the inhabitants of this part of the world. L.

Our Eyes Were Opened, By Arnold M. Maahs, Chaplain, Lt. Col., U. S. A. The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio.

In this book of 110 pages a member of the American Lutheran Church tells us of his visit, while in service, on the island of New Guinea, where his Church is conducting mission work among the natives. He describes the country, its products, and its inhabitants and their customs. He contrasts the pagan to the Christian native. He shows what marvelous changes the preaching of the Gospel has wrought not only in the manner of life and the outward appearance of the "Fuzzy-Wuzzy," as the natives are called on account of their bushy hair, but especially in his heart and mind. He speaks of the loyalty of the native Christians to their faith and to the Lutheran Church whose missionaries had brought them the joyous message of salvation. A loyalty and devotion, the sincerity of which was tried and proved during the Japanese occupation, when their missionaries were taken from them. The necessity and the glory of mission work is what the author means with his title "Our Eyes Were Opened."

L.

Is Masonry a Religion? An Analysis of Freemasonry, by Theodore Graebner, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. 79 pages, 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 7 in. Paper covers. Price, 25c. — Concordia Publishing House.

From which angles the author approaches the question he raises in the title of the little brochure may be seen from the following table of contents. "I. Origin of the Masonic Order. II. Our Sources of Information. III. Organization of Freemasonry. IV. Initiations. V. Masonic Oaths. VI. Symbols and Allegories. VII. Masonic Prayers. VIII. Freemasonry and the Bible. IX. Religion of Freemasonry. X. Delusions."

Two and a half pages of Bibliography conclude the pamphlet.

The ninth chapter, deservedly, occupies the greatest amount of space, 16 pages. The essay contains numerous quotations from the source material listed in the Bibliography, also from other sources that are not listed (*e. g.*, Elijah A. Coil, "The Relation of the Liberal Churches and the Fraternal Orders").

The well known arguments against Freemasonry are here assembled in a convenient form. They bear restating.

M.

The Lodge, by Karl Kurth. 28 pages, 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$. Paper cover. Price: 10c. Concordia Publishing House.

This is tract 96. The author shows that the lodge is indeed a "religious organization." Then he takes up an itemized study of some of the religious aspects of the lodge. About the God of the lodge he says: "So here are many different religions represented in the lodge, and in order to satisfy all, a god is set up who will be satisfactory to

all. It is a man-made god" (p. 15). The point is well taken that a Christian cannot join an organization which recognizes a false god. — Other points the author discusses are: God's plan of salvation; Prayer; Oaths; Secrecy. With regard to the last point a caution would seem in place that secrets are not in themselves sinful.

The tract is intended for use in "catechumen classes" to fortify young Christians against the dangers of the lodge. Would not a word of warning against Scoutism have been in place also? M.

Road to Reformation, by Heinrich Boehmer. Translated from the German by John W. Dobberstein and Theodore G. Tappert. Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, Pa. Price: \$4.00.

"Der Junge Luther", the original title of this book, was published ten years after World War I as the first volume of a series of books on Germany's greatest men (deutsche Führer). Only a few years after World War II this volume is presented in English dress to English and American readers at a time when the Reformer is under attack by the English-speaking world. We owe Drs. Dobberstein und Tappert a vote of thanks for this timely and fluent translation by an indisputably great Luther-student, the worthy successor to the great Albert Hauck. Laymen, teachers and pastors will be greatly benefited by reading this scholarly work with its two parts: "The Reformer in the Making" and "Beginning of the Great Struggle."

P. PETERS.

Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms, by John Hastings Patton. The John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1944. Price: \$1.50.

The response which we have received to our review of *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* in the foregoing number of our periodical encourages us to review and to recommend the above dissertation on Canaanite parallels selected from the Ugaritic or Ras Shamrah texts. It gives our readers interested in the study of parallels a splendid opportunity to compare "thought patterns," "word patterns" and "word parallels" with those of the Psalms. Since this study deals only with "comparisons" and not with "contrasts," the author according to his closing words (p. 48) does not enter in upon "the spiritual and moral significance of the Psalms and the Ugaritic literature." The reader will, of course, be guided by the fact "that identical phraseology does not necessarily imply identical theology" (comp. *The Babylonian Genesis* by A. Heidel, p. 116).

P. PETERS.

Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America Assembled at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, August 6-9, 1946. Price: \$0.13.

Quartalschrift

Theological Quarterly

Volume 44

July, 1947

Number 3

CLOSING ADDRESS

Delivered in the chapel of the Lutheran Theological
Seminary at Thiensville, Wisconsin, to the
Graduating Class of 1947 on June 5

Text: Luke 10, 20

*Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are
subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names
are written in heaven.*

To enter the ministry of the church today does not hold out the prospect of much joy, outwardly considered. The trends of the time being what they are, a faithful minister will find it increasingly difficult to hold his ground against a spirit of indifference in doctrine and worldliness in practice. You may even find that temptations will come from such from whom you have every reason to expect strengthening and encouragement. Yet if you adhere closely to the words of your Savior you will experience great joy in your office even in these perilous times. In our text Jesus speaks to the Seventy whom He had commissioned, about the joy of their office, and also about a danger that might disturb it. His words apply to your office with equal propriety.

JOY IN THE MINISTRY

Jesus wants His ministers to be happy in the work which He assigned to them. He said to the Seventy: "Rejoice because your names are written in heaven." Through Jesus Christ the names of all sinners now stand written in heaven, not one excepted. Jesus wants His ministers to apply this wonderful truth to themselves. You will understand Him correctly if you take His words in a very personal sense.

Rejoice Because Your Own Name Is Written in Heaven

The names of all men, your own among them, were written in heaven from the beginning, in God's great family record. When God created man in His own image He entered the name of every individual as His son or daughter. They were all His children, and He was their loving Father who showered His blessings on them and made them heirs of eternal life.

We know what happened. Through one man sin entered into the world. By the fall of Adam all men became sinners. Not only do all men commit sins in thought, word, and deed, sins of commission and of omission: their entire nature is corrupt so that they cannot but sin.

What effect did our sinfulness have on the writing of our names in heaven? The name of every individual was completely obliterated. Sin was spattered heavy over all of them. That meant death and damnation for all.

Then all joy was gone, all hope was squelched. They had given place to gloom and despair.

But God in His mercy prepared salvation. He so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. The Son of God shed His blood, and His blood cleanseth us from all sin. With the blood of the Son of God the filth of sin that covered our names in the register of heaven was completely washed away. Our names are not only faintly legible, they stand out in their original luster.

What joy to know that one's name is written in heaven! What do the sufferings of the present time mean in comparison with that joy, even though our outward man perish! What does it hurt if heavy burdens are laid on us and difficult tasks are set before us! What does it matter though even friends desert us and we are left to stand alone! What though the devil, the world, and our own flesh assail us! The battle may be bitter and painful, yet in the joy because our names are written in heaven we find encouragement and strength to withstand and win the victory.

If you then wish to rejoice in your ministry, assure your

heart of the great fact that your name is written in heaven. Daily strengthen and nourish your personal faith.

Remember your baptism. That was not the washing away of some filth from the flesh: it was the washing away of the filth of sin from your name in heaven, it is the answer of a good conscience toward God. Study your Bible, not only professionally, study it for your own edification. In it you find the assurance that your sins are forgiven, that your name again stands clearly, legibly written in heaven. Do not fail to partake of Communion frequently to assure yourself that Christ's body was actually given for you and His blood was shed for the remission of your sins.

Then, no matter what seeming hardships and disappointments your particular call will have for you, you will experience joy in your ministry.

It is evident that if you make this fact that your name is written in heaven the fountain of joy from which you draw daily for your own use, then you cannot but make this joy also the center of your work and the chief topic of the message which you bring to your people. Only in so doing will you find joy in the ministry; and to do so will be real joy.

Make This Truth the Heart of Your Message to Your People

To be sure, you will have to proclaim also the Law in all its severity. God is a holy God, and He demands that we be holy as He is holy. He is a jealous God. He demands not only that we make an effort, that we try our best to be holy, He demands that we be perfect as He is perfect. He will accept nothing but a flawless obedience.

We preach the Law, but not as an end in itself. We dare not preach it as a means for pleasing God, that by the works of the Law we build up our own character, and by our character merit God's favor. No, we preach the Law only as a means to produce a knowledge of sin and to strike terror into the hearts of sinners. And this, to prepare the hearts for our real message that our names are written in heaven.

How is a sinner to rejoice because his name is written in

heaven if he does not realize that it had been blotted out by his sins? How is he to rejoice if he does not realize the terrible judgment of God, that when a name is not perfectly restored, then the sinner is hopelessly doomed? How is he to rejoice in his Savior if he still labors under the delusion that he can by his good turns and by his own character do something to restore his name in heaven to legibility? Only as a sinner despairs of his own condition will he rejoice in the announcement that his name is written in heaven with the blood of Jesus.

This, then, must be the heart of your message if you would have joy in the ministry.

Take a few illustrations.

We all have to die. All members of your congregation must die. Your task is to prepare them for death. The thought of death may not seem to trouble them very much in the days of health. It is different when they meet with a serious accident or contract a fatal disease. Then assure them that their names are written in heaven, and the comfort which that message brings will strengthen them to face death, to overcome the fear of death, to appear confidently before the judgment of God. What greater joy can you desire than to help a sinner overcome the fear of death?

Some member of yours may fall into grievous sin. His conscience may be troubled as though there were no hope for him. Assure him that the blood of Jesus has restored also his name in heaven. No sin is so great that the blood of Jesus can not remove. And when this glad message helps him to triumph over despair, great will be your joy.

It will be a part of your ministry to lead your people in sanctification. You may coax them to do outwardly good works by laying down the law in some form, or by appealing to their sense of honor; but really good works will follow only when because they realize that their names are written in heaven they in gratitude give themselves unto the Lord. Though this may go on very quietly, yet it means great joy to the pastor when he sees his flock increase in really good works.

Great joy you will also experience when under your instruction your children learn the great truth that their names are

written in heaven, when with grateful hearts they forget about their own honor and in their lives try to honor Him who shed His blood to restore their names.

You can have joy in the ministry. Our names stand written in heaven clearly legible through the blood of Jesus. Make this truth the heart of your message and of your work.

The Seventy in our text were especially happy because the evil spirits were subject unto them. They met some unfortunate people who were possessed by the devil and were tormented. In the name of Jesus they commanded the evil spirits to depart. And they obeyed. Their poor victims were restored. Jesus warned the Seventy that they should not let this joy blind them to the real joy of their ministry.

Do Not Let False Joys Warp Your Vision

What was wrong with the joy of the Seventy when they rejoiced that they had cast out devils in Jesus' name? In one word, they focused their attention on something which was after all of minor importance, and drew it away from the great essentials.

The greatest damage that the devil did to man is that he seduced him to sin, so that through sin he blotted out his name in heaven; and that he now blinds men spiritually so that they do not believe in the blood of Jesus Christ through which their names have been restored. In comparison with this spiritual possession bodily possession is of far less importance. It was like other evils of the body. So also the casting out of devils could not compare in importance with the spiritual healing of the heart.

But just as the raising of the dead, the restoring of sight to the blind, the feeding of thousands with scanty supplies was far more spectacular than bringing peace to a troubled heart, so was also the casting out of devils, perhaps in an even higher degree. It caught the eye of the people. They admired the deed and them that could perform it. The Seventy probably received little public recognition for the message of peace which they brought from the Savior, but when they cast out devils they were acclaimed as wonderful men of God. They rejoiced in this.

Then Jesus warned them that this joy might easily interfere with their real joy because their names are written in heaven. Their vision might become warped.

The same danger threatens today. The Gospel message that a sinner's name is written in heaven, brings peace and true joy to a heart. But that is a quiet joy. The sinner deeply appreciates it, but the general public does not make much of it.

It is different when a pastor is an eloquent speaker, when he is a good mixer, a good organizer and knows how to raise funds, etc. It is different when he shapes the liturgy in a rich and beautiful way, etc. Thereby he becomes popular, and large congregations extend tempting calls to him.

Just as the casting out of devils was a valuable gift from the Savior, so are also the just mentioned accomplishments. But there is the danger of over-estimating them. A man possessing them may begin to consider himself as just a little superior to others and of greater importance to the church, while others who do not possess these gifts may envy the one who has them.

Do not permit your view to be warped. Thank God wherever you find these gifts, but let them not be the chief cause for rejoicing. Whether you serve in a large church of the metropolis or in a tiny mission located miles from nowhere; whether you preach to large audiences or to a mere handful of people: you can under all circumstances experience the full joy of the ministry if you bring the message to the people:

Your Names Are Written in Heaven

M

THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD AND CIVIC RIGHTEOUSNESS

V.

After having depicted in ch. 1, with words that no one could dare to question, the terrible results following man's abuse of his natural knowledge of God, Paul in the second chapter addressed a man who, without changing his basic attitude, tried to stem the tide of vice by moralizing and reform work. Being a *krinōn*, he carefully evaluates the conduct of men, commending some, condemning others. He may be a philosopher who in a speculative way develops ethical concepts, or he may be an educator who on the basis of the philosopher's work tries to lead men to a higher level of morality. Without fear of contradiction Paul charges the moralist and reformer with being guilty of doing the very things that he criticises.

More. Finding himself guilty of the same offenses which he severely condemns in others, he is doubly without excuse. By his very profession as a *krinōn* he must realize that he is guilty of God's condemnation. But God did not yet visit His righteous wrath on him, He spared him so far. Thus in addition to the natural knowledge of God implanted in his heart by God Himself, reenforced by an observation of God's works in creation and preservation, he has a manifestation of God's goodness in his own personal history, a goodness which has for its aim the repentance of the *krinōn*. When God strives for improvement He does not act like the *krinōn*. He employs goodness in a rich measure, forbearance and long-suffering. From this fact the *krinōn* should realize that his own basic attitude is all wrong. A complete change of heart and mind is indicated: repentance. The fact that he closes his eyes to this evident lesson and that he tenaciously adheres to his criticising, is sufficient to prove him guilty of despising the goodness of God: else he would not ignore it so completely in his system of reform.

Inexcusable, so Paul had said about those who abandoned themselves to a life of debauchery. *Inexcusable*, so he said

about the attitude of the *krinōn*. Now he summarizes briefly in v. 5: "But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God."

The attitude of the *krinōn* as Paul has described him may be summed up in a single word: hardness, *sklērotēs*, which manifests itself in the impenitence of his heart.

The *krinōn* of Paul, and that applies to all *krinontes* of all ages, has been tinkering with the outward conduct of men, propounding to them fine ideas, and clarifying their ethical concepts. He has been urging them to adopt these concepts as norms for their conduct, and thus to reform their mode of living, assuring them that if they will only give his system a fair trial they must succeed. It never occurred to him that the roots of the evil might go deeper, that outward living is but an expression of an inner attitude, that the most revolting crimes and vices are merely symptoms of the total corruption of the heart. He worked on the assumption that man's nature is inherently good, that in order to achieve real goodness of life it is enough to instruct the understanding properly and to strengthen the will sufficiently; which may be achieved by education and training.

Accordingly, his own heart remained impenitent, in spite of his intensive occupation with ethical concepts, with a study of God's works in nature, and in spite of his personal experience of God's goodness in His dealing with the offenders, the *krinōn* in particular, with great patience and forbearance. Yes, the deeper he penetrated into these matters, the more firmly he became set in his ways, convinced of the basic correctness of his position. He failed to repent. He may have been willing to waive a point or two in his system; he may even have been open to correction, and to tolerate other systems — anything short of repentance. Therein is manifested his *hardness*.

Could Paul in his Gospel work join hands with the *krinōn*, sincere and serious moralist and reformer though he was? Could he acknowledge his efforts as something good? Paul would have been unfaithful to his Lord who had called him

if he had allowed any righteousness, and any program for achieving righteousness, as good, that is not built on repentance. He therefore tells the *krinōn* in unmistakable words to what all his efforts at reform really amount: *thou treasurest up*. — Do we have to remind ourselves that this judgment applies with equal force to all moralists and reformers who walk in the footsteps of Paul's *krinōn*?

Paul here uses the progressive present, *thēsaurizeis*, you are treasuring up for yourself. Does Paul really consider the work of the *krinōn* as a gathering together of valuable treasures? He is merely appropriating an expression borrowed from the ideology of the *krinōn*. The *krinōn* considers his achievements as valuable treasures. He is happy when he can credit his account with another good deed, or report another good turn. Paul borrows the expression, and apparently concedes that the *krinōn* is amassing some valuable treasures, and that his stock pile of merits is growing with every new accretion. But what these vaunted treasures really are, Paul will tell us immediately.

Again a single word suffices: wrath, *orgē*. Here the *krinōn* had imagined all along that by his endeavors he was meriting God's favor, at least he was mitigating, perhaps even appeasing, His wrath, and was teaching his followers how to achieve the same results. Had not God spared him so long? All these years he had been promoting reforms, and God, since He did not interfere by imposing punishments, seemed to be favorably inclined toward his efforts. Did not His withholding of punishment indicate at least some degree of approval? And now Paul tells him bluntly that he is laboring under a terrible self-deception. He is not gathering credit points for himself, he is increasing the wrath of God against himself. Mark the awful word *wrath*: not merely a negative lack of approval, but a positive indignation. By every step forward that the *krinōn* takes, by every good deed that he records, he merely fans the wrath of God to greater fury.

Paul is speaking from the spiritual standpoint of the Gospel. He is not considering the question at all from the angle of sociology, whether for communal life of the people

the efforts of the *krinōn* are not preferable to the theory which considers a life of vice as the normal life. By the way in which he pictured the downgrade tendency in ch. 1 till the deepest depths are reached, Paul already indicated that in a certain respect the level from which things started has some advantages over the final stage. Paul is ready to grant, what everybody can grasp with his natural common sense, that the philosophy of the *krinōn* is far superior to licentiousness, from the standpoint of society. But Paul does not make the mistake of confusing social goodness, or civic righteousness, with spiritual goodness, nor of attempting to fuse the two by integrating the program of the *krinōn* into his own. Paul was not sent to preach the social gospel. His call was to preach the Gospel of redemption, achieved by Christ's death, to be appropriated by faith. And viewed from that standpoint all the socially good deeds of the *krinōn* must stand condemned as merely inciting the wrath of God to greater fury. In Pelagian fashion they serve "to obscure the glory of Christ's merit and benefits" (C. A., II, 3).

The wrath of God may not become immediately apparent. God, who aims at repentance, who wants all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, may in His goodness defer even a long past due punishment; yes, having arranged to preserve this world according to certain laws, both physical and moral, may seem to reward those who adjust their lives to these laws, as our Confession is ready to concede (Note the concessive conjunction *wiewohl*, *quamquam*, although.) that God may honor the righteousness of reason with bodily rewards (Apol. IV, 24, p. 126). In His world government, in His outward dealings with the deeds of men, God may even allow a difference between lesser and greater evils, as, e. g., when He instructed Moses, because of the hardness of the heart, to grant license that some one issue a writ of divorcement to his wife in other than a case of adultery. Yet Paul keeps it clear in his own mind, and warns his readers not to be deceived, that spiritually there is no difference between men, that among natural men there can be no "noble souls" whose good efforts we must acknowledge. Spiritually

considered, the unalterable attitude of God toward all efforts of natural man is one of wrath.

As stated before, this may not be apparent at once; but the day is rapidly approaching when it will become evident to even the hide-bound *krinōn*. Paul says, "against (*en*) the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God."

Paul did already call attention to the fact that the wrath of God is continually being revealed in a way (*apokalyptetai*) by His dealings in this world in that He gives men up or over (ch. 1, 24. 26. 28) to evil. In our verse he spoke of a treasuring up of wrath, which in some way does not come to wreak destruction immediately; and now he points to a coming day of wrath when its pent-up fury will be fully revealed.

It will be a *righteous* judgment, which even such people as at first brazenly protest will be forced to admit. For the concept "righteous judgment" Paul uses a word which occurs only here in the New Testament. Among the Oxyrhynchus papyri a case is found which seems to indicate that the word was in use in court matters as almost a technical term. In the year 303 A. D. a certain Aurelius Demetrius Nilus, who described himself as *agrammatos* (unlettered, i. e., most likely, as unable to draw up his document himself) had a scribe draw up a petition for him to the Prefect of Egypt, Clodius Culcianus, saying that he makes his appeal with confidence, *euelpis ōn tēs apo sou megethous dikaiokrisias tychein*, being of good hope to obtain *dikaiokrisia* from thy eminence. Did the scribe adopt the word from Rom. 2, 5? or from official usage? (This happened during the time of the Diocletian persecution.) The papyrus plainly points, not so much to the act of judging, but rather to the sentence in which the verdict is announced. This would make very good sense also in our passage. Compare Jh. 5, 30; 7, 24 (*dikaia krisis*: "my judgment is just" — "judge righteous judgment").

The term *dikaiokrisia* leads over directly to the next section, in which Paul establishes the absolute justice of God's final sentence on that great day.

We need not spend much time on v. 6-8. For although

these verses contain a great deal of valuable material, they have no direct bearing on the question for which we are seeking an answer, the natural knowledge of God and civic righteousness. They unfold the *dikaiokrisia* according to its double content. Then, when in v. 9 Paul, while describing the result of God's *dikaiokrisia*, begins to present also the motivation, we shall find much material to shed a flood of light on the role which the natural knowledge of God plays in God's economy.

When in v. 7 Paul says that the Judge will duly reward every man *kata ta erga autou*, according to his works, he does not want to be understood as though God counted the recorded good turns of a man, or balanced his merits against his demerits, to see which would outnumber or outweigh the other: as the expression in the next verse, *hypomonē ergou agathou*, and the singulars *to kakon* and *to agathon* in v. 9 and 10 clearly indicate, he considers the life of every man as a whole, composed of many individual acts. In 2 Cor. 5, 10, where he says that we all must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, he also combines the singular and the plural, mentioning first the things, *ta . . . ha*, which a man has done, then reducing it all to the singulars *agathon* and *phaulon*. This is in accordance with the picture of the Judgment as Jesus paints it for us in Mt. 25. The individual acts constitute merely so much evidence of the basic attitude of a person, whether he be as a believer joined to Christ, or as an unbeliever separated from Him.

In v. 7 and 8, with *tois men* and *tois de*, Paul more specifically unfolds the *dikaiokrisia* of God. It seems best to take these two expressions as pronominal in character, rather than to prefix them as articles to one or the other of the following participles respectively. Another difficulty is found in the fact that Paul in the first member, *tois men*, continues his construction as governed by the verb of the preceding verse, *apodōsei*, the reward being stated in the accusative; while in the second member, *tois de*, he ends up with the nominative. But the different nature of the two groups of concepts will readily account for the change in construction.

While you may give (*apodōsei*) *doxan* and *timēn* and *aphtharsian*, or even *zōēn aiōnion*, it cannot well be said that you give *orgēn* and *thymon*. These are emotions which motivate one's giving. Hence Paul changes the construction: God's *orgē* and *thymos* will be the lot of the second group of people.

Kath' hypomonēn ergou agathou, thus Paul states the motivation of God's *dikaiokrisia* in the case of the first group. He will reward them according to their endurance in well-doing. What He will give them is "glory and honor and immortality," seeing they have abandoned the sham life of earthly-mindedness and are earnestly striving for real life, eternal life. On the second group the "indignation and wrath" of God will remain, seeing they "do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness." They do so *ex eritheias*. *Eritheia* is derived from *erithos*, not directly but, as the accent indicates, via the verb *eritheuō*. *Erithos* is a laborer working for hire. That is precisely what characterizes this group of people. They stand to God, not in the relation of dear children to their father, they are hirelings working for a reward. They expect credit for their work, and for their inconveniences, having "borne the burden and the heat of the day." They duly record their "good turns." Their *eritheia*, their mind of an hireling, prevents them from embracing God's truth of the Gospel of free grace in faith; they continue to the end in their original *adikia* in spite of their moralizing and their efforts at reform.

The following verses, 9 and 10, not merely amplify the concept of the judgment meted out in each case according to the *dikaiokrisia* of God, by mentioning some details, but they return to a thought expressed in ch. 1, 16, that this will apply first of all to both Jew and Greek. Condemnation and punishment will be the inescapable lot of all that reject the truth of God, and both Jew and Greek will head the list. On the other hand, to those following the good course, glory and honor and peace will be granted, and again both Jew and Greek will be the first. — For with God, Paul says in v. 11, there is no respect of persons.

The last remark about the absolute impartiality of God,

both in pronouncing and in executing His judgment of condemnation, calls for further elucidation. Are there not some people who never heard about the Law of Moses? Was not the Law of Moses prefaced by the remark: "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" (Ex. 20, 2)? Being thus addressed specifically to the people of Israel, did not the Law, by implication, exempt all other peoples from its demands? Yet Paul himself three times so far expressly linked the Greeks together with the Jews as standing in the front line: "the Jews as well first as the Greeks." How does he justify that coupling of the two peoples, and how does he harmonize it with the impartiality of God?

Paul sums up the situation in a statement which, if taken out of its connection, might seem very unreasonable: "For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law." How can any one sin "without law," *anomōs*? Does not Paul himself in ch. 5, 13, lay down the principle: "Sin is not imputed when there is no law"? If sin is the transgression of the law, then by its very definition it presupposes the previous promulgation of a law; and a sinning *anomōs* is a contradiction in the very terms. But Paul is not speaking in a vacuum when he here maintains a sinning without law. He has emphatically placed Jews and Greeks side by side as belonging into the same class as far as the question is concerned which he is discussing, great as the differences between the two may be in other respects. In ch. 3, 9, he recapitulates his thesis in these words: "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles (*Hellenas*) that they are all under sin." Thus Paul himself restricts the *anomōs* to his classification of the Greeks with the Jews. Compared with the Jews the Greeks are living *anomōs*, because they have not the Law of Moses. Yet they are thereby not excused. Though living without the Law of Moses, they must nevertheless be charged with sinning, because, as he will show immediately, they are transgressing a law of their own which in substance is identical with the Law of Moses.

That the Children of Israel, who have sinned in the Law, will be judged and condemned by the Law, no matter how much they may boast of a superior knowledge, and may pose as the teachers of the Gentiles, requires no elaborate argument: "for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but (only) the doers of the law shall be justified" (v. 13). But what about the Greeks who did not have the Law of Moses? How can their guilt be established? Yes, here the scope of the question must even be widened so as to include not only the Greeks, but all non-Jews.

Paul undertakes this proof in the following verse, v. 14, to which the first clause of v. 15 must be added: "For when the Gentiles (*ethnē*) which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts."

These words are clear in themselves and require no comment; but the facts which Paul here uses call for some further discussion. Paul is not drawing on his imagination when he says that the Gentiles are a law unto themselves because the very same work which the Law of Moses prescribes is written in their hearts. Paul knew the current systems of philosophy of his day, particularly of practical philosophy, of ethics. He met the leading philosophers at Athens on their own ground; he proclaimed the Gospel of Christ to them and called them to repentance. — It will be worth our while to review briefly some of the chief points of the prevalent systems.

The philosophy of the Greeks in Paul's day was not the same that it had been under Plato and Aristotle. The emphasis had greatly shifted. While the older philosophers had devoted themselves chiefly to the problems of metaphysics, those pertaining to the nature and the change of things, the later schools turned more to matters of ethics. Also Plato and Aristotle had discussed problems of ethics, but theirs was chiefly social ethics, considering man as a member of society, as a citizen; while the later schools gave attention pre-eminently to individual ethics. They could not, it is true,

altogether avoid the problems of metaphysics, seeing that their ethical deductions were based on their metaphysical assumptions; but their prime interest was in the field of ethics.

In Athens Paul met Epicureans and Stoics.

In their metaphysics the Epicureans were materialists. They allowed only matter as really existing. The human soul they considered as composed of a very refined gas, which permeated the body and dissipated in death. Since they admitted no life after death, their ethical prescriptions were limited to conduct in this life. As already mentioned, they did not extensively cultivate a social ethics, telling man how to become a useful member of society; they concentrated on individual ethics, telling man how to get the most out of this life, how to attain *hēdonē*. Since misery is inevitable and pure joy unattainable, every man's aim must be to reduce pain to a minimum, coupled with a maximum of pleasure. They counseled moderation in all things. How the people heeded this advice may be seen from the common saying which Paul quotes in 1 Cor. 15, 32: "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." Already the most famous pupil of Epicurus, Metrodorus, reduced Epicurean ethics to the formula that "all good things have reference to the belly." It was apparently Epicurean philosophy that vexed the Corinthian Christians with doubts about the resurrection. On Areopagus Paul directed his remarks chiefly against the Stoic position.

Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, was a pantheist. The world is an unfolding of God, and will ultimately be reabsorbed into the godhead. The human soul is a spark of the deity, after death to return to its source. Everything is thus governed by an inexorable fate. Hence the supreme demand of ethics must be that a man bring himself into conscious agreement with fate, striving for a willing surrender to the divine will. He must let neither pain nor pleasure affect him (*apatheia*). If things become unbearable and he can no longer control his passions: *exire licet*. — If we remember Zeno's basic pantheism, we shall also understand his rule: *Zēn kata physin*.

While the Stoics conceived of God as an impersonal being, so it seems, yet they were tolerant over against popular

religion. On Areopagus Paul quoted from a poem of Cleanthes, who was a pupil of Zeno. Cleanthes addressed an ode of praise to Zeus, whose name he may seem to substitute for the Stoic Fate, yet hinting that even Zeus is subject to Fate. We here reproduce a German translation, taken from Chr. Ernst Luthardt's *Apologetische Vortraege* (4th edition, p. 228f. — An abbreviated English translation by Walter H. Pater may be read in Will Durant's *The Life of Greece*, p. 653f.)

Hochster, unsterblicher Gott, vielnamiger, ewiger Herrscher,
 Waltender in der Natur, du Lenker des Alls nach Gesetzen,
 Heil dir! mit dir zu reden ist jeglichem Menschen gestattet:
Sind wir doch deines Geschlechts. Ein Grundton wurde gegeben
 Jedem der Wesen zur Stimme, die leben und weben auf Erden.
 Damit will ich dich preisen und immer erheben dein Machtwort.
 Dir folgt jede der Welten, die hoch um die Erde sich waelzen,
 Wie du leitest, und deinem Gebot beugt jede sich willig.
 Ohne dich wird kein Ding, du Gewaltiger, weder auf Erden
 Noch in der goettlichen Hoehe des Luftraums, noch in dem Meere,
 Als was die Boesen vollbringen in eigener Geistesverblendung.
 Aber das Unrecht weisst du zum Rechten hinwieder zu wenden.
 Uniform machst du zur Form, Unfreundliches artest du freundlich:
 Also stimmest du alles zu Einem, das Boese zum Guten,
 Dass es fuer Alles ein ein'ges in Ewigkeit geltendes Wort gibt,
 Dem nur Boese sich unter den Sterblichen fluechtig entziehen,
 Sinne beraubte! die, immer Erlangung des Guten erstrebend,
 Nimmer erschauen des Gottes Gemeinspruch, den nicht vernehmen,
 Dem sie mit Weisheit gehorchend ein freudiges Leben genoessen.
 Aber sie stuermen dem Schoenen vorueber nach Jenem und Diesem:
 Einer hat neidische Sucht in dem Herzen nach Ehre und Namen;
 Schmucklos sinnet ein Andrer auf Klugheit nur und auf Raenke;
 Andere trachten nach Luesten und suessen Genuessen des Leibes,
 Maechtig sich sputend, bemueht das lockende Ziel zu erreichen.
 Aber o Gott, Allgeber, Umdunkelter, Herrscher der Blitze,
 Von dem berueckenden Wahnsinn, o Vater, erloese die Menschen,
 Streif ihn von ihrem Gemuete und lass du sie finden die Richtschnur,
 Welcher dich fuegend du Alles nach ewigem Rechte regierest,
 Dass wir, geehrt von dir, dir wieder entgegen mit Ehre,
 Ewig besingend dein Tun, wie's ziemet den sterblich Gebornen.
 Denn nicht fuer Menschen noch Goetter ist hoehere Wuerde gegeben
 Als in Gerechtigkeit preisen die Allen gemeinsame Regel.

Making full allowance for the pantheistic undertone of this hymn to Zeus, we have here a clear expression of the natural knowledge of God and a recognition of our moral obligation over against Him to honor and obey Him, while envy, and trickery, and sensual lusts are set down as wickedness and insanity.

This ode is the effusion of a philosopher and poet. How the common man felt in his heart even about sins against the Sixth Commandment, which were generally condoned as a permissible gratification of a natural impulse, may be seen, *e. g.*, from the remark of a certain Curio about Caesar, saying that he was *omnium mulierum vir et omnium virorum mulier*.

Paul was familiar with the ethical views generally held among the common people, he understood equally as well the philosophical systems in vogue among the educated classes. He had solid ground to stand on when he said that the Gentiles, although they had not the Law of Moses, were a law unto themselves, and that the works of Moses' Law were written in their hearts.

And yet, although he acknowledges the natural knowledge of God as correct in itself, as *alētheia*, and although he admits that the Gentiles, when they follow the dictates of their hearts, are doing "the things contained in the law," yet he has no positive use for either, neither for their natural knowledge nor for their civic righteousness, in his Gospel work. The only effect that he recognizes is that because of their knowledge the Gentiles stand condemned as inexcusable even in their best efforts.

M.

THE BLOOD SACRIFICES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

(Continued from our January issue.)

3. The Sin Offering

The first two types of offerings which have so far been considered in this study, the Burnt Offering and the Peace Offering, served to express the Covenant relationship of Israel with its God. The other two which are still before us, the Sin Offering and the Trespass Offering, were to restore that same relationship in those countless instances where it had been disturbed by the failure of the people to abide by the terms of the covenant which their God had established with them.

The first of these is the Sin Offering, *CHATTATH*. The first meaning of the Hebrew word is simply sin, in the sense of erring from the appointed way. The same word then becomes the name of the Offering which shall be brought for this sin. The LXX uses *hamartia* for both concepts.

There can be no mistaking the purpose of this offering. The Law which had just been given in connection with the Covenant of Sinai could not fail to create among these people a painful awareness of their many transgressions. It had been designed by God for several functions, but particularly to lead to a true knowledge of sin. Unless men hardened their hearts, it did this with telling effect. If under such conditions God's true children were not to despair, they would require a source of strong comfort. This needed to go beyond what was proclaimed by the use of the blood in other types of offerings. In these other instances this blood provided the assurance that men might worship and draw near to their God because provisions had been made for the covering of their sins. Here this truth is to be set forth in a way that would be fundamental for the entire time of the Old Testament. A great and solemn institution, *YOM KIPPUR*, the Day of Atonement, was to unfold what these other sacrifices implied only in passing.

It is, therefore, most striking that the ordinance concerning this all-important offering should begin with the words, "If a

soul shall sin through ignorance" (Lv. 4:2). This certainly constitutes a definite limitation as to the cases to which these provisions were meant to apply. It presents a thought which is taken up in Hb. 9:7 where the High Priest is described as offering blood upon the mercy seat "*for the errors (agnoēmata, sins of ignorance) of the people.*" Num. 15:27-31 puts it even more drastically, especially when it adds, "but the soul that doeth ought presumptuously (lit.: with up-raised hand), that soul shall be cut off from among his people." Many explanations are offered for this apparent withholding of forgiveness from all sins save those done in ignorance. The simplest solution is perhaps the one which notes that these statements refer only to the sacrificial ceremonial, to the public action by which God's people were assured that those sins were forgiven which did not grow out of a despising of the Word of the Lord (v. 31), which did not involve the element of wilful and impenitent defiance of their God. So far this general rite could go, and only so far.

But this did not mean that there could and would not also be a very specific and personal assurance of forgiveness where a sinner who had previously defied his God in a most flagrant manner now contritely confessed his evil deeds. The absolution which Nathan pronounced to a penitent David is a case in point. Isaiah 1:18 holds forth a similar promise of pardon: "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." In fact, the Old Testament abounds in passages and instances that make it plain that the penitent sinner shall receive the free forgiveness of God even though his sin might lie beyond the range of the "errors" for which this particular offering was designed.

The occasions for the use of the CHATTATH were many, ranging from an individual's desire to confess his sin to a similar provision for the entire people. It also covered a number of special occasions which called for a cleansing from previous sins, such as the consecration of priests (Ex. 29:9-14) and the festival which marked the beginning of each new month (Num. 28:15). It culminated in the Day of the Great Atonement (Lv. 16). On this last occasion the offerings were very elaborate, in keeping with the solemnity of the occasion. But this elaborate-

ness was not an essential feature of all Sin Offerings. For the sake of the individual who was seeking the comfort of forgiveness the offering could also be a most simple one. Even the most modest meal offering was acceptable: one-tenth of an ephah of fine flour (Lv. 6: 11), lest an Israelite be deprived of this precious comfort of forgiveness by reason of his poverty. The all-important thing was that this provision for conveying the pardoning grace of God be kept constantly before the people and made available to every member.

It is in connection with the detailed description which Lv. 16 gives of the Day of Atonement that we have the best opportunity to note the full significance and purpose of the various parts of the ceremonial of the Sin Offering. This also makes it plain that the CHATTATH rather than the Trespass Offering, the ASHAM, is that offering into which God has placed the greatest measure of Messianic significance and Gospel content. This is the sacrifice which demonstrates most clearly the expiation of sin before God and which shows how God is propitiated. Very properly Delitzsch calls this Day of Atonement the "Good Friday of the Old Testament."

Reference to the comparative table that was published with the first installment of this study will show that the ceremonial of the blood played a much more prominent role in the CHATTATH than in any other offering. The use of blood was an essential requirement in the other sacrifices also, but there it was enough that it was dashed against the sides of the altar as a general reminder of the promise which God had attached to this most important part of the entire ceremonial, Lv. 17: 11. In the case of the CHATTATH, however, the directives given in Lv. 4 and 5 are very specific. If it was an individual member or even a ruler of the people who was bringing the offering, the Priest was carefully to apply some of the blood to the horns of the Great Altar. Thus he was, so to speak, bringing before the very eyes of God this mute plea for forgiveness. If, on the other hand, the offering was for a High Priest who in his official capacity had erred in some part of his ministrations and thus had brought a certain measure of responsibility and guilt upon the people whose official

representative he was, * the blood was to be applied also to the Altar of Incense and to be sprinkled seven times before the Lord, before the Veil of the sanctuary. For these were the holy places where he officiated and upon which he had brought the reproach of his error. The same was to be done if the sin was one of the whole people. This last application was in substance the pattern for the use of the blood on the Day of Atonement, except that there it was carried out to a far higher degree. For it was for the sins of the people that the atonement was being made, the many accumulated sins. Here no possibility was to be overlooked. No place was to remain where the abomination of sin could offend against the holiness of God. The atonement proper was to be made upon the Mercy Seat, in the very presence of God. But the sanctuary itself, the Altar of Incense, the Great Altar of Burnt Offerings, also must be cleansed from the taint of the many sins which had been brought before God in this holy place. This was the great climax in the use of the blood upon the altars of Israel, in fact, of the entire sacrificial system. Nor can there be any doubt but that the blood ceremonial is to be considered the essential element in these sacred rites.

After this, only a secondary role may be ascribed to that part of the ceremonial which describes the use of the flesh in the Sin Offering. The sacrificial burning (HIQTIR) remains as a constant factor in the rite. The ceremonial eating of certain parts by the priests is also practiced, at least when the offering is brought by an individual, be he king or commoner. But a significant change appears when the CHATTATH was offered for the priest or for the nation. In these instances there is no mention of any eating of the sacrifice, only the specific command to take the entire offering to a place outside of the camp where it was to be cleanly consumed with a bright and blazing fire (SARAPH). This meant

* This is the sense of Lv. 4:3: "If the priest . . . do sin *according to the sin of the people*," — L'ASHMATH HACAM — to be inculcating of the people. This verse is also interesting because the High Priest is here called HAKKOHEN HAMMASHIACH, the Messiah priest, a designation which occurs only in connection with this particular prophetic type-offering, the fulfillment of which we have in Jesus, the true Messiah-Priest.

that no part of it was to be converted to any common use. Beyond that, however, this act had no special meaning. It added nothing to the sacrifice. The full significance of the Sin Offering lay in the blood that had been shed. This act gains added significance when we note that the two kinds of CHATTATH where this departure from the normal use appears, the sacrifice for the priest and that for the people, are the same that were prescribed for the Day of Atonement. On that day above all others there was to be nothing that would detract in the least from the full significance of the atoning blood. To note this will help one to understand the reference which the letter to the Hebrews makes when it says: "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp." (Ch. 13:10f.) For when the blood of Christ was shed in death upon the cross, no further act was needed. "The life of the flesh is in the blood." The atonement was complete. The *tetelestai* could now be spoken.

An interesting variant appears when we note the description of the ceremony by which the priest on the Day of Atonement made ready the second of the two goats for the peculiar part which he was to play in the ceremonies of the day. We have observed that the laying on of hands was one of the factors which were common to the several types of offerings. It is mentioned in Lv. 1:4; 3:2; 4:4 — but always in the singular: the offerer shall lay his hand upon the head of the victim. The plural does appear in chapter 4:15, but only because a group of offerers is mentioned: "The elders of the congregation shall lay their hands," etc. But in Lv. 16:21 the picture changes: "Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness." The intention is clear and the sign language very drastic. The meaning which this gesture had in the other cases is here to be intensified. The symbolism of this act is further supplemented by the spoken word. The oral confession of sins, solemnly pronounced before the assembled people by their highest ranking

mediator, must have made a profound impression on the assembled multitude. But if this was true of the confession, it was equally true of the absolution which was implied when the live goat was now led away into the wilderness, "bearing upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited." Thus their damning sins are now rendered harmless, are returned to AZAZEL, to their author. For this rendering of the L'AZAZEL of verse 8 is better than the translation of the A. V. and others who render this as "for the scapegoat." For the parallel of the phrases ("one lot for the Lord, and the other lot L'AZAZEL") compels us to take this *hapax legomenon* as a proper noun even as JAHWEH. We take this as another designation for Satan rather than for some demon of the wilderness. For this is simply in keeping with the entire teaching of Scripture on this subject, which traces the origin of all sin to the Great Adversary of God. It should be noted, of course, that the text says nothing to indicate that this second goat was in any way meant to be a sacrifice to AZAZEL. To him God's people owe no tribute. — For an extensive and thorough discussion of this entire subject, see Keil's Commentary on the text.

When we ask for the New Testament significance of this offering and its distinctive features, there can be no uncertainty as to the answer. In connection with what was said on the general use of the blood we have already stated that it is pointed at a greater sacrifice that was to come. But in the same degree in which the use of the blood in the CHATTATH is more detailed and impressive, and therefore of greater significance than the use of the blood in the other offerings, so the prophetic function is more specific and its legitimate application richer in its amazing variety. For here we have a clear picture of the Great Atonement in its many different aspects.

The Epistle to the Hebrews brings the great unfolding of this theme, particularly in Chapters 7, 9 and 10. It is significant that in so doing it describes the atonement of Christ chiefly in terms of the CHATTATH, the Sin Offering, and that it makes extensive use of the dramatic features of that great day which called for the most vivid and solemn observance of this particular type of offering.

In tracing the manner in which this thought is developed,

we must, of course, keep in mind that the writer of this Epistle is tracing a two-fold likeness between the type and its fulfillment. To him Christ is the great, the perfect High Priest, with an unchangeable priesthood, who is able to save to the uttermost. "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once, when he offered up himself" (Heb. 7:26f.). As such he entered in once into the holy place, having attained eternal redemption for us (9:12). As such he has entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us (9:24). As such, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, he sat down on the right hand of God . . . till his enemies be made his footstool (10:12f.). As such He, therefore, will rule with God until unto them that look for Him He shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation (9:28).

But another phase of the Savior's mission remains. He was not only to bring the offering in the manner of the ancient priests. He was to be the offering: "Himself the Victim and Himself the Priest." In this He was again the perfect fulfillment of the Old Testament types. His offering was indeed "not without blood." "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. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God" (Heb. 9:12-14). But in this respect the type was not merely equaled. It was exceeded by far. The "*how much more*" of verse 14 is characteristic of this Epistle which everywhere shows the better, the greater, the more excellent priesthood of Christ. To this end the pouring out of His blood was indispensable, for "without shedding of blood is no remission" v. 22.

The writer of this epistle attaches a similar significance to the death of Christ as the sacrificial victim, attributing to it a distinct redemptive value of its own. Verse 15 reads (in Moffatt's trans-

lation): "He mediates a new covenant for this reason, that those who have been called may obtain the eternal inheritance they have been promised, now that a death has occurred which redeems them from transgressions involved in the first covenant." This death is the final factor which validates the testament which so far has been but a promise. "For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth" (9: 17). Indeed, so perfect is the sacrifice, so complete, so entirely without any flaw, that it stands in no need of constant repetition. It exceeds the type in this respect also that it is of eternal value. "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. 9: 25-28a).

These observations should make it clear that the various features of the ancient Sin Offering were meant to foreshadow our great redemption, and did actually provide a true picture of it, thereby presenting even to the faithful of the Old Testament, the Gospel in its most concentrated form. But when we note the mass application of this offering, by which it was employed for an entire nation at the same time, we should not forget that it also had a highly individual and personal use. It was so designed that it was available even to the poorest Israelite as a strictly private ministrations. If the wider use of this offering may be compared with the general public preaching of the Gospel even to all the world, then the personal and individual use finds its most fitting equivalent in that institution of the church which, we fear, is falling into ever greater disuse and neglect among us, — the practice of private confession and absolution. This Old Testament rite should certainly move us to greater zeal in cultivating this private, personal assurance of the forgiving grace of our Lord in our congregations and among our people, and in seeking it for our own spiritual comfort.

4. The Trespass Offering

The last of the blood offerings is the Trespass Offering, *Schuldopfer*. As in the case of the CHATATH , so the original name for this offering is likewise simply a word which in its first sense means sin, and then it also applied to the offering which is to be brought for it. But in this instance the Hebrew word ASHAM emphasizes the thought of guilt, and the responsibility which has been incurred by trespassing upon the rights or property of another. The LXX has *plēmmeleia* (sometimes also *plēmmeleſis*), derived from *plēn*, beyond, and *melos*, song, and meaning therefore a mistake in music, a false note, discord, and then metaphorically a fault, offense, error. The more active *plēmmeleſis* would then imply failing, sinning.

In order to explain the difference between the Sin Offering and the ASHAM , the Trespass Offering, it has been suggested that the former pertains to sins of commission, the latter to those of omission. In view of Lv. 5:17 this theory is untenable. It is far more in keeping with the original meaning of ASHAM to take this as referring to offenses which were of such a nature that the loss which they caused would be estimated and so covered by compensation (Robinson-Brown). A careful reading of the passage in Leviticus and Numbers which refer to this offering will show that the element of restitution recurs constantly. In this sense one may say that the thought of satisfaction prevails in this offering. Our civil courts would call them compensatory rather than punitive awards.

How this can be done toward one's neighbor is easily understood. Lv. 6:1-7 describes in detail the manner in which an offender who has defrauded his neighbor shall make amends by restoring to him the principal, and adding the fifth part more thereto. And then he shall bring his ASHAM unto the Lord, a ram without blemish. But it is not so evident how this can be done with reference to God who, after all, is not made richer by the gifts of man. The difficulty becomes even more pronounced when the ASHAM is called for in the ceremony of the cleansing of lepers (Lv. 14:12ff.), and in certain offerings by Nazarites. But the difficulties disappear when we consider that in the case of an

Israelite who found himself in default with regard to some of his obligations toward his God ("in the matter of sacred gifts to the Lord." Goodspeed-Smith: American Translation. Lv. 5:15), this requirement was not prescribed for the sake of compensating God, but rather constituted a measure which was wholesome and beneficial for the delinquent, as a matter of training and discipline. This training included even the adding of the fifth part to the amends.

That a leper could not keep up with his religious obligations was inevitable. Certainly no reproach was to come upon him on that score. But it was good and wholesome for him to be reminded that in the day of his rejoicing over his recovery he would not only remember to give thanks to God, but also go as far as his means permitted in bringing a token offering as compensation for his accumulated arrears in his duties toward his Lord. Note that the "amends" are not called for in this instance. The Nazarite was to bring an ASHAM only if during the days of his vow he had become ceremonially defiled, and therefore temporarily disqualified for the special service to God which was specified by his vow. It was an acknowledgement that some days had been lost which belonged to God (Num. 6:12). God did not profit thereby. But the Nazarite himself was further trained and exercised in the conscientious fulfilling of his solemn pledge. "Offer unto God thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the most High" (Ps. 50:14).

A somewhat different use of the word occurs in 1 Sam. 6:3 where the tribute of gold which the Philistines sent along when they returned the captured Ark of the Covenant is also called an ASHAM. Though this lies entirely outside of the range of the prescribed ceremonial offerings of Israel, yet a certain relation appears in the intended meaning of this act. The Philistines had become painfully aware that they had violated the honor of the God of Israel by taking the Ark into the temple of their idol, Dagon. They understood that the calamities which had befallen them were active demonstrations of YAHWEH's power to avenge Himself. By the return of the Ark they meant to rid themselves of the object of their guilt. By this added tribute of gold they intended to satisfy the honor of an offended God. Thus in its purpose this intuitive action of these foes of Israel comes close

to the principle which God's people were to be taught by this particular type of offering. — Oehler (*Theologie des A. T.*, p. 471) sums up the difference between the Sin Offering and the Trespass Offering by quoting Delitzsch: "The basic idea of the Sin Offering is the *expiatio*, and of the Trespass Offering, the *satisfactio*; in the former case the evangelical character prevails, in the latter the disciplinary."

It will be noted that in addition to all the special provisions for the restitution of what had been withheld from God or taken from the neighbor, the offering of a sacrificial victim still remained, and that the normal use of the blood was observed. This clearly demonstrated that material restitution and compensation, even in excess of the offense, did not remove the moral wrong, the offense against the holy will of God. An atonement was still needed for that, and could be supplied only by the means which God's grace had established for that purpose: the sacrificial blood.

In the case of the Trespass Offering it was normal procedure that part of the flesh was eaten by the priests. "Every male among the priests shall eat thereof" (Lv. 7, 6). By this ordinance God was acknowledging the Levitical priesthood as truly representing Him, so that He received these offerings through them as well as directly by means of the ceremonial burning. This representative status of the priests was further emphasized when the amends which accompanied the offering of the victim were assigned to the priests in those cases where the guilt had consisted in withholding something which was due to God (Lv. 5:16), a principle which was also applied under quite unusual circumstances in Num. 5:8-10 ("let the trespass be recompensed unto the Lord, even to the priest").

The New Testament significance of this Trespass Offering is revealed when Isaiah (53:10) speaks of the Servant of the Lord as bringing his life as an *ASHAM*. The A. V. does not make the reference to this particular type of offering quite clear, mainly because it speaks of an "offering for sin." Goodspeed-Smith translates: "When He makes Himself (*NAPHSHO*) a guilt-offering." Luther: "Wenn er sein Leben zum Schuldopfer gegeben hat." The implications of this terminology are carried out in the following quotation which we offer in a rather free translation:

"ASHAM in the sense of guilt is that type of offense by which man does injury to God or to the property of his neighbor and by which he is obligated to make some restitution. ASHAM in the sense of sacrifice is, therefore, that offering by which such restitution is made. Satisfaction is made for sin, but not by means of punishment (that is the function of the Sin Offering), but by redressing the injury by means of compensation over and above the harm that has been done. It is especially to be noted that this Trespass Offering is really based on personal awareness of guilt and free acknowledgement of the offense. As our suffering substitute the Servant of the Lord had taken our sin upon his own conscience as an offense against God, considered the guilt His own, and offered His life to God in voluntary satisfaction therefor." (Pieper, *Jesaias II*, p. 414.)

In addition to the special light which this passage thus sheds on the redemptive work of Christ the observations which we have made on this last type of offering lend themselves to some very practical applications to the congregational life of our day, specifically to the purpose and the exercise of Christian discipline. The aim of such discipline in our day is also not to be a punitive one, but rather remedial and constructive, a purposeful training of the New Man. If there has been any violation of the rights or property of a neighbor, proper restitution will certainly be in order wherever possible. This is definitely a matter of Christian sanctification, a bringing forth of fruits of repentance. The fact that God graciously forgives the sin itself should be ample motivation for such a deed. To guide our Christians in such a direction will be a most evangelical exercise of brotherly admonition and discipline.

The same principle holds good when the occasion for such discipline is a matter of someone's neglecting the obligations which all Christians have toward their church and its Lord. The entire vexatious question of the arrears of members in their support of their congregation and its work crops up at this point. If it is really a matter of neglect, and not of inability to do more, if it is really a case where the reluctant flesh seems to be getting the better of a Christian, then again brotherly admonition along the above lines in that same spirit will certainly be in order. And

this may well include an urgent appeal to such a brother that as far as possible he make amends for his past neglect, — not for the sake of enriching the coffers of the church, but rather for the sake of his own training and development. There is need among us for cultivating the attitude that our support of our church and its work constitutes an obligation of love and gratitude to our Lord and should, therefore, be held sacred. The fact that this has as a rule been attempted only in a mechanical and legalistic manner, with the unsatisfactory results which must necessarily follow upon such methods, does not mean that it cannot be done in a right and evangelical way, and should so be done.

In reviewing the entire subject matter which has been covered in this essay we cannot forgo one final observation. One cannot but be deeply impressed by noting how great were the sacrifices which God required from His people when they stood under the dispensation of the Law, how sternly He dealt with them when there was any breach of the Law, yet how graciously He made arrangements, albeit provisional ones, for the covering of their sins. How much more should not we to whom so much has been given, we who stand in the glorious era of fulfillment of the many things which were merely implied in Old Testament prophecy, we who have the wondrous Gospel of reconciliation and atonement, of justification by grace through faith, — how much more should not we excel in our joyful tribute, in our offerings of thanksgiving to the God of our salvation.

E. REIM.

A SPECIAL APPLICATION OF THE TENTH COMMANDMENT TO PASTOR AND CONGREGATION

This article, as its heading reveals, is not to be a profound treatise, but a simple, practical essay in which special application of the Tenth Commandment is made to pastor and congregation. The Tenth Commandment is to be studied as if it read: Pastor, thou shalt not covet that which is thy neighboring pastor's.

Without more words of introduction, we shall proceed to the study at once. We shall begin with the question:

I. Who Is One's Neighboring Pastor?

The words and actions of many, especially in this day and age, make it appear as if all men designated as pastors, priests, and rabbis are one's neighboring pastors.

The words of Jesus, the perfect pastor, however, speak a different language. Jesus did not call false teachers His neighboring pastors. He labeled them false prophets, ravening wolves (Mt. 7, 15). He described them as men not sent by God, who pretend to be divine messengers, who, however, have no divine call, nor do they proclaim God's will.

And Christ's actions coincided with His words. As He spoke of false teachers, so He treated them. True, in everyday life they indeed were His neighbors in an hour of need and Jesus was the perfect neighbor to them, but in church life they were not neighboring pastors to Him, and His treatment of them was according.

Christ did not fellowship with false teachers. His conduct did not give the appearance that He was a brother of a ministerial association of false teachers. The Pharisees were false teachers. When He met them in the course of doing His work on earth, He called them what they were, hypocrites, (Mt. 15, 7) and uncovered their hypocrisy. He did not shield them in His sermons, or attempt to preach sermons so vague that it was difficult for the layman to determine if He was for or against them. He warned His hearers against them in His sermons. "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees." He did not urge the followers of false prophets to stay with their false teachers and perform the

duties imposed upon them by the same. He stretched forth His gracious arms in invitation saying: Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

As Jesus, so Paul, the great apostle of our Savior — Paul followed in the footsteps of Christ. The words and actions of Paul reveal that false teachers were no neighboring pastors to him. Paul was not a cog which would fit into a unionistic endeavor. 2 Cor. 11, 12 he calls false teachers false apostles and deceitful workers. He warns against false teachers in his epistles. It is he who, inspired by the Spirit, wrote the words recorded Rom. 16, 17: "Avoid them," and 2 Cor. 6, 17: "Come ye out from among them." It is he who by the strength of the Spirit withstood Peter, an apostle, to the face when he out of fear by his actions gave support to the false doctrine of the Judaizers.

Paul had not fellowship but a curse for false teachers, regardless of who they were. Gal. 1, 9 we read: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

As Paul, so we should follow in the footsteps of our Savior. False teachers should not be neighboring pastors to us. They are no pastors. They are ravening wolves, false prophets, not sent by God, who pretend to be divine messengers proclaiming God's will, who, however, preach the lie. Let us remember this and endeavor at all times to avoid giving the impression that false teachers and faithful pastors are neighboring pastors. Let us give no offense in anything, that the ministry be not blamed (2 Cor. 6, 3) for the opinion that prevails to a marked degree among our members, namely, that all men occupying pulpits are ministers of God, and that all religions are a true serving and worshiping of God; that one is as good as the other, the important thing being that one lives the faith which one embraces. Rather than throw a pinch of incense on the altar to worship Caesar, the martyrs of old went to their death at the stake or to the lions in the arena. "Awake Thou Spirit who didst fire the watchmen of the church's youth," we pray; and may He give us strength to stand fast and not to throw a pinch of incense upon the altar of false teaching and false practice by fellowshiping with false teachers in any way. Give use the spiritual strength in this unionistic age in which truth means so little

to so many (but so much to the souls of men) to stand alone if need be, and reveal false teachers both in word and by action as being light and treacherous persons who pollute the Sanctuary and do violence to the Law. Zeph. 3, 4.

Let no pastor think, however, that the fact that false teachers are not neighboring pastors gives him any and all kinds of freedom of action over against them; that the door stands wide open; that he has a right to become a busybody in a false teacher's realm, to show no respect for his rights, that it is his duty to challenge him to open debate, that his life should be dedicated to going forth and destroying his neighboring false teacher, taking his followers from him either by hook or crook. A pastor should follow in the footsteps of the Savior and realize that the same law governs him in the performance of his work as the Savior. Jesus was sent into the world to do a specific work. In fact, it was His meat and drink. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and finish His work," John 4, 34. This work brought Him in contact with false teachers and their followers. When in the course of doing His work, working out our redemption, this happened, then He busied Himself with the false teachers and their disciples; and then it was part of His work, the work of redemption; then He fulfilled for us the Law in dealing perfectly with false teachers. Thanks be to God! For how often do we not come short of the mark. Had Jesus dealt otherwise He would have sinned; that is, had Jesus forgotten to make the work of our redemption His business from Bethlehem to Calvary, had He suddenly dedicated His life to giving false teachers a royal battle, destroying them, He would not only have sinned, but failed completely in His mission. He would have brought destruction to the existing false teachers, but not salvation to the sinner.

As Christ, so the Christian pastor — the pastor has a specific work to do, even as his Savior did. That work is not to fight false teachers, become a busybody in their field, but as we read 1 Pet. 5, 2: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof." To feed means to shepherd. A pastor's work is to shepherd, that is, to feed, defend, nurse, and shelter. Whom? The wide world? The flock "which is among you," the flock which is entrusted to his care by the Good Shepherd through a divine call;

the flock for which he shall be held accountable on the last day. — “Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand.” Ezek. 3, 17-18. A pastor’s days and nights should be dedicated to shepherding his flock, doing his work. Like unto his Savior, his work should be his meat. “The zeal of Thine house hath eaten me up.” And when in doing his work he comes in contact with false teachers and their disciples, he then should busy himself with them. Such action is not sinful but Christ-like, not being unfaithful to his call, but faithful to his calling.

And no faithful pastor need go out of his way to meet false teachers. They will be on the way that duty demands he follow. Jesus came in contact with false teachers as He went from Bethlehem to Calvary along the road marked by the Father. Every faithful pastor will meet them along the road of feeding, defending, nursing, and sheltering his flock. In fact, he will meet them so often that the danger will be present that he might grow weary in his testimony against them and go out of his way to avoid and sidestep them and the issues that confront him in his congregation because of them. Sermon text after sermon text during the course of the year places false teachers and false doctrine squarely on his path. Faithfulness requires that he expound the text, warn and condemn. Conversations with members during the course of the year place the issue squarely before the pastor. He must either in the weakness of his flesh join in with a weak member in throwing a pinch of incense on false teachers and their doctrines or else by the strength of the Spirit instruct and enlighten, uncovering the errors of false teachers and the destructiveness of their false doctrines. Every mixed marriage confronts him with the issue. Let us say that a pastor learns that one of his flock is about to enter or has already entered into a mixed marriage, for example, with a Roman Catholic. As a shepherd he has work to do. His sheep is in danger of the Anti-Christ. He must expose the Anti-Christ without mercy in the light of Holy Writ to his sheep.

He must instruct, warn, condemn. He must urge his member to stay with the altar of Christ. And what about the follower of the Anti-Christ placed into his pathway? Urge the same to stay with the Anti-Christ and do his commands? Indeed not! Following in the footsteps of his Savior, he should stretch forth mission, not competition, arms in invitation: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." But what if the party involved is a Christian, by the grace of God knows the Savior and trusts in nothing more and nothing less than Jesus' blood and righteousness? Then the words of Paul are in place: "Come ye out from among them." And if in so doing he gains an entire Roman Catholic congregation He has done so in the performance of his work: Feed the flock of God which is among you taking the oversight thereof. He has not been a busybody but a faithful shepherd. And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear he shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

But if false teachers are not our neighboring pastors, what teachers are? The answer is simple: naturally, the true teachers. But who is a true teacher? All claim to be that, none would stand there otherwise. A true teacher is one who teaches the truth. And what is truth? Pilate did not know, and obviously had none too great an interest in learning, lest he suffer for truth's sake. And many today do not know and are not overly anxious to learn for fear that truth might be what they do not desire it to be. To some truth in the field of religion is everything and anything. While doing mission work several years ago I met a man affiliated with no church. I asked him what he considered the truth to be. He was quick on the trigger and replied, everything that all churches teach is truth: What the Roman Catholics teach is true, so also with Methodists, Lutherans, etc.; and he stated, he was through with a pastor when he learned that he preached otherwise and condemned the teachings of others. Whereupon I politely informed him that he was speaking to that type of man, and with concrete examples showed him that his statement was utterly unscriptural and dangerous to his soul. I invited the man to attend services the next Sunday, Reformation Sunday, pointed out ahead of time what he would hear. By the grace of God through the strength of the Spirit he was there, and the Spirit did His work. The man attended

church faithfully after that and in due time asked to be instructed. There are many minded as this man was; and only too often do men occupying Reformed pulpits sow and water such seed in the hearts of people, so that it becomes a strong plant. — Truth, however, is not anything and everything. It is nothing indefinite, but something most definite. John 17, 17 we hear Jesus say: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." Here we have the definition of truth. God's Word is the truth. And God's Word is the Bible. The Bible is God's Word. The Bible is not a book which simply contains God's Word, or merely as a whole is God's Word. It is God's Word. And they who teach the Bible and the Bible only are true teachers. The spirit of a true teacher is that of Luther: "It is written"; that of Paul: "Any other Gospel is false."

The Bible is the truth. That, however, does not signify that everyone who has the Bible is a true teacher and a neighboring pastor. The Pharisees had the Scriptures; but to Jesus they were false prophets, ravening wolves. Why? He told them. His words are recorded Mk. 7, 11-13. They made the Word of God of none effect through their traditions. They had the Word, but the Word meant nothing to them. John 8, 47, Jesus speaking to them says: "He that is of God heareth God's Word; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." So today teachers of church bodies who use the Bible as the Scribes and Pharisees did are no neighboring pastors.

Our Savior states John 8, 31-32: "If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." These words clearly reveal who true teachers are.

But is it not a fact that men who do not teach the Word of God in truth and purity have sincere, devout Christians as members? Indeed! That reveals itself time and again; but a man is not to be judged by certain members that he has, but by his teachings. And true Christians in a congregation which has a false teacher do not make the false teacher a true one.

But what about the man who is affiliated with a church body whose confessions are not in complete agreement with the truth, yet preaches not according to these confessions but the truth? There are such men, as we know. Should we treat them as neighboring

pastors, fellowship with them? Indeed not! Over against them we have a different duty, and that is to admonish and exhort them with the words of Paul: "Come ye out from among them."

May the Lord grant that we shall never be among them or of them who are false teachers. May we ever be faithful pastors. And we have the assurance of Christ: "If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." And if we should falter, in the weakness of our flesh conduct ourselves as Peter at Antioch, may the Lord in His grace call us to repentance through a faithful Paul who will withstand us to the face. And in this unionistic age may the Lord grant us strength to be faithful Pauls in this respect that we withstand any shaky Peters affiliated with us, to the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

II. What Is Our Neighboring Pastor's?

We are applying the Tenth Commandment to church life as such; so we shall not enter in on a discussion of all of a pastor's property, as for example, his wife, man-servant, or maid-servant, but we shall focus our attention on that property of his that plays such a vital part in his work, and which for that reason ought to come in for special consideration; in other words we shall not discuss what is his by marriage or the labor of his hands, but what is his by birth, and by virtue of his call.

I. His property by birth — every person has gifts by birth. They are his property by creation. All people, however, have not the same gifts by birth. God in His wisdom deems it wise not to distribute to all in like measure. Physically and mentally there are tremendous differences.

So pastors have gifts by birth — truly, not all in like measure and manner. They are theirs by creation and are used in the performance of their duty. Since this is true, that pastor has no reason to be proud who has been blessed abundantly by creation. It is not to his but to God's glory that he is what he is. However, it is to his shame if he does not use these gifts faithfully. And every gift is attributable to God's grace only. "By grace I am what I am" applies. The Lord has given, and let us not forget, the Lord can take away, and that overnight. 1 Cor. 4, 7 should humble every

pastor who glories in himself, and will do so if taken to heart. "For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?"—And it is not to be forgotten that an abundance of gifts does not make a man immune to folly. A man of great gifts can make and does make a great fool of himself if he lives on in pride and does not faithfully use them as a humble servant of the Savior to glorify Jesus and not himself. The only true way to use special gifts is to use them to increase not self but Jesus in the eyes of the people. "He must increase, but I must decrease." A pastor is in the ministry to make Christ, not self, great. On the other hand, since a man's gifts are his by creation, the pastor who has not been blessed so abundantly has no reason to be discontented and discouraged. He as well as the other is a wise creation of God. Thy hands have wisely made me. He is a product not of accident or his own making, but of God's wisdom. God in His wisdom wants him just so. Why then should he be discontented and desire to be otherwise? As a devoted servant he should strive to be faithful, not long to be what he is not, and have the comfort in his weakness that the Lord seeks no more than that a man be found faithful. It is to be borne in mind that in plant life it is not always the largest tree that produces the most and best fruits, the biggest bush that has the most beautiful flowers. And we can be sure that Judgment Day will reveal that big names in the ministry, due to natural gifts, did not always do the best work; nor will all the men with degrees be found at the head of the class. Many an insignificant "bush pastor," who was no shining light in the ministry in the eyes of the people, yet faithful in his office, who did not hear many "well dones" on earth, will hear the "well done, thou good and faithful servant" there where it will count. And then the man who has no special gifts should not forget the words of 1 Cor. 12, 4: "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." The Church is not the work of our gifts, but the product of the Spirit. One may have a stronger voice, keener intellect, more pleasing personality than the other, but the Spirit is the same. The power of John 3, 16 is not the man who speaks it, but the Spirit who works through it. Wherever the Word of God is preached in truth and

purity there is a tremendous power, the Spirit. The Word of God is a power of God through the strength of the Spirit. It is as almighty as God Himself. No one can put any might into it, add any power to it. And it is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Heb. 4, 12. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord." Let us ever remember this and not worry that the Church will suffer because of our weakness; our strength, thank the Lord, is not the bulwark of the Church; but let us faithfully preach that Word of God just as God has made us and see and experience its mighty power wherever preached. "My word shall not return unto me void." What the Church needs above all is not pastors of great renown, but faithful men, faithful to the Word of God, filled with the spirit of Luther: "The Word they still shall let remain and not a thank have for it. He's by our side upon the plain with His good gifts and Spirit. And take they our life, goods, fame, child, and wife, let them all be gone. They yet have nothing won; the kingdom ours remaineth." — And that kind of pastors we can be by the grace of God through the strength of the Spirit, faithful, even though we may not be gifted, faithful to His Word.

2. The property that every pastor has by rebirth. — All Christians have a property by rebirth. It is not a natural but a spiritual property, not the result of creation but redemption. Its source is the wounds of Christ. Christ wrought and won it with His suffering and death. The Holy Ghost appropriates it to a person by working faith in the heart. That possession is the royal priesthood. As soon as a person is brought to faith by the Holy Spirit he is a royal priest. He who loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father, Rev. 1, 5-6. Yes, a person is a priest the moment he becomes a Christian. And as a priest he has complete possession of all the blessings and treasures of the bride of Christ, and they are at his disposal with supreme kingly and priestly sovereignty for his and his neighbor's soul's salvation. In other words, the keys of the kingdom of heaven

are his, the authority to bind and to loose, to forgive and retain sins. They are his as long as he is and remains in faith.

Every pastor as a priest, as a Christian, has this possession, the royal priesthood. It is his by rebirth. It was his before he was a pastor, as soon as he became a Christian. As little as the call into the ministry made him a Christian, so little did the call into the ministry make him a priest, and give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the right to use them. The call made him a pastor but no priest. Faith in Christ made him a priest. In fact a pastor as a pastor, rightly understood, has no more keys to the kingdom of heaven than he did as a common Christian. 1 Cor. 3, 21 Paul speaking not to pastors but to laymen says: "Therefore let no man glory in men" (namely, in the church, as if one man had more and better keys than the other). "For all things are yours."

3. The property that a pastor has by virtue of his call. — Every pastor has property which is his not by birth, not by rebirth, but by virtue of his call. His call gives him the exclusive deed to the same. And without his call he could not and would not have this property. What is it? Is it the rights of the royal priesthood of the individual Christian in his congregation? Some are of this opinion. They maintain that the individual Christian transfers his priestly rights, the keys and the right to use them to the man who has been called as his pastor: or in other words, a Christian loses something that is his to his pastor. This, however, is not true. The fact is that no Christian can transfer that which is his by rebirth, his individual priestly rights. They are inborn, inherent, inseparable from his Christian nature. No man can take these individual priestly rights from him by force either, not even the Anti-Christ with his satanic decrees. The decrees of a pope do not strip a Christian in the Roman Catholic Church of his priestly rights. There is only one thing that can happen to the priestly rights of a Christian, that is, they can be lost to him by his falling from grace; for they flow out of faith and stand and fall with faith. A Christian's feet are shod with the preparation of the Gospel, Eph. 6, 15, that is, it is his very nature to preach, bring offerings, and pray for himself and others wherever he goes. This not only is his nature, but also his duty. He

is to show forth the praises of Him who has called him out of the darkness into His marvelous light, 1 Pet. 2, 9. He is to be a walking letter of Christ. A Christian simply is and remains a priest and has his priestly duties to perform until death. There are no inactive priests in the Church. At least, there should not be. A Christian can be a retired pastor, but not a retired priest. There are honorary pastors, but not honorary priests in the Church.

But if the call does not give the pastor the individual priestly rights of his members, then what does it give him? Does it perhaps transfer to him the exercise of these priestly rights in this sense that the pastor is the only one who has the right and duty to bear witness? There are some Christians who think this. At one time the writer was exhorting Christians to be walking letters of Christ, to call erring brethren to repentance in their daily walk of life, to preach Christ to unbelievers when they came in contact with them, to comfort the penitent, to warn the impenitent, in short, to exercise their priestly rights in public life. To his surprise he learned that one man felt free of such obligations by virtue of the fact that he had a pastor. It was his opinion that a pastor relieved a Christian of those duties, that a Christian with a pastor was merely a hearer in the strict sense. He had his preacher, who was to preach to him and for him. At the bottom of his theology, if the word theology will here be tolerated, was not God's Word, however, but something else, as a statement revealed that he made to another member: *Dazu haben wir einen Pastor berufen. Der kann sich die Nase verbrennen.*

Despite the thoughts of some, a Christian, however, does not transfer every exercise of his priestly rights to his pastor. A member of a Christian congregation is not to be a silent, inactive priest in public life because he has a pastor. It is not only his duty to call his pastor's attention to people who are mission material; he is to be a missionary as well as the pastor. He as well as the pastor should exhort the brethren, be his brother's keeper. This is stated so clearly in Scripture that there can be no doubt about it. A Christian, despite the fact that he has a pastor, can follow in the footsteps of the following laymen: Stephen, Acts 6, 7, Philip, Acts 8, 5, Apollos, Acts 18, 25-26.

This, of course, does not mean that a Christian can "mir nichts, dir nichts" exercise his priestly rights in public life, that he can preach, baptize, give communion as he pleases. 1 Cor. 14, 40 we read: "Let all things be done decently and in order." God is a God of order. The Christian is to be a man of decency and order. The Christian must always remember that the Lord in His divine wisdom has men called to preach, baptize, and give communion in given fields. It is God's orderly way. To come in conflict with the same in the exercise of one's priesthood in public life is treading on forbidden territory, is sin. The Christian who observes God's orderly ways will soon see, though God commands the Gospel to be preached in all the world, that all the world is not his for the public administration of his priestly rights.

And it takes little study of Scripture to come to this knowledge also, that a Christian cannot on the basis of the fact that he is a priest set himself up as a public minister, claim to be a pastor. No man takes this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God.

But what does the call give a pastor if not the individual priestly rights of his member, or the member's right to exercise the same in public life?

It transfers a most specific thing to him, something that no man has by birth, no Christian by rebirth, that a Christian can obtain only by virtue of a divine call.

Where there is no Christian, no one has a commission to preach the Gospel, for the Lord has commissioned the Christians only to preach the Gospel. As soon as there is just one Christian at a place, there, however, is the commission to preach the Gospel. That lone Christian has it, for the Lord has commissioned every Christian without exception to preach His Word in all the world. The lone Christian is the preacher, and should show forth the praises of Him who has bought him with His blood. He should exercise his royal priesthood. — But the general rule is that not a lone Christian but two or three or more live together in the same locality. They are spiritually joined together by their one common faith. It is only natural that they should also be drawn together. They have one faith, Lord, etc., and they gather to worship Him together and to do His work. In fact it is God's will that Christians living in a given locality should

not forsake the assembling of themselves together. And what springs from this gathering together? The local congregation as we have it today. Two or three or more believers, all with the keys and the right to use them in public, form a Christian congregation; not because there is a distinct command in Scripture to do so, but a study of the New Testament Church reveals that so it is. As a congregation, as a body, they now jointly show forth the praises of their Lord. As a body, as a congregation, they preach, baptize, give communion. But who does so? Do all? That would lead to the greatest disorder. And God is a God of order. Order is that *one* should do so. But who? Who has the right? No one by rebirth has the right to step up and administer the keys publicly in the name of all. No one by rebirth has such a call. What no one has by rebirth, that the congregation then by means of a divine call gives one man. It calls a man who in Scripture is known as the pastor, the shepherd of the congregation.

So we see what a pastor has by virtue of his call, the right to use the keys of the kingdom of heaven in the name of those who called him. And here it is to be stressed *in the name of those who called him*, not in the name of all Christians on earth. A call to be a pastor of a group of Christians does not make me a pastor to all Christians. "Feed the flock of God which is among you." A careful reading of one's call clearly reveals how far one's calling goes as a pastor.

And it is also evident from what has been said, that the property of the pastor by virtue of his call never is the property of the individual Christian, that the Christian therefore cannot look upon his pastor as one to whom he has suffered a loss. Instead of losing, the individual Christian gains the moment he has a pastor. He gains a personal pastor, a man to whom he can say: My pastor, my shepherd! For the call places every individual Christian in a congregation in a special relation to the man called, and the called man in a special relation to the individual Christian who took part in the calling. That relation is thine and mine, mine and thine: my pastor, his sheep; my sheep, his pastor.

(To be continued)

NEWS AND COMMENTS

✠ Professor Dr. Ludwig Fuerbringer ✠ — On May 6, after a brief illness, the subject of this sketch departed this life in the Lutheran Hospital in St. Louis, having reached an age of 83 years, 1 month, and 7 days. With his death a rich and blessed life has come to an end — rich in the treasures which neither moth nor rust will destroy, and therefore blessed for himself also, on account of the position in the Church which he has been privileged to occupy for such an unusually long time, for thousands of his fellow-men.

Ludwig Ernst Fuerbringer was born at Frankenmuth, Michigan, on March 29, 1864. His father, Pastor Ottomar Fuerbringer, was one of the Saxon pioneers who were, together with others, instrumental in founding the Missouri Synod. He studied at Fort Wayne and St. Louis. After his graduation in 1885 he became assistant to his father, and after the latter's death the pastor of St. Lorenz Church at Frankenmuth. However as such he was not to remain long, for in 1893 he was called by his synod to a professorship at Concordia Theological Seminary in St. Louis. For fifty years he taught here Hermeneutics, Isagogics, Propaedeutics, Liturgics, and Bible Interpretation. From 1931-1943 he was also, in addition, president of the seminary. After his retirement from class work he still retained the editorship of *Der Lutheraner*, the official German organ of the Missouri Synod, a position he has held for forty-six years. Besides, he was editor or co-editor of "Guenther's Populaere Symbolik," the "Thomasius Gospel Selections," "The Concordia Cyclopedia," "Eighty Eventful Years," and author of numerous articles in the periodicals of his synod.

We have good reason to use the death of Dr. Fuerbringer as an occasion to remind the readers of the *Quartalschrift* that also we of the Wisconsin Synod should offer thanks to the Lord for the gift of this His servant to the Church. We will remember him as the lovable Christian gentleman he was and as a warm friend of our synod. We remember him as a man who throughout his public life has been advocating ever closer relations between our synods, who has been guarding, to the best of his ability, the fellowship of faith and confession existing between his and our synod. For this he had a special opportunity and a special incentive when he was chosen president of the Ev.. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America in 1927, in which office he was retained till 1944. This in turn made him in our own circles one of the best known representatives of the Missouri Synod. But apart from that, many of our brethren who had become acquainted with him, personally or through his writings, have learned to hold him in high esteem as a staunch Lutheran who unflinchingly upheld the truth as revealed in this inerrant Word of God and confessed in the Book of Concord of 1580, to which he testified in his writings,

his lectures, and in private conversation. The qualities of his Christian character: his firmness in matters of doctrine and life born of deep conviction coupled with his unfeigned modesty and kindness toward everyone, be he friend or foe, won him the hearts of those with whom he came in contact.

The funeral service was held in Holy Cross Church in St. Louis. Dr. J. W. Behnken, president of the Missouri Synod, spoke in his sermon on Phil. 1, 21: "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." Interment was made at Concordia Cemetery.

M. LEHNINGER.

Wishful Thinking? — Writing for the Staff of the *Lutheran Witness*, Dr. W. G. Polack discusses a formal statement entitled "A Friendly Invitation," issued by the Fellowship Committee of the A. L. C. in March of this year. We publish the editorial *in toto*, both for the sake of the text of the Invitation which is quoted in its entirety, and for the sake of the comment made on it by the *Witness*.

"In the issue of November 19, 1946, we commented editorially on the resolution adopted by the American Lutheran Church at its convention in Appleton, Wisconsin, with special reference to the Doctrinal Affirmation. We expressed the opinion that the resolution, quoted in full in that issue, expressed 'a very evident and sincere desire on the part of the American Lutheran Church to achieve true Lutheran unity.'

"In our issue of December 17, 1946, we discussed the action of the American Lutheran Church on our Unity Resolutions of 1938 and stated that the 'setting aside of the Doctrinal Affirmation leaves the *status quo* as of 1938.'*

"In substantiation of our editorial conclusion we read with deep appreciation in the *Lutheran Standard* of the American Lutheran Church, March 22, 1947, under the heading 'A Friendly Invitation,' that the Fellowship Committee of that body has extended an invitation to our Committee on Doctrinal Unity to meet with it, as soon as a meeting can be arranged, for the purpose of answering the question: 'What practical step can be taken to demonstrate in action, life, and practice the measure of unity which now exists?'

"Our readers will be interested to see the complete text of the statement relative to the Missouri Synod issued by the A. L. C. Fellowship Committee, which contains the invitation just mentioned:

"The Committee on Intersynodical Fellowship of the American Lutheran Church was charged by the American Lutheran Church at its convention in Appleton to 'explore the measure of agreement

* 'Our brethren in America are now back to their 1938 position.' Pres. Cl. E. Hoopmann, in the *Australian Lutheran*, January 29, 1947.

we have with other Lutheran bodies and to further such agreement toward the goal of true unity.'

'In furtherance of this duty laid upon us and in view of the forthcoming synodical meeting of the honorable Synod of Missouri, our Committee adopted the following:

"1. Our Committee is bound by and herewith reiterates the position formulated in the resolution adopted by the American Lutheran Church in 1938, to wit:

'That we declare the Brief Statement of the Missouri Synod, together with the Declaration of our Commission, a sufficient doctrinal basis for church fellowship between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church.

'That, according to our conviction and the resolution of the Synod of Missouri, passed at its convention in St. Louis, the aforementioned doctrinal agreement is a sufficient doctrinal basis for Church-fellowship, and that we are firmly convinced that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all nonfundamental doctrines. Nevertheless, we are willing to continue the negotiations concerning the points termed in our Declaration as not divisive of Church-fellowship, and recognized as such by the Missouri Synod's resolutions, and instruct our Commission on Fellowship accordingly.'

"2. We earnestly reaffirm our conviction that no intervening discussions which we have had with the Committee on Doctrinal Unity of the Synod of Missouri have revealed any fundamental doctrinal difference in the understanding of the Lutheran Confessions that forbid entry into pulpit and altar fellowship with the Missouri Synod.

"3. Our Committee's concurrence in abandoning efforts to secure the formulation and adoption of the Doctrinal Affirmation which underwent several revisions is based on the following considerations:

a. We hold that the slight divergencies in language and point of view between the Brief Statement and the Declaration all lie in areas where there exists an allowable and wholesome latitude of theological opinion on the basis of the teaching of the Word of God.

b. We further hold that to make the production of a unified statement of the sort contemplated in the Doctrinal Affirmation an absolute *sine qua non* of Christian fellowship constitutes a threat to evangelical liberty of conscience by demanding a degree of uniformity in the statement of Christian truth that is incompatible with the Scriptures and with strict intellectual candor.

"4. In accordance with the foregoing sentiments we are happy to make the following suggestions:

a. That we have a joint meeting with the Committee on Doctrinal Unity of the Missouri Synod as soon as it can be arranged for the purpose of answering the question: What practical steps can be taken to demonstrate in action, life, and practice the measure of unity which now exists?

b. That we express our willingness to make available to the proper floor committee at the 1947 convention of the Synod of Missouri several representatives of our committee in order to make personal conference possible.

"The reader will note that in this resolution there is again an unequivocal acceptance of the Brief Statement together with the Declaration of the American Lutheran Church as 'a sufficient doctrinal basis for Church-fellowship' and also a frank acceptance of our 1938 resolutions on this point. Likewise, the assertion that it is 'neither necessary nor possible to agree in all nonfundamental doctrines' is followed by the statement: 'Nevertheless, we are willing to continue the negotiations concerning the points termed in our Declaration as not divisive of Church-fellowship, and recognized as such by the Missouri Synod's resolutions, and instruct our Commission on Fellowship accordingly.'

"We would remind our readers that our former Committee on Lutheran Union as far back as December 8, 1939, declared its agreement with the position stated in the last sentence, and that the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, on the request for an opinion in the matter said under date of May 8, 1944: 'We believe that the position voiced in the above by the American Lutheran Church Commissioners and approved by our Commission has not been contradicted by any later statements coming from the American Lutheran Church.' (See *Lutheran Witness*, 1944, page 172.) †

"We can best conclude this editorial article with the prayer of President Cl. E. Hoopmann with which he closes his article in the *Australian Lutheran* referred to above: 'May we, therefore, never cease to pray: O God, for Thy mercy's sake speed the efforts which are being made to

† "The following is the release of Synod's Committee on Lutheran Union of December 8, 1939: Next the items in the Sandusky Resolutions that had caused misgivings were considered. On our question what this statement in these resolutions means. 'We are firmly convinced that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines,' the reply of the American Lutheran Church Commissioners reads thus: 'It was asked whether it was not true that all Scripture doctrines are binding, whether they are fundamental or non-fundamental.' The answer was: 'To be sure, everything that the Scriptures teach is God's Word and therefore binding.' The Statement was included in our Sandusky Resolutions because Point 3 of the St. Louis Resolutions could be understood as meaning that for the time being the *Declaration* given was sufficient and disagreement in those well-known points was to be tolerated but that actual establishment of church fellowship cannot take place until agreement even in these points are reached. While we are ready to continue the discussion on these points, certainly the erection of church fellowship

reunite all Lutherans of our land. Bless also the efforts of our brethren in America to establish true unity. Sanctify all who call upon Thy name in Thy truth, for Thy Word is truth. Amen."

* * * *

We are concerned about the discrepancy which appears between this rather bland, suave, diplomatic "Invitation" of the A. L. C. Committee, and the frank and blunt expressions of that same committee as they are quoted by Secretary Brunn in the official report of the Missouri Committee for Doctrinal Unity. This report was published in the *Lutheraner* of March 4 and quoted in our last issue, p. 132, q. v. We are even more concerned about the difference between the rather serious view taken by this official committee and the optimistic analysis by the *Witness* Staff which appears above. Since the editorial is based on the Invitation, and since this document had not yet appeared when the Committee for Doctrinal Unity published its report, two questions may be raised.

The first is whether Secretary Brunn's report is factually correct. Its accuracy might be challenged. We have made it a point to inquire and have it at first hand and from completely reliable sources that the statements attributed to members of the A. L. C. Committee were actually made by them. It definitely was said that there are doctrinal differences between the two bodies. The doctrines of election, conversion, the Church, and the Last Things were specifically mentioned as the ones where these differences appear. In these matters the Brunn report is simply relating history.

The second question is whether the situation has been changed materially by the appearance of the "Invitation." It has been said that this new statement cancels out the things which are mentioned in the Brunn report. It is evident, of course, that the A. L. C. Committee regrets the frank statements which they made last August, when they were informing the Missouri Committee of their decision to advise their convention to reject the Doctrinal Affirmation. The "Invitation" is obviously meant to retrieve

should not be made contingent on the result of these deliberations; church fellowship is justified, and can be practiced even if no agreement is reached on these points. *We gave our approval to this statement.* (Italics ours. W. G. P.) Since the statement in the Sandusky Resolutions is ambiguous, we were happy to receive a satisfactory declaration on this point. *The discussion had shown that the American Lutheran Church Commissioners and we are in full agreement on the important question which is here involved, that of the authority of Scriptures.* The A. L. C. Commissioners and we are unanimous in the stand that, while we have to distinguish between fundamental and non-fundamental articles, *this distinction does not mean that any teaching of Holy Scripture may be treated with indifference and that, though disagreement in a non-fundamental doctrine is not per se divisive of church fellowship, it is our sacred duty to endeavor to reach an agreement in such articles also.* (Italics ours. W. G. P.)"

what its authors consider an unfortunate situation, to tone down some of those former blunt expressions. But does that really cancel out the earlier events?

One cannot "cancel out" a historical fact. These words have become a part of the record. They stand there. Certainly, those who spoke them may retract them. Or if the Committee considers them false, it may disavow them. Such a procedure would indeed clear the situation. But the "Invitation" does neither. It offers charm and friendliness, — but it does not change its position.

In Section 2 it does not say that there are no doctrinal differences in the understanding of the Lutheran Confessions. It says that discussions have not revealed any *fundamental* differences *that forbid entry into pulpit and altar fellowship*. In 3-a it minimizes the differences as being *slight divergencies* in language and point of view, which *all (!)* lie in areas where there exists an *allowable and wholesome latitude of theological opinion*. But it is silent on the fact that official members of their highly important committee in an official meeting mentioned not only the doctrine of the Last Things, but also those of election, conversion, and the Church as such in which a difference is admitted. In 3-b it simply restates the old Iowa doctrine concerning Open Questions, thereby flatly contradicting the corresponding paragraph in the Missouri Brief Statement.

We feel that these significant qualifying statements should have received greater attention and been scrutinized with greater care by the *Witness* staff. Then the resulting editorial would perhaps have been less optimistic, but surely much more realistic and sober. We find it hard to understand that the editors did not see these obvious points. But it would be much harder to assume that they saw, and yet ignored them. The only other solution which we can suggest is that this is but another instance where judgment has been influenced by wishful thinking.

E. REIM.

Melanchthon and Mühlberg. The year 1947 gives us occasion to recall two eventful dates in the period of the Reformation. Four hundred and fifty years ago, on the 16th of February, 1497, Melanchthon was born at Bretttau in the Lower Palatinate (Baden). Four hundred years ago on the 24th of April, 1547, the Smalcald League suffered a crushing defeat at Mühlberg. Not only the former but also the latter date is eventful in the life of Luther's most intimate friend. Melanchthon did not only become a refugee when Charles V gained a decisive victory over John Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, but was also threatened with the imperial ban and consequently had to decide whether he would remain under the protection of the Ernestine house, represented by the sons of John Frederick, or whether he would seek the protection of the newly-created Elector, Maurice of the Albertine dynasty. Melanchthon decided in favor of Maurice,

whereby he placed himself under the influence of a cunning statesman who was obligated to Charles V.

Where was Melanchthon during and after the victory of Mühlberg? Already in November of 1546 the university of Wittenberg had suffered a forced and temporary dissolution because the forces of Duke Maurice were threatening it. In consequence Melanchthon retired in mid-winter to Zerbst in the principality of Anhalt. Here he enjoyed the hospitality of the princes of Anhalt-Zerbst and here he received invitations from the cities of Brunswick and Nuremberg. When John Frederick forced Maurice to raise the siege of Wittenberg, Melanchthon returned. After a few days, however, he deemed it wise to go back to Zerbst. In February of 1547 he once more spent a few days in Wittenberg, from where he importuned the Elector to sue for peace. The fortunes of war now forsook the champion of the Lutheran cause and on the 24th of April John Frederick suffered not only defeat but also captivity at the hands of the Emperor and his allies, King Ferdinand and Duke Maurice. Melanchthon had again retired to Zerbst, and here he received the news of the defeat and captivity of the Elector. He was fully aware of the dire results which the victory of the Emperor was to have on the future of the Reformation in Germany. "I foresee," he writes to Caspar Cruciger, "a change of doctrine and schisms within the churches." Perhaps he did not realize at this time that all his further steps and decisions would be instrumental in bringing about these changes and disorders.

Melanchthon's next step was to flee with his family from Zerbst to Magdeburg, where he met Luther's widow who was about to seek refuge in Denmark. He accompanied her to Brunswick and from there he went to Nordhausen, the mayor of the city, Meienburg, being a fast friend of his. It was at this time that he received a call to the University of Tübingen which he did not accept, although Tübingen was not far from his birthplace, to which his thoughts often turned during his flight. On the 8th of June he decided to return to Wittenberg to confer with his friends on the reorganization of the University which he loved as his home. At the same time, however, the eldest son of John Frederick called him to Weimar for his advice in matters pertaining to the newly founded University of Jena. Here Melanchthon learned that the sons of John Frederick thought only of calling him, not any of his friends and colleagues, to Jena. This was not at all to his liking. His fatherland was nowhere else but where his friends and former colleagues were, he had written to Augustin Schurf on the 13th of July. Consequently Melanchthon left Weimar for Zerbst, where he hoped to meet with Schurf, Eber and other friends. In Merseburg, however, on the 18th of July, he received a letter from George of Anhalt and from Cruciger urging him to come to Leipzig, where Maurice desired to consult with them. Maurice instructed Melanchthon and his friends to return to Wittenberg, to reorganize the university, to recall the former professors, and to appoint members for the

church-consistory. On the 25th of July, 1547, Melanchthon returned to his beloved Wittenberg, together with Bugenhagen, Cruciger, and Eber. And on the 16th of October they recommenced their lectures, Melanchthon beginning with the reading of Colossians and Proverbs.

There can be no doubt in our minds that Melanchthon's decision to return to Wittenberg, and not to accept the call to Jena, was of the most far-reaching importance both as to Melanchthon's and to the church's future. Already at their first meeting with Maurice in Leipzig, the newly created elector had gone far out of his way to create a favorable impression on the Wittenberg theologians. In the following year, 1548, he called them to Leipzig to assist him in coming to a decision on the Interim of the Emperor. Maurice desired to consult with Melanchthon above all on the extent to which concessions might be made with a safe conscience. He had Melanchthon attend no fewer than seven conferences upon this subject, and to write all the memorials that were presented. Especially the deliberations of the divines of Wittenberg, Leipzig and Brandenburg (Agricola) at Begy, Zell, and Jüterbock resulted in the publication of a book written by Melanchthon, and of a decree founded upon it respecting the observance of things indifferent. The *Leipzig Interim*, because of its change of doctrine, became the fruitful source of the keenest disputes between the churches and their theologians. "It was a unionistic document sacrificing Lutheranism doctrinally as well as practically" (Triglot, p. 99). It was the humanist in Melanchthon who wrote this publication. His Semipelagian teaching regarding original sin and free will had already cropped out in the second edition of his *Loci* in 1535. Mühlberg and the fear-instilling anger of the victorious Emperor, together with the wiles of the newly created Elector, had not wrought a "change" in Melanchthon, but had only contributed toward evoking his humanistic theology, which had been held in abeyance as long as Luther lived, and as long as John Frederick was the leader of the Lutheran party. For when Melanchthon, "bereft of an excellent and faithful father," as he called Luther in his funeral oration, was required to act alone in a crisis, the true nature of his humanistic theology was clearly disclosed. From it he had not really turned even when he wrote to Matthesius: "I confess indeed that I have committed sin in this affair, and implore forgiveness of God that I did not wholly fly from these subtle disputations." Mühlberg was indeed a turning point in the life of Melanchthon and his words of premonition to which he gave utterance at the time bear to be repeated: "I foresee a change of doctrine and schisms within the churches."

P. PETERS.

Die kirchliche Lage Deutschlands. — Ueber die innere Entwicklung der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands erfährt man so wenig wie garnichts. Alle Berichte, die uns hier erreichen, sind eingestellt auf die Beziehungen der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands zum Auslande. Nunmehr ist ein Bericht

von Pfarrer i. R. D. Gerß, bis zum Ende des Krieges Pastor an der freikirchlichen Gemeinde in Königsberg, eingegangen, der uns einen tiefen Einblick in die Vorgänge der kirchlichen Lage gewährt. Pastor Gerß, der vor Jahren von der Landeskirche zur Freikirche gekommen war, ist dem Unterzeichneten als ein sehr tiefblickender und zuverlässiger Kenner deutschkirchlicher Verhältnisse bekannt. Darum bringen wir gerne seinen Bericht zur Kenntnisnahme unserer Leser.

„Sie fragen, lieber Herr Bruder, auch nach der kirchlichen Lage bei uns und wünschen Berichte darüber. Das ist nun der eigentliche Hauptgrund meines Schreibens, Ihnen etwas darüber zu schreiben. Doch bitte nicht zu vergessen, daß man darüber natürlich so manches sehr Wichtige in unserer jetzigen Lage nicht schreiben kann. Doch einiges kann ja mitgeteilt werden.

„Da ist zunächst zu sagen, daß die kirchliche Entwicklung aufs Ganze gesehen, seit Aufhören des Krieges gegen früher nicht die geringste Wendung erfahren hat. Die von manchen geteilte und ausgesprochene Hoffnung, daß nach dem Zusammenbruch die Kirchen, weil nun von dem Kampf gegen den Staat befreit, andere Wege einschlagen, sich wieder mehr ihrer religiösen Aufgabe zuwenden, oder gar zum biblischen Evangelium zurückkehren würden, hat sich auch nicht im Geringsten erfüllt. Der Wagen der Landeskirchen ist vielmehr so weiter gelaufen, wie er, nicht erst seit 1930, sondern seit Jahrzehnten gelaufen ist. Ja seit zwei Jahren hat sich in der veränderten politischen Lage erst recht herausgestellt, welches eigentlich die entscheidenden Triebfeldern der kirchlichen Entwicklung der Landeskirchen sind.

„Nur eine ist eigentlich als die entscheidende zu nennen: **das Streben nach Macht im gesamten öffentlichen und politischen Leben.** Aus diesem kirchlichen Machtsstreben allein erklärt sich die Haltung der Kirchen wie in den vergangenen Jahren so auch heute.

1.

„Nach wie vor bewegt sich das Denken und Handeln der evangelischen Landeskirchen in erster Linie um den Staat, und lebt am Staat. Der vergangene Staat, der Staat der letzten zwölf Jahre wird vielfach noch bekämpft, als ob er noch da wäre. Zum heutigen Staat wird ein möglichst enges Verhältnis gesucht. Der heutige Staat soll die Kirchen frei lassen, soll aber selbst von den Kirchen nicht frei werden. Ein Hauptanliegen der Kirchen ist demnach, die Kirche und das Christentum in die Staatsverfassungen einzubauen, Rechte und Vorrechte der Landeskirchen durch die Verfassungen der Staaten zu erlangen und zu sichern.

„So spricht die neue Verfassung von Nord-Württemberg und Nord-Baden nicht nur den Grundsatz der Glaubensfreiheit aus, sichert nicht nur ungestörte Religionsübung und staatlichen Schutz für sie zu, sondern auch Anerkennung der kirchlichen Aufgaben und staatliche Förderung derselben. Dazu Vorrechte für die Landeskirchen als Körperschaften des öffentlichen

Rechts vor den anderen Religionsgemeinschaften. Auch ist die mythische ‚Verpflichtung des Staates zu finanziellen Leistungen an die beiden Grokirchen‘ in der Verfassung verankert, alle ihre Einrichtungen fr Erziehung und Wohlfahrtspflege genieen verfassungsmig die steuerlichen und andern Vorrechte gemeinntziger Einrichtungen. Als Regelschule wird die ‚Christliche Gemeinschaftsschule‘ proklamiert, in welcher der Religionsunterricht ordentliches Lehrfach bleibt, aber die Erteilung den Kirchen berlassen bleibt, die ihn durch ihre Krfte, Pfarrer, Lehrer, Hilfskrfte in den Schulen erteilen knnen. Die Verfassung wurde einstimmig, auch mit den Stimmen der Kommunisten, angenommen.

„Also ist die Kirche, das heit die evangelischen Landeskirchen, soweit entfernt davon, sich vom Staat zu scheiden, da sie vielmehr heute sich eine Existenz ihrer Kirchen ohne die aktive Hilfe des Staates, ohne staatliche Geldmittel und vom Staat verliehene Vorrechte gar nicht denken kann. Vor dem Gedanken, sich selbst zu unterhalten, ist sie weiter entfernt denn je. Sie will Machtkirche sein ber das ganze Volk, das kann sie ohne aktive Hilfe des Staates nicht sein.

„Bezeichnend ist auch, da die Kirche mit den ihr durch die Verfassung der neuen Staaten verliehenen Vorrechten usw. noch gar nicht zufrieden ist. Sie will eigentlich noch mehr. Sie kmpfte im Parlament dafr, da auch die Hhe und die Art der finanziellen Leistungen des Staates und der Erhebung der Kirchensteuern sollte in der Verfassung verankert werden, so, wie sie unter der vorigen Staatsregierung bestanden hat. Das konnte sie, da die kirchliche Partei nicht die Mehrheit im Parlament hatte, doch nicht durchsetzen. Es wurde das gesetzlicher Regelung berlassen.

„Auch mit den Bestimmungen der Verfassung unseres Landes hier ber das Schulwesen sind die Landeskirchen nicht zufrieden. So verlangten Vertreter der Kirchen in einer krzlich in Ulm veranstalteten ffentlichen Versammlung, die das Schulthema behandelte, durchaus und mit fanatischem Eifer die konfessionelle Schule unter scharfer Verwerfung der eben verfassungsmig verankerten Gemeinschaftsschule. Die Versammlung verlief brigens — wie schon eine frhere mit dem Thema ‚Hat die Kirche versagt‘ in Stuttgart — auerordentlich strmisch. Die Gegenstze steigerten sich bis zur Siedehie und man schrieb in der Ulmer Zeitung darber: ‚Einige Reden kirchlicher Vertreter hrten sich so an, als ob die Kirchen auch vom heutigen Staat verfolgt werden‘. Diese Vorkommnisse sind fr die Beurteilung der kirchlichen Entwicklung nicht unwesentlich.

„Die Kirchen, auch die Evangelische Landeskirche, verlangen eben vom weltlichen Staat zuviel. Sie wollen ihn fr ihre Zwecke ausnutzen, ja beherrschen. Lt er sich das nicht gefallen, so treten diese Kirchen dann sehr gern als ‚Verfolgte‘ auf, womit sie ja im Laufe der Jahrhunderte immer gute Geschfte gemacht haben.

„brigens kommen die Kirchen, die eine solche enge Verbundenheit mit dem Staat erstreben, auf diesem Wege doch in eine Staatsgebundenheit

wieder hinein, sie mögen ihre Freiheit vom Staat verankern, wie sie wollen. So stehen sie z. B. doch in Staatsgebundenheit mit der Vorbildung ihrer Pfarrer, die durchaus den staatlichen Universitäten vorbehalten bleiben soll, damit die Kirchen in enger Verbindung mit dem geistigen Leben des Volkes bleiben. So hat denn der Staat, der die theologischen Professoren nach seinen Grundsätzen ein- und absetzt, doch wieder großen Einfluß gerade auch auf das innere Leben der Kirchen. Wenn kürzlich der Staat in Bayern bei Absetzung von 30 Professoren in Erlangen auch drei theologische — Mthaus, Preuß und Strathmann — abgesetzt hat, so muß sich die Kirche damit abfinden, so staatsfrei sie sich stellen mag. Die theologischen Professoren sind nun einmal Staatsbeamte.

2.

„Die Tätigkeit der Landeskirchen war in den letzten zwei Jahren neben diesem Bemühen um ihre Sicherstellung und Privilegierung durch den Staat auch sonst eine sehr rege und mannigfaltige. In der Richtung dieser Tätigkeit ist aber nach dem Krieg keinerlei Aenderung eingetreten. Schon nach 1918, nach Wegfall des landesherrlichen Kirchenregiments, nahm die Arbeit auch der evangelischen Landeskirche an Eifer und Intensität außerordentlich zu. Man konnte und kann von da an bis heute von einer neuen kirchlichen Bewegung reden. Dieser neue kirchliche Eifer und Arbeitsfleiß, der untrittig vorhanden ist, auch in der evangelischen Landeskirche, hat leider immer wieder dazu verführt, anzunehmen, daß die Landeskirchen wirklich eine Zeit religiöser Erneuerung, einer Rückkehr zur biblischen Wahrheit und zur eigentlichen Aufgabe der Kirche erlebt haben und heute erleben. Eine solche Annahme ist aber völlig unbegründet. Sie zur Grundlage unserer Stellung zu den Landeskirchen zu nehmen, würde zu großen und gefährlichen Enttäuschungen führen. Von einer kirchlichen Bewegung kann man durchaus sprechen. Nur ist es keine Bewegung zum Evangelium hin, sondern von ihm hinweg, keine Glaubensbewegung, sondern eine Bewegung kirchlichen Machtstrebens. Sie ist in keiner Weise mit der Bewegung der Reformation zu vergleichen, wohl aber mit der kumiazenischen Bewegung des Mittelalters und besonders mit der Gegenreformation des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts.

„Auch die evangelischen Landeskirchen versuchen mit höchstem Eifer, sich in alle öffentlich-weltlichen Entwicklungen, Bestrebungen und Geschäfte hineinzudrängen, sie zu beeinflussen, zu beherrschen und zu gestalten. Es ist ihnen z. B. keineswegs genug, an den Armen und Elenden christliche Liebestätigkeit zu üben. Sondern sie wollen als Kirche auch die weltlich-politischen und sozialen Aufgaben maßgebend beeinflussen, durch die die sozialen und politischen Verhältnisse gebessert werden sollen. Sie stellen für die dazu nötigen Staatsgesetze Forderungen, angeblich ‚vom Glauben‘, vom ‚Evangelium‘ her. Sie wollen auch bei jeder andern Gesetzgebung maßgebend beteiligt werden, machen Gegenvorschläge und Abänderungsvorschläge

zu staatlichen Gesetzen, ja drohen damit, daß, wenn man sie dabei nicht hören und ihnen nicht folgen sollte, sie staatliche Gesetze für nicht Gewissen bindend erklären müßten.

„Die Landeskirchen betreiben ein sehr ausgedehntes Werk öffentlicher Schulung, keineswegs bloß religiöser oder moralischer Schulung, sondern auch politischer und sozialer. Eine Evangelische Akademie z. B. hier in Württemberg veranstaltet Schulungskurse für alle Berufe, Landwirtschaft, Handwerk usw. zur Schulung in ihren Berufsfragen unter Leitung des Bischofs. Andere Kurse versammeln Vertreter aller erlaubten politischen Parteien einschließlich der völlig gleichberechtigten Kommunisten zu Vorträgen und Aussprachen über politische und soziale Fragen.

„Damit nicht genug haben die beiden Großkirchen nach dem Zusammenbruch eine neue christliche politische Partei gegründet, die Christlich-demokratische Union, die nun in den Parlamenten und Regierungen die Vögel der Kirchen vertreten und die ganze Gesetzgebung vom Glauben, vom Evangelium aus gestalten und beeinflussen soll. Wohl stellt sich die Kirche formell so, daß sie erklärt, für die Angehörigen aller Parteien da zu sein, wirbt aber doch gleichzeitig für ihre christliche Partei und unterstützt sie auf alle Weise. Was früher nur die römische Kirche mit ihrem Zentrum tat, das tun jetzt römische und evangelische Landeskirchen eng vereint mit dieser Christlich-demokratischen Union. Diese hält übrigens eine Arbeitsgemeinschaft mit den andern erlaubten Parteien einschließlich der kommunistischen Partei aufrecht, erklärt hier und da gemeinsame Kundgebungen usw. Diese Politifizierung der evangelischen Landeskirchen hat sie schon 1918, dann 1933 und erst recht 1945 auf Irr- und Abwege geführt, auf denen sie im weltlich-staatlichen Leben viel Unheil angerichtet hat, die Kirche aber ist dadurch auf eine niedere Ebene hinabgezogen worden, das Evangelium ist in Gesetz verfälscht, das Reich der Gnade und ewigen Herrlichkeit in ein Reich von dieser Welt, die Erlösung von Sünde, Tod und Teufel in eine angebliche Besserung der politischen und sozialen Verhältnisse, die geistlichen Wahrheiten des Christenglaubens in politische Kampfmittel.

„Ein Beispiel dafür ist die seit zwei Jahren in den Landeskirchen geübte Art der Bußpredigt. Die damit geforderte Buße unterscheidet sich von der wahren Buße des Zöllners im Gleichnis, des Schwärzers am Kreuz so wie Christus sich von den Hohenpriestern, Schriftgelehrten und Pharisäern unterscheidet. Von andern Irrwegen der Landeskirchen hier ganz zu schweigen. Es sei bemerkt, daß sich dabei die römische Kirche sichtbar klüger, vorsichtiger und in manchen Stücken maßvoller zeigt als die evangelischen Landeskirchen, die ohne die Jahrhunderte alte politische Übung der römischen Kirche sind und unter dem Druck der Zeitströmungen mit ihren politischen Aspirationen oft wie Trunkene einhertaumeln. Die Achtung vor allem, was Kirche und Evangelium heißt, hat dadurch gelitten.

„Begnügen sich viele in den Landeskirchen damit, sich mit ihren politischen Bestrebungen in den Dienst der jeweilig herrschenden Weltmächte zu

stellen und ihnen die Kirchen dienstbar zu machen, so gehen andere dazu über, die Staatsgewalten möglichst auszuschalten und die Kirche an ihre Stelle zu setzen, also ein Jahrhundert klerikaler Kirchenherrschaft heraufzuführen. In einer hochoffiziellen Kundgebung des ‚Rats der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland‘ vom 19. 10. 1945 schreibt in der sehr aufschlußreichen offiziellen Begründung derselben Anmussen — nach Barth der einflußreichste Theologe heute in den evangelischen Landeskirchen: ‚Die Welt geriet in heillose Unordnung, als sie den Priester absetzte und ihn durch den vernünftigen Politiker oder geschickten Propagandisten oder den der Aufklärung dienenden Schulmeister zu ersetzen versuchte.‘ Er will also die Priesterherrschaft über Welt und Staat und verspricht den Völkern, daß die zu irdischem Wohlsein und Glück führen werde. Das deutsche Volk stehe vor der einzigen Entscheidung: Das Nichts — Nihilismus oder Christus. Da tritt denn das eigentliche letzte Ziel der Bekennenden Kirche — Landeskirche — klar genug hervor. Er stellt das deutsche Volk und schließlich alle Völker vor die Alternative: das Nichts, womit das Chaos im weltlichen Leben gemeint ist, oder die Kirche, das heißt aber die Priesterherrschaft. Er hofft, daß das verwirrte, hungernde Volk nun verkommen genug ist, um auf diesen Schwindel als auf einen letzten Rettungsweg hineinzufallen. In Wahrheit will diese Kirche gar keine Gesundung und wirkliche Besserung des Volkslebens. Da könnte ja der Priester, die Kirche, wieder entbehrlicher werden. Also je mehr Elend, desto besser für die Kirche, die dann unentbehrlich ist. Von der Preisgabe des geistlichen Wesens der Kirche durch diese Irrwege gar nicht zu reden.

„Nun genug für heute. Doch möchte ich noch etwas über das Verhältnis der heutigen lutherischen Kirche ausführen, und wie da auch das weltliche Machtstreben der heutigen Kirche alles beherrscht.“

Wir hoffen die Fortsetzung dieses Berichtes in der nächsten Nummer der „Quartalschrift“ zu bringen.

Fr. Peters.

Rome and the Bible. — In the October number, 1946, of the *Catholic Digest* there is a resumé of an article written by Michael Early on: The Best Seller of the Ages. We should like to bring some of the characteristic statements of this article to prove that Rome does not change. Michael Early admits that the Roman Douay Version of the Bible of 1639 was inferior in style and diction to the Protestant King James Version. He denies that the Romanists neglected the Bible, for ‘they made generous use of the Bible in the official prayers and liturgy of their Church.’ He does not make it clear to his readers that these prayers and Bible passages were in Latin, practically unintelligible to the common man. He goes on to say that the Word was handed down to the faithful through the centuries through preaching. Strangely he confesses that there were no Bibles before Gutenberg, thereby contradicting the boasts of other Romanists.

He furthermore makes the peculiar assertion that the faithful in those days were familiar with the Bible, because they understood the Latin of the Mass and had the Scriptures expounded to them at every mass. Now we know that all of these assertions are historically untrue. The Roman author knows that too, or at least he ought to know it. The easily duped readers are being deceived systematically. The rank and file of the Roman laity knew as little Latin in the days of Gutenberg and prior to that as they do today. Even the rank and file of the clergy knew little Latin and less Greek. The intelligentsia was acquainted with the Latin text to a certain extent. Only the humanists and the higher clergy cultivated the Latin.

We could overlook such historical untruths as expressions of ignorance to a certain extent. The real Devil's foot appears, however, when the author blatantly claims: "The Word of God within the covers of a book, no matter how revered, is not sufficient to lead men to the better life. There must be something more: the language of the Bible correctly interpreted and made clear. We can follow Christ and save our souls through Christ's Church without the book that is known as the Bible. Millions of souls were so saved before Gutenberg, but it will be hard to find salvation by the Bible without the Church." When one reads such statements, one can no longer explain them as expressions of ignorance. It is deception and untruth, pure and simple. Here we have the clear rejection of *Sola Scriptura* over again, even though the Romanists try to hide this very cleverly and endeavor to create the impression as though they had the first and only claim to the Bible. If souls were saved in the so-called dark Middle Ages, and we do not doubt that, then they were saved through the Scriptural means of grace in spite of the false teachings of Rome. The hearts of the hearers are unfortunately better than the minds and hearts of the preachers.

Early continues to justify his Church's attitude and teaching: "In spite of all who make the Bible the sole rule of faith and in spite of the fact that so many millions of copies of the Bible have been distributed, the Bible as sole rule of faith is insufficient. It has been found wanting because it lacks the infallible guidance of the voice of Christ." We should rather substitute: the voice of the church, or of the pope, the Antichrist. The full measure of blasphemous assumption and deception is to be found in the words: "The Bible in the Church means salvation, outside the Church it means spiritual chaos." Early also speaks of the error of the Reformation because of the private interpretation of the Bible and goes on to say: "In the sacred Word of God as interpreted by the commissioned authority of the Church mankind learns what is the way of Christ and where to find it." Add to this the further statement which needs no further comment: "From the very beginning the Church recognized this danger (of not reading the Bible) and endeavored to remove it, granting

indulgences to those who would read portions of Holy Scripture each day." There is a note of tragic irony in his last remarks: "Catholics should welcome this new movement to spur reading of the Scriptures. They should cooperate by becoming familiar with the contents of the sacred text. It is not to our credit that non-Catholics are more at home with the Bible than we are. This text belongs in our tradition." How can Catholics change their opinion overnight when they have been taught through the ages that Bible reading is a privilege of a few clerics and requires special dispensation. The Devil and the pope hate nothing more than if one reads the Bible. If it must be, then rather let them read a purged text, so as to offset the reading of the real Bible.

The version of the Bible authorized by Rome is not the original Hebrew and Greek text, but the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, known for its departures from the original text of the Bible. The papal concession to read the Scriptures was forced upon Rome. If Rome had her own way about it and were strong and influential enough to keep the laity in intellectual subjection, it would continue to keep the people in ignorance and away from the Bible, the Word of Truth. The Roman claim that the Bible is sufficient unto salvation is refuted by the clear word of Saint Paul to Timothy (2. Tim. 3:15): "From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." For Rome not the Bible, but the Church or the pope is the supreme authority of doctrine and life. Rome does not change. By its teaching it clearly reveals that it is the church of the Antichrist and not the true Church of Christ.

The Roman author carefully hides from his own readers that it was the Church of Rome that suppressed the Bible and condemned those as heretics who read it. Let us not forget among many other proofs which could be adduced that it was Gregory IX who decreed in 1234 that translations of the Bible should be given up by the people and burned. Wycliffe was condemned for heresy in 1383 for having translated the Bible. Pope Clement in his bull *Unigenitus* in 1713 condemned Bible reading on the part of the Christians and later popes did the same. Pope Pius VII in 1810 called the Bible societies a pest. It makes strange reading when one is asked to believe that Rome always wanted the laity to read the Bible. May this suffice to recall the real Roman attitude toward the Bible. It was Rome that burned the Bibles and it was Rome that burned Tyndale, the English translator of the Bible at the stake. Rome would like to have the world forget these facts. It is revolting to see how Romanists can distort the Bible and historical facts and still keep a straight face before their own people. It is beyond us how their intelligent laity can swallow such falsehoods. They surely know how to appear in sheep's clothing. They are ravenous wolves and the underlings of the Antichrist. Let us not be deceived by pious phrases.

H. A. Коч.

REVIEWERS' DESK

The Art of Ministering to the Sick, Cabot and Dicks. The Macmillan Company, \$3.00.

This volume is the joint work of a physician and a clergyman. It aims to provide helpful suggestions and methods for pastors in their visiting of the sick and, particularly, for better teamwork between the two professions. The medical man is Dr. Richard C. Cabot, whom we remember for an excellent paper on "The Wisdom of the Human Body" which was presented before the Massachusetts Medical Society in Boston in 1937. In this paper Dr. Cabot, obviously a devout Christian, spoke of experiences which convince him of the wisdom of the divine Creator as manifested in the structure and functions of the human body. The clergyman is Rev. Russell L. Dicks, a Presbyterian minister, apparently of the more modern type. These co-authors provide a key by which the reader is generally able to tell by which of the two a respective passage is written.

The sections written by Dr. Cabot contain much sound and sober advice. We note particularly his suggestion that ministers do not try to practice psychotherapy in any technical sense (page 51). His suggestion is that the pastor come as minister and not as healer. He also warns pastors against an injudicious use of medical terms. "Terms often imply theories. The doctor fears that the minister will mix his patient up with 'explanations' which give an impression different from the doctor's and so leave the sick man wondering whether anybody really knows anything about his disease" (page 50). Dr. Cabot also speaks of the problem of keeping relations between a doctor and his women patients on a properly impersonal basis and in this connection recommends the presence of a third person. When he goes on to state that such a third person is available, even when it is not practical to have a nurse or relative present, and makes clear that the Person who is always present is God whom the doctor can introduce in his conversation and that this presence is the most valuable safeguard in delicate situations, we felt like pronouncing a hearty Amen. This entire section (page 172ff.) can be read with profit by pastors as well as doctors.

We were disappointed in the chapters written by the clergyman. We could not escape the feeling that he views the problem from different premises than those to which we are committed. We found it hard to understand the introductory chapter which is devoted to a long line of argument by which he undertakes to justify the presence of the minister in the sickroom. Surely there is no call for an apologetic attitude, nor is there any need for our defending the presence in the sickroom of those who are "Ambassadors for Christ." It is fortunate that our members

by and large still consider the presence of the pastor in the sickroom as something selfevident and expected.

To hear the author (page 191) speak of the "new birth" as a "process of self-creation" in which the minister assists sounds strange to us who think of regeneration as a wondrous thing wrought solely by the Spirit of God in the sterile and lifeless heart of natural man. It is also disturbing to note that among a fair number of prayers which are quoted there is only one (page 228) which is recognizable as a prayer for forgiveness. And this is introduced by a statement that "*if patients suffer from a sense of guilt, whether they are guilty in your eyes or not,*" the minister's task is then to relieve them by a prayer following a form of confession (our emphasis). We note with regret that even in this prayer the atoning work of Christ and the sacrifice of the Lamb slain for the sins of the world is not made the basis of the plea for forgiveness. Nor does the rest of the book reassure us on this score. It seems that in the eyes of this clergyman-author the mission of the minister in the sickroom is not primarily to proclaim a Gospel of atonement and redemption by the blood of Christ, but chiefly to provide sympathy and understanding and to cultivate an attitude on the part of the patient which will either be helpful to his recovery or aid him to bear his lot with patience and fortitude.

We still feel that our pastors can gather much valuable information from this book and use it with profit in their own ministry to the sick. But these gleanings will be of an incidental nature and can be used to advantage only if one disregards the wrong theological approach which this book reveals.

We note one expression which is probably no more than an unfortunate slip of the pen, namely, that Jesus, in the course of His efforts, "ran amuck against the civil authorities and was killed."

E. REIM.

Sumerian Mythology. A Story of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B. C. by S. N. Kramer. The American Philosophical Society, Independence Square, Philadelphia, 1944. Price: \$2.00.

Dr. Heidel in his two works on *The Babylonian Genesis* (p. 14) and on *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (p. 14) informs his readers that these literary masterpieces of the Babylonian Semites are "undoubtedly based upon the cosmology of a non-Semitic people known as the Sumerians" and that "the earliest literary form of most, if not all, of the tales or episodes imbedded in the Gilgamesh Epic was doubtless Sumerian, as far as available evidence goes." This "available evidence" is brought quite near to us now by Kramer's *Sumerian Mythology*, a study based especially upon the two thousand and one hundred tablets and fragments excavated by the University of

Pennsylvania at Nippur some fifty years ago. The author stresses the basic importance of these sources as representing the oldest literature of any appreciable and significant amount ever uncovered. The cross-section of Sumerian mythology which the author gives us in this first volume — six others are to follow — includes the myths centering about the creation and organization of the universe, the creation of man, and the deluge. The readers will be grateful to the author for his efforts at an interpretation of these myths and for his selection of no less than twenty plates, many of which are designs portraying the mythological stories. We must not take for granted, however, that the author has, in every case, translated and still less interpreted these myths correctly. In the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (April 1946) a Sumerian scholar has this to say in his Review Article: "We are as yet in the earliest and most tentative stages of penetrating the inner structural coherence of these Sumerian materials, of clarifying the cultural system in which they are imbedded and from which alone they derive their intellectual and emotional meaning. The task is exceedingly difficult and most delicate" (p. 148). Still less can we take anything for granted when a comparison is drawn between the Sumerian myths and the Old Testament. Since Dr. Kramer regards "some of the Old Testament material" as "mythological in character" and as "not original," our readers will do well to read or reread what Dr. Heidel has to say on the various points of comparison between the Babylonian mythological literature and the Bible. His points, which are well taken and to be found in his study, *The Babylonian Genesis* (pp. 108-118), apply also to a comparison with the Sumerian mythological literature.

P. PETERS.

The New Modernism. An Appraisal of the Theology of Barth and Brunner by Cornelius Van Til. Published by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Second Edition, 1947. Price: \$3.75.

While many books have been written on Barth's and Brunner's theology, still none of these books, to the knowledge of this reviewer, contains such a satisfactory and exhaustive presentation of the philosophical background of "The Theology of Crisis," as can be found in Dr. Van Til's work, "The New Modernism." In the first five chapters of his book (pp. 1-130) the author deals with the philosophies which have been taken over by Barth and Brunner into their theology and which form the premise for all their theological thinking. Captions such as "Criticism," "Dialecticism," "Urgeschichte," and "Existenz" assure the reader of an adequate study of all the pertinent philosophies involved. The following pages of this work (pp. 130-387) with captions such as "Theology of the Word,"

"The Freedom of God," "The Divine-Human Encounter" a. o. guarantee a no less painstaking study of the actual theology of both Barth and Brunner.

Dr. Van Til is Professor of Apologetics in the newly formed Westminster Theological Seminary and contends that the real nature of "The Theology of Crisis" has nothing in common with the traditional orthodox theology of the Reformed Faith. The same holds true to Lutheranism, Arminianism, and to the Reformation theology in general, the author declares. Therefore he "would rally the forces of the Reformed Faith and behind them those of evangelical Christianity against this new enemy." For "The Theology of Crisis acts as a fifth-column in orthodox circles" and "a charge so serious needs to be substantiated by an abundance of evidence" (p. 3f.).

In view of Barth's and Brunner's great influence on modern theology in Europe and America, we should not neglect to study this book from cover to cover, and above all the claim that there is no Calvinism in the new modernism of these two Reformed theologians. For Van Til goes so far as to say: "Nothing could be more untrue to history than to say that the theology of Barth and Brunner is basically similar to that of Luther and Calvin. . . . A Calvinist should not object to the Lutheranism in Barth; there is no Lutheranism there. A Lutheran should not object to the Calvinism in Barth; there is no Calvinism there." While orthodox Lutheran theologians do not acknowledge Barthianism as Lutheran, they have, however, always claimed that in its last analysis it is Calvinistic in view of Barth's denial of the means of grace in the Lutheran sense, of the objective gift of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, just to mention some of the most important doctrines dealt with by Barth in his numerous writings, especially in his kirchliche Dogmatik (cf. Concordia Theological Monthly, 1944, p. 379). These claims of our Lutheran theologians should be kept well in mind when studying the book of Dr. Van Til, since his ultimate claim is that "the Reformed Faith is the only foe of Dialecticism that can withstand its attack" (p. 3).

P. PETERS.

For His Name's Sake. By Martin Hegland, Ph. D., Professor of Religion, St. Olaf College. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Price: \$1.50.

In a prefatory note the author says: "This book features readings from the New Testament. Beginning with the life of Christ based on the four Gospels and continuing through the rest of the New Testament there is a reading for each day with a descriptive heading and a prayer related to the contents of the reading." This is the best recommendation for the use of this book that it offers Scripture readings for every day of the year. What could be of greater importance than to make the Christian

reader thoroughly acquainted with the Bible! This is something sorely needed in our days, indeed. May it then help to induce its readers to return to the Word of God in daily meditation and prayer, and to use the Holy Scriptures, the only source of a saving faith and a God-pleasing life, for the edification of their souls. L.

See His Banners Forward Go. Published by the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States in commemoration of its centennial. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, 1947. Price of single copy, \$.40, postpaid.

A profusely illustrated and beautifully printed booklet guiding its readers pictorially and by means of an accompanying brief text through the past hundred years of the history of the Missouri Synod, and opening up new vistas for the future. L.

Heirs of the Prophets. An Account of the Clergy and Priests of Islam, the Personnel of the Mosque and Holy Men. By Samuel M. Zwemer, F. R. G. S., Professor Emeritus of the History of Religion and Christian Missions, Princeton Theological Seminary. Published by The Moody Bible Institute, Chicago. Price: \$2.00.

Our pastors and teachers who are reading *The Minaret* with its call for Lutheran Missions to the Moslem World, will welcome this book on Islam's clergy and priesthood and find "that Islam is at heart a missionary religion and that not only by conquest but by preachers it has won adherents."

P. Peters.

Jesus Christ Our Hope. Radio Messages of the First Part of the Twelfth Lutheran Hour by Walter A. Maier, Ph. D., D. D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Price: \$1.75.

Rebuilding With Christ. Radio Messages of the Second Part of the Twelfth Lutheran Hour by Walter A. Maier, Ph. D., D. D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Price: \$1.75.

* * * *

All of the above items may be purchased from our Northwestern Publishing House, 935-937 North Fourth Street, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin.

Quartalschrift

Theological Quarterly

Volume 44

October, 1947

Number 4

OPENING ADDRESS

on 2 Tim. 3, 15-17

SEMINARY CHAPEL, THIENSVILLE

September 9, 1947

Dear Young Friends:

You have enrolled in our Seminary for the purpose of studying *Theology*. You aim to become theologians.

In our text St. Paul speaks to Timothy as to a theologian. He calls him a "man of God," *theou anthrōpos*. That was a name applied to the great prophets and theologians of the Old Testament, *e. g.*, Moses and Samuel, and others.

What Paul says to Timothy about theology applies today to us as well, and it will be of benefit if you mark his words from the beginning of your studies. We cannot hope to exhaust the riches of St. Paul's remarks in the few minutes at our disposal this morning, nor in the course of a year's study; you will have to continue to ponder his words prayerfully throughout your career. We take note of a few points only.

The Nature of Theology

First we consider the nature of theology. What is theology? and what is a theologian?

You were probably under the impression that theology is a science, that a man becomes a theologian if he acquires a certain form of knowledge. It is true, a theologian must be in command of a certain amount of information in order to be a theologian; without it he could never be one. But knowledge is not all, it is not even the most important mark of a theologian.

In speaking of a man of God Paul describes him as "thoroughly furnished unto all good works," *pros pan ergon agathon exērtismenos*. A theologian is a man, not who knows something, but who can do something, something good and profitable; and do it well. In other words, St. Paul regards theology as an aptitude. Our Lutheran theologians use the expression *habitus practicus*, that is an active, operative skill. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in this connection speaks of a *hexis*, the Greek word for the Latin *habitus* (ch. 5, 14). In writing about the administration of the New Testament St. Paul calls it a *hikanotēs*, a sufficiency (2 Cor. 3, 5).

Remember then, in studying theology you are to acquire and develop a certain skill, a capability for doing something.

A capability for doing what? Paul uses a very general expression: "unto all good works." Naturally, in speaking of "good works" Paul does not have in mind meritorious works, works by means of which men try to build up their character and merit God's favor. He is not thinking of works, *e. g.*, of helping a neighbor in trouble or of doing him a good turn. Paul was an apostle of the Gospel of Christ, appointed to administer the word of reconciliation. Timothy, the theologian, had been elected and ordained to supervise the work of the Gospel in the churches in and about Ephesus. For him the "good work" was to discharge the duties of his office properly.

But he does not merely use the general term *pan ergon agathon*, he points out specifically in what this good work consists, when he says, "make thee wise unto salvation." Paul considered this as a most faithful saying and as worthy of all acceptance that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. This aim of saving sinners he kept constantly before his eyes when under all sorts of conditions he adapted himself to the most unpleasant circumstances in order that he might by all means save some. This is the work for which Timothy as a theologian should seek to become ever better qualified.

Here note a peculiarity of theology. Paul says, "make thee wise." Timothy is to strive not only to save others, he is to strive for his own salvation first. This is not the only place in which

Paul speaks in this way. In 1 Tim. 4, 16, he says: "In doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." Here, then, is a profession in which no harm is done to the service when a man first of all is mindful about his own welfare. Rather, it is in the nature of theology that, the more a man strives to achieve its purpose in his own person, the better will he be equipped to serve others. Yes, Paul was even afraid that he might disqualify himself as a theologian if while preaching only to others he himself became a castaway.

Mark this well while studying your theology.

The Source of Theology

How does one become a theologian, a man of God thoroughly furnished unto every good work, saving himself and them that hear him? Paul tells Timothy: "And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation."

There you have the source, the only source, of theology. Human science, human art, human philosophy can contribute exactly nil to theology. A man may have mastered all science, all art, all philosophy, he may thereby qualify for the highest positions which the world has to offer: but he is for that reason not one hair's breadth nearer to being a theologian than is the profoundest ignoramus. Not that we despise the sciences and the arts, we treasure them highly as precious gifts of God; and a theologian will make full use of them in his work, but by themselves they contribute nothing toward theology. The Bible is the source, the only source.

Note that Paul says, know the holy Scriptures. He does not say, know something, know as much as possible, *about* the Scriptures; but he says, know the Scriptures themselves. There are very many interesting and valuable things that may be known about the Bible and in connection with the Bible, *e. g.*, about the lands and people mentioned in the Bible, their background and their history; or about the writers and first readers of the books of the Bible, and the circumstances under which these were written; or about the collection, the preservation, the spread, the translations, etc., of the biblical books; or about the opinions

people held of the Bible and the impression it made on them. And hundreds of other things.

Paul says, know the Scriptures. Hence you must make the Bible the center of your work in preparing to become a theologian.

Note something peculiar in this connection. Paul says "from a child." Yes, a little child, a *brephos*, may know the Scriptures sufficiently for salvation. And yet, while this is true, there never dare be any break in our study of the Scriptures. As the years progress, there must be a corresponding progress in our knowledge of the Bible, an ever widening and ever deepening understanding of the Scriptures, a process never completed.

The Bible is the source of theology. It teaches salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

All men have a natural knowledge of God, and some cultivate and develop their knowledge. All men know that God is holy and that He is good; and while great numbers may neglect His holiness and abuse His long-suffering goodness by giving themselves over to a life of sin and vice, others seriously insist on an honorable and upright life. Yet in all this they contribute not one iota to their salvation; rather, if they do not repent, they only increase their own damnation. There is only one way to salvation, and that is in the righteousness procured for us by our Savior through His holy living and His innocent suffering and death, appropriated by us through faith.

Scripture teaches this faith. And it does so under the most widely different circumstances conceivable. Paul, in our text, mentions four. He says, Scripture is profitable for *doctrine*. Scripture presents the facts: the fact of original sin, of our total depravity, of our separation from God, of our inability to make restitution or contribute the least thereto; and of God's love and the sacrifice of His only-begotten Son. A clear and simple doctrine.

Then Scripture is profitable for *reproof*. Natural man refuses to receive the doctrine of sin and grace. It is foolishness to him, and he rejects it. He insists on a recognition of his own merits. But Scripture is equal to the situation. It does not compromise. It does not integrate the two systems. It reproves natural man of his error.

It does not stop there. Even when reproved and convicted of his error, natural man cannot by his own reason or strength come to Jesus and believe in Him. But Scripture is profitable for *correction*.

And lastly, it is profitable for *instruction*, for education and training. It nourishes, strengthens, preserves the believer in his faith and helps him to progress in its expression by a life of daily repentance and sanctification.

You want to be theologians? Turn to the Scriptures.

Theology a Gift of God

Do not make the mistake, however, to think that by a diligent use of Scriptures you can make theologians of yourselves. It is beyond your power to do so. Theology is a creation and gift of God.

Note that Paul says, Scriptures can make thee *wise, sophisai*, unto salvation. We have already considered briefly that Scripture teaches faith in Christ Jesus as the only way to salvation. Salvation is not a matter of our own merits. No good works that we may imagine to have done, no sacrifices that we may have performed, no self-denial that we may have imposed on ourselves, count for anything in the matter of salvation. The man who led an exemplary life all his days stands no nearer to salvation than the most abject scoundrel and vice monger. Salvation is a matter of God's grace alone, who gave His only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life.

This Gospel, God's wisdom unto salvation, is utter foolishness to natural man. It not only seems ridiculous to him, he scorns it, he hates it, because it deprives him of any credit. 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.

Such a man, who from the bottom of his heart detests the Gospel — he should be made wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. We realize that no amount of information, of education, of training will be able to make a theologian

out of him, because all the instruction along these lines will only irk him and rouse him to more determined opposition.

What is needed is a new creation. Ye must be born again, Jesus said to Nicodemus. But this is a miracle which the Scriptures actually can perform. They can make the fool wise unto salvation. They can overcome the foolishness of his heart, and they can create true wisdom in its stead.

How can they do it? No one but God is able to create anything out of nothing; and to a greater degree, no one but God can transform an obstreperous fool into a comprehending and appreciative wise man. Yet, Paul says, the Scriptures can do it.

He also gives us the reason: All Scripture is given by inspiration of God. It is *theopneustos* from beginning to end. No part of the Scriptures, not a single word, was produced by human will or ingenuity. The holy men of God, the old theologians, spoke as they were moved by the Spirit of God.

Let us try to get a clearer grasp of the situation. There are people who imagine that God at some time in the hoary past revealed Himself to selected men and spoke to them. Then they recorded what they heard. Thus the Scripture is a record of God's revelation, or, as some would say, the history of God's revelation.

Paul claims much more for the Scriptures: they are the Word of God itself. What does that imply? Jesus once said: "The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are life." When you hear the Scriptures, or when you read the Scriptures, it is the same as though God Himself were standing before you in person in all His holy majesty, and were addressing personally to you the words of His love. The Scriptures are not a record of a past revelation of God, they are His ever present and powerful revelation. The Gospel of Christ is a power of God unto salvation.

This being the case, the Scriptures can make theologians out of you.

May God then bless your studies here at the Seminary and later throughout your lives that through the Scriptures you become ever more efficient theologians who save yourselves and them that hear you.

M.

THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD AND CIVIC RIGHTEOUSNESS

VI

Since Stoeckhardt prefaces his discussion of Rom. 2, 14-16, with the remark that this short passage is among the most difficult of the entire epistle, and since he finds it necessary to devote a special paragraph to a discussion of *gar* and the relation of this section to the foregoing, we will do well not only to consider the text and the truths which it conveys most thoroughly, but also to review very carefully the line of thought that leads up to this section.

Beginning with v. 5, Paul has been discussing the final judgment of God on the last day. In v. 9 and 10 he referred to the special standing of both Jew and Greek. There is a *prōton* to be registered with reference to them both in case of a favorable and of an unfavorable verdict. Both have been highly favored by God in their history. The Jews have received the revelation of God in the written law of Moses, and the Greeks were endowed with an exceptionally keen mind and with a deep appreciation of the beautiful and the ethical. In them in the first place was fulfilled the old prophecy of Noah that God would "enlarge Japheth" (Gen. 9, 27). Paul does not refer to this prophecy concerning Japheth, but he does very emphatically link both Jews and Greeks together, three times in his whole discourse, twice in connection with the final judgment. While with reference to their doing of the good he uses the simple verb *ergazein*, he uses the compound *katergazein* when referring to their doing of the evil, thereby showing in which direction his thoughts are running: both Jews and Greeks are steeped in evil, and hence will receive an adverse judgment on the last day.

This leads Paul to declare emphatically the great truth that there is no partiality with God, no consideration for outward advantages that any one may have. The Jews had the outward advantage of the written Law, the Greeks the advantage of their philosophy. This in itself does not give them any preferred standing; if anything, it increases their responsibility and the severity of their sentence. As many as have sinned without law

will simply perish without law; but as many as have sinned in the law will not merely perish, they will be judged by the law. Paul applies the principle laid down by the Lord: "That servant which knew his lord's will and prepared not himself neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes" (Luke 12, 47. 48). The fairness of such judgment is evident from the rule that "unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required" (v. 48).

The explanation which Paul offers in v. 13, though voicing an incontrovertible truth, that not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified, may at first sound rather trite to us. That is due chiefly to the colorless English word *hearer*. In the Greek Paul used *akroatai*. An *akroatēs* is not merely one who hears, an *akouōn*. An *akroatēs* is one who attends lectures, a pupil, a student. Now both Jews and Greeks were diligent students of the law, the Jews of the written Law of Moses, the Greeks of philosophical ethics. But all their research work in the law will not help them; only complete compliance with the demands of the law will justify.

Incidentally we note the clearly forensic character of *dikaioō*.

This line of thought Paul now continues with the difficult section v. 14-16, using as a connective the conjunction *gar*. — For a comparison I shall submit three of the more recent translations, the R. S. V., Goodspeed's, and Menge's.

V. 14. When Gentiles who have not the law do by nature what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. (R. S. V.) — When heathen who have no Law instinctively obey what the Law demands, even though they have no law, they are a law to themselves (Goodspeed). — *So oft naemlich Heiden, die doch das Gesetz nicht besitzen, von Natur die Forderungen des Gesetzes erfuehlen, so sind diese, da sie das Gesetz nicht besitzen, sich selbst ein Gesetz;*

V. 15. They show that what the law requires is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness and their conflicting thoughts accuse or perhaps excuse them (R. S. V.) — for they show that what the Law demands is written on their hearts, and their consciences will testify for them, and with their

thoughts they will either accuse or perhaps defend themselves, (G.) — *sie beweisen ja dadurch tatsaechlich, dass das vom Gesetz gebotene Tun ihnen ins Herz geschrieben ist, wofuer auch ihr Gewissen Zeugnis ablegt und ebenso ihre Gedanken, die im Widerstreit miteinander Anklagen erheben oder auch Entschuldigungen vorbringen.*

V. 16. On that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus. (R. S. V.) — on that day when, as the good news I preach teaches, God through Christ Jesus judges what men have kept secret. (G.) — *Das wird sich an dem Tage zeigen, wo Gott die geheimen Vorgaenge im Herzen der Menschen richten wird, und zwar nach der Heilsbotschaft, die ich verkuendige, durch Jesus Christus.*

We shall not discuss these translations, we shall devote our attention to the text itself.

We notice that Paul here speaks of *ethnē*. He does not, as he did in v. 9. and 10, combine Jew and Greek. He does not even mention the eminently gifted and highly cultured Greeks in particular. He speaks of *ethnē* in general, of Gentiles of every nationality, simply in so far as they are Gentiles. Nor does he consider the Gentiles as constituting a group, as an entity. He does not say *ta ethnē*, the Gentiles, but uses the word without the definite article: he is speaking about any one who has the characteristics of a Gentile. About them he says by means of a participle with the definite article, which makes it equivalent to an English descriptive relative clause, that they have no law. He does not say *ton nomon*, as though he were referring specifically to the Mosaic Law. Of course, they have not the Law of Moses; but they may be "lawless" to an even greater extent: they may also be without a philosophically developed code of ethics. In short, they are not confronted by anything like a law to demand of them what they must do.

Of these Gentiles Paul says that they do the things demanded by the law, *ta tou nomou*. He does not say that they always do them, not even that they regularly do them. Nor does he say that they do them properly, so that the law must be satisfied with their obedience. He says *hotan poiōsin*, that is, whenever they do and to whatever extent it may be. As the verb *endeiknyntai* in the

following verse indicates, he is thinking of outward acts which men can see and evaluate. In this respect Gentiles may do *ta tou nomou*.

An important remark of Paul is that the Gentiles do the commandments of the law *physei*, by nature. He opposes this idea to that of a law: they have no law to regulate their conduct, but they do the commandments of the law by nature. Their nature tells them the same things that are contained in the law. The Law of Moses and also the ethical codes of the Greek philosophers stood over against the people as demanding something of them, as imposing some duty upon them. The "lawless" Gentiles to whom Paul refers here, do the right thing as coming from within them, as being a characteristic of their nature. Yet the translation which Goodspeed offers is not correct. He says *instinctively*. If that were the case then these works of the Gentiles would automatically lose their ethical nature. Whatever is done by instinct is neither good nor bad; it is done without thinking, without choosing between several possibilities. Instinct cannot be separated from the nature of a thing, it is a part of the creature. Take away the natural instinct, and you have destroyed the being itself; it no longer is what it was before. When Paul here says *physei*, he does not want to say this is a part of their nature so that they have no choice in the matter. Else he could hardly have used *hotan*, whenever they do it, admitting by implication that there are times when they don't. Moreover, in the following he clearly distinguishes between the *physis* as such and the ethical concepts, of which he says that they are *written* in the Gentiles' hearts. As a tablet and the writing on it are two different things, so are the human heart and the works of the law written in it. Yet the two cannot be separated, the writing is indelible, though it may be badly blurred. — In this sense they act *physei*, in this sense they *are* a law unto themselves.

It is well to remind ourselves briefly of the aim which Paul is pursuing in this part of his argument. It is not to demonstrate that the Gentiles are capable of performing good works, it is not to determine the relative goodness of their works; it is to show God's absolute justice over against such as have sinned *anomōs*, in His consigning them to perdition. They sinned indeed *anomōs*,

but they were not for that reason really *anomoi*, they were *ennomoi*. For although they had no code of laws confronting them and telling them what they must do, neither the Law of Moses nor the philosophical systems of ethics, they had the work of the law written in their hearts, so that they were a law unto themselves and knew by *physis* what to do. God did not judge them according to the superficial appearance of their case, He took all facts into due consideration. Their conscience will bear this out.

Before taking up our study of Paul's presentation concerning conscience, we may digress a little to review briefly what our Confessions have to say about the good works of natural man. Alluding to our text the Apology says: "Human reason naturally understands, in some way, the Law, for it has the same judgment divinely written in the mind" (Trgl., p. 121, 7). "Reason can work civil works" (p. 127, 27). "Although, therefore, civil works, *i. e.*, the outward works of the Law, can be done, in a measure, without Christ and without the Holy Ghost from our inborn light" etc. (p. 157, 9). "Nor, indeed, do we deny liberty to the human will. The human will has liberty in the choice of works and things which reason comprehends by itself. It can to a certain extent render civil righteousness or the righteousness of works; it can speak of God, offer to God a certain service by an outward work, obey magistrates, parents; in the choice of an outward work it can restrain the hands from murder, from adultery, from theft. Since there is left in human nature reason and judgment concerning objects subjected to the senses, choice between these things, and the liberty and power to render civil righteousness, are also left" (p. 335, 70). More passages of similar import might easily be adduced, in which the ability is ascribed to human reason of producing a (limited) civic righteousness.

We now reproduce in full the most striking passage which concedes that God rewards civic righteousness. "Now, we think concerning the righteousness of reason thus, namely, that *God requires it*, and that, because of God's commandment, the honorable works which the Decalog commands must necessarily be performed, according to the passage Gal. 3, 24: 'The Law was our schoolmaster'; likewise 1 Tim 1, 9: 'The Law is made for the

ungodly.' For God wishes *those who are carnal* to be restrained by civil discipline, and to maintain this, He has given laws, letters, doctrine, magistrates, penalties. And this righteousness reason, by its own strength, can, to a certain extent, work, although it is often overcome by natural weakness, and by the devil impelling it to manifest crimes. Now, *although we cheerfully assign this righteousness of reason the praises that are due it, for this corrupt nature has no greater good* (in this life and in a worldly nature nothing is ever better than uprightness and virtue) and Aristotle says right: 'Neither the evening star nor the morning star is more beautiful than righteousness,' and *God also honors it with bodily rewards: yet it ought not to be praised with reproach to Christ'* (p. 127, 22-24).

What our Confessions consider as an undue praise of civic righteousness, as a praise "with reproach to Christ," they express in numerous places. "*Darum ist's gut, dass man dieses klar unterscheidet, naemlich, dass die Vernunft und freier Wille vermag, etlichermassen aeusserlich ehrbar zu leben; aber neugeboren werden, inwendig ander Herz, Sinn und Mut kriegen, das wirkt allein der Heilige Geist. Also bleibt weltliche, aeusserliche Zucht; denn Gott will ungeschicktes, wildes, freches Wesen und Leben nicht haben; und wird doch ein rechter Unterschied gemacht unter aeusserlichem Weltleben und -froemigkeit — und der Froemigkeit, die vor Gott gilt, die nicht philosophisch aeusserlich ist, sondern inwendig im Herzen'*" (p. 336, 75). "In spiritual and divine things the intellect, heart, and will of the unregenerate man are utterly unable, by their own natural powers, to understand, believe, accept, think, will, begin, effect, do, work, or concur in working anything, but they are entirely dead to what is good, and corrupt, so that in man's nature since the Fall, before regeneration, there is not the least spark of spiritual power remaining, nor present, by which, of himself, he can prepare himself for God's grace, or accept the offered grace, nor be capable of it for and of himself, or apply or accommodate himself thereto, or by his own powers be able of himself, as of himself, to aid, do, work, or concur in working anything towards his conversion, either wholly, or half, or in any, even the least or most inconsiderable part, but that he is the servant

(and slave) of sin (John 8, 34) and a captive of the devil, by whom he is moved (Eph. 2, 2; 2 Tim. 2, 26). *Hence the natural free will according to its perverted disposition and nature is strong and active only with respect to what is displeasing and contrary to God*" (p. 883, 7).

And this applies to civic righteousness in its most highly developed forms.

Dr. F. Pieper, in his *Christliche Dogmatik*, asks the question: *Was ist von diesen Werken* (viz. good works of the Gentiles) *zu halten?* He answers: *Die bessere Lehrweise ist die, wenn wir mit dem lutherischen Bekenntnis die guten Werke der Heiden und die der Christen auf die zwei voellig verschiedenen Gebiete verweisen, denen sie tatsaechlich angeh hoeren. . . . Wir unterscheiden daher mit dem lutherischen Bekenntnis scharf zwischen Weltreich und christlicher Kirche. Im Weltreich sind die guten Werke der Heiden gut, auf dem Gebiet der christlichen Kirche sind sie Suende. So durchweg das lutherische Bekenntnis; und man muss sich wundern, dass in der christlichen Kirche eine andere Lehre sich ans Licht wagen durfte und darf* (Vol. III, p. 53f.) *

This evaluation of the good works of the Gentiles contained in the Lutheran Confessions and voiced by sound Lutheran theologians is in full agreement with Paul's own verdict. Did he not emphatically declare that all people are without excuse, whether they give themselves over to their lusts, or whether they start reform movements? And here in v. 14 he shows that they cannot plead ignorance. By every one of their occasional efforts (*hotan*) they give unmistakable evidence (*endeiknyntai*) that the work of the law is written within their heart.

It is "written," Paul says, *grapton*. Who wrote it? Not they themselves. This inscribed law is not the result of their specula-

* It was recently quoted by some one as a "heroic" saying of Dr. Dallmann, *i. e.*, as a hyperbole which must be taken with a liberal dose of salt, that the virtues of the Gentiles are nothing but glittering vices. Dr. Pieper in the above quotation says the same, and not with a twinkle in his eye. The expression is current among Lutheran dogmaticians and can be traced back to Augustine, who called the virtues of Gentiles *splendida peccata* (or *vitia*).

tion, reached perhaps after a slow and laborious process of reasoning by the trial and error method. It was not found by men on the basis of their experience and observation to be the most expedient to regulate human conduct as the relations of society became more complex. It consists not of conventions which through usage and training produced a custom, which then gradually acquired the force of a law. No, this inscribed law, rather, forms the starting point of all ethical thinking and judging. Men did not write it into their own hearts, they found it there written by another hand.

Who then wrote it? As a synonymous expression for the same thought Paul said in the previous verse that the Gentiles do the demands of the law by nature, *phusei*. This answers the question as to who wrote the law into the hearts of men. The same God who created the *physis* is also the author of the inscribed law. Just as God in creation implanted a knowledge of Himself, of His eternal power and godhead, into the hearts of men, so He also implanted a knowledge of His holy will.

The Gentiles, by their conduct, show that they realize the authority of the inscribed law. They realize that they did not make this law themselves, and that thus they do not have it in their own hand to change it as it may suit them. This law is something which exists independently of their wishes. They may not like it, they may hate its provisions: that does not affect the law in the least. It does not yield to their wishes. It is unrelenting in its demands. Moreover, they realize that the law has authority over them which they must regard. It can demand respect for its commands. They realize that there is some one behind it who will enforce submission, be it by obedience, be it by suffering the punishment.

After having thus emphatically established the fact that all Gentiles have a law which they must acknowledge as divine and binding on them, Paul now adds two further facts in the following words: "their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another."

The first point we notice is that Paul sharply distinguishes between conscience and the inscribed law. They are not the same. Some people try to identify the two, but without any foundation

in our text. Paul uses the word *symmartyrousēs*, i. e., *jointly* bearing testimony, or "also bearing witness," as the King James version has it.

On the other hand, conscience is not the same as the thoughts that fill the heart, accusing and condemning the person, sometimes also vindicating him. — Thus there are three things that Paul distinguishes: there is the inscribed law, there is conscience, and there is the flood of judging thoughts.

What is the relation of the three to each other?

The relation of conscience to the inscribed law is indicated in the word *symmartyrousēs*: it joins in bearing witness. It joins hands with the inscribed law. The inscribed law testifies to its own divine origin: it was written, not by men, not by experience, not by convention, but it was written before men could formulate any ordinance or profit by their experience, it was written when their very nature was fashioned, it was written by their Creator. This is the testimony of the inscribed law about itself and its own origin. In this witness it is joined by conscience. Conscience is a second witness who fully corroborates the testimony given by the first.

We see from this that conscience is more than an activity of the intellect. Compare S. J. Baumgarten's definition: *Der Gebrauch seines Verstandes bei Beurteilung seiner Handlungen nach dem Gesetz ist das Gewissen*. It is more than a merely moral function. Compare Quenstedt's definition: *Lex est regula universalis, jubens aut vetans. At conscientia est examen sui ipsius ad istam regulam*. Leaving out of consideration that Quenstedt is really describing the activity of conscience, not defining it strictly according to its essence, we see that he finds no more in conscience than a moral function, judging the ethical merits or demerits of our conduct. According to Paul it is much more. In chap. 1, 19, he had made the sweeping statement about the *gnōston tou theou* in its widest range: "God hath showed it unto them." That includes also, according to chap. 2, 15, a knowledge of His holy will as it is expressed in the inscribed law. And in turn, this is also the content of the testimony of conscience. Hoenecke's definition covers the point: *Das Gewissen ist Bewusstsein von Gott als dem im Sittengesetz sich als heilig offenbarenden und*

Heiligkeit fordernden Gott (*Dogmatik* II, p. 364). It amounts to the same when in another connection he defines conscience as *das Bewusstsein von der Verpflichtung durch das Gesetz als Gesetz Gottes, wie immer auch dabei Gott mag vorgestellt werden* (Cf. l. c. footnote). Conscience is a religious function. It is a consciousness, *syneidēsis*, of man concerning his relation to the holy God, a consciousness which attests the inscribed law as the law of God and the demands of this law as divinely binding.

Conscience sets in motion the thoughts of the heart concerning a man's relation toward his God. Paul intimates that the thoughts will in the great majority of cases be accusing thoughts, although he grants that occasionally they may also rise to the defense of a person. Every time a person has violated the inscribed law, conscience will trouble him and the thoughts aroused by his conscience will be filled with fear, because, as Luther expresses it, *sie fuehlen, wie sie mit Gott uebel daran sind*.

Paul does not say that conscience is always correct, just as little as he says that the inscribed law is always correctly understood. God inscribed the law, and then it was a perfectly reliable expression of His holy will. He also gave man his conscience, and then it was an infallible witness. But as through the fall the entire nature of man became corrupt, so did also the two endowments of conscience and the inscribed law. The inscribed law is no longer clearly legible, and conscience is subject to error. Yet conscience still functions sufficiently, so that a man will have to accept God's judgment, based on the inscribed law and the testimony of conscience, as just in his own case; for God does not judge according to outward appearance, there is no *prosōpolēmpsia* with Him. He judges according to the *kardia* (cf. 2 Cor. 5, 12).

That conscience is more than an intellectual judgment, more also than an ethical judgment concerning right and wrong, that it is a religious function, becomes perfectly plain from the last verse to be discussed, v. 16: "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my Gospel."

The connection of this verse is not evident at once in the English Bible, "in the day" being a literal rendering of the Greek *en hē(i) hēmera(i)*. This sounds like an adverbial phrase of

time. Yet the idea of time does not seem to fit the picture. In the preceding verse Paul spoke of the activity of conscience, arousing thoughts which accuse or defend. This process was going on in Paul's day, had been going on before, and is still going on today. It is not confined to the day of judgment, rather, on that day another judge will take over. The idea that Paul is here fixing a date has caused other difficulties. What is the tense of the verb? *Krinei* admits of two accents. It may have a circumflex on the ultimate, which would make it future; or it may have an acute on the penult, making it present. The future would fit the coming day of judgment very naturally; the present might be understood as a timeless description of that future day. The time idea induced some to assume that Paul is here not referring to the final judgment, but is speaking of a judgment which is going on now, and is being carried out by the Gospel. But in v. 5ff. Paul had very distinctly pointed to the judgment on the last day, so that his presentation would become rather unclear if here, in the end of the section, he would adopt a different use of the expression without in some way indicating the change.

The time idea thus posing questions to which it is difficult to find a satisfactory answer, it behoves us to investigate whether the *en* phrase may not have some other meaning. Luther translated *auf den Tag*, as though Paul had written *eis tēn hēmeran*. Yet he is closer to the real sense than those who cling to the time idea. The Greek *en* conveys the general idea of connection. The accusing and excusing thoughts in some way stand in relation to the last day. This is not difficult to grasp. If man in his conscience did not realize that a day of final reckoning is coming, what influence could conscience have on his conduct? If the Epicurean theory were right that death ends our existence, that as our bodies disintegrate, so also our soul evanesces into nothing, then conscience with its demands, with its testimony, with its accusations would only make itself ridiculous. The natural course indicated by the circumstances would then be the one generally followed by the Epicureans: "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." But if there is a day of judgment coming in which God Himself will be the judge, and if then not only the overt acts of men will be examined, but the most secret things will be subjected to

judgment, then indeed conscience can demand to be heard. That is what Paul here says: conscience acts in connection with that great day, it anticipates the judgment of that day.

With this point Paul clinches the proposition that conscience is a religious function of the human soul, it deals with man in his relation to God. An appeal to a man's conscience is a religious appeal.

What does Paul wish to say with the phrase "according to my Gospel?" We need not waste any time on the possessive "my." Paul is not speaking about the Gospel in the form in which he is preaching it as contrasted with that of other apostles. If that were his aim then *my* would have to be placed with some emphasis, which it is not in the Greek, being expressed by the unaccented, enclitic *mou*. In chap. 1, 1, he called himself an apostle *aphōrismenos eis euangelion theou*. Well may he then in chap. 2, 16, call the Gospel his Gospel. The stress is on the Gospel.

But what is the meaning of the preposition "according to"? Does it modify the whole thought complex that a judgment of the secret things will be held by God on the last day? Does Paul wish to present this truth as a part of his Gospel message? It is a truth confessed in the Second Article of the Apostolic Creed; but a reference to that in this connection would seem rather trite and would really weaken Paul's argument. What he has been stressing so far is that conscience knows about this coming judgment and reenforces its own authority by functioning in close connection with this judgment. Why should Paul here inject the thought that also according to the Gospel we are looking forward to such a judgment? — Stoeckhardt, following earlier exegetes, points out the proper meaning of *kata*. It modifies directly the verb *krinei*. The standard according to which God will judge men is the Gospel which Paul preaches. It is neither the Law of Moses, nor some philosophical system of ethics, nor the inscribed law, which God will apply to the deeds of men. He will gauge their lives by the Gospel.

This presents a rather startling turn in Paul's argument, and yet not strange or arbitrary in the least. Had he not from the very outset proclaimed the superior authority of the Gospel? Had he not used the law throughout so far merely as the dark back-

ground against which the Gospel would shine with all the more brilliant lustre? It is really quite natural, then, that now when his discussion of the wrath of God as revealed from heaven has reached a certain climax he should with a simple turn in the expression point out that the law-judgments of men will be superseded by a judgment according to the Gospel on the last day.

This truth is underscored by the fact that God will execute the final judgment, not in person, but by Jesus Christ. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. . . . And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man" (John 5, 22, 27). Christ is the end of the law, who through His holy life and innocent suffering and death fulfilled all the demands of the Law. He will not on the last day reverse Himself. He will not revive the Law which He ended. Since judgment is committed to Him He will judge according to the standard which He Himself established by His death.

Paul was separated unto the Gospel. He was to replace the law-idea current among the people with faith in the Gospel. He knew that he could not graft the Gospel on the Law, nor incorporate a law program into his Gospel work. The two are mutually exclusive. He could point out, and he did point out, that by the Law is the knowledge of sin, so that every mouth may be stopped; he could point out that the law in any form makes men inexcusable: and then he must invite the poor, lost, and condemned creatures to accept the Gospel as the power of God unto salvation, overruling all Law.

If we now pause to review briefly the main thoughts that Paul developed so far, we realize the absolute exclusiveness of the Gospel. Paul is an apostle of the Gospel, to preach the Gospel, the whole Gospel, nothing but the Gospel. Everything that might further the Gospel he is not only permitted to use in his work, it is his duty to do so. If he neglects anything that might lead people to open their hearts to the Gospel, he would be unfaithful to his charge. Paul speaks of the natural knowledge of God, he speaks of reform endeavors, of civic righteousness, of conscience and its activity. What use can he make of these forces? Can he take over with his Gospel work where, *e. g.*, the moral reformer

leaves off? Can he continue to build on the reformer's program? We may be reasonably sure that the reformer would have been willing in due humility to offer his program to Paul to aid him in his work and to supplement his efforts.

Paul was unswerving in his attitude of separation from all moral forces outside the Gospel. He did not deny the truth of the natural knowledge of God. Coming from God Himself it cannot be false. He does not question the validity of the inscribed law, it was written by God into the hearts of men. He does not challenge the verdict of conscience. In fact, only by granting their original correctness can he justify his evaluation of these forces. His verdict concerning all of them is that they render men inexcusable. If these factors were false in themselves, their condemning verdict could not be accepted; but now it stands as God's own. Outside the Gospel, before rescued by the Gospel, all things are under the wrath of God. "All flesh is grass and *all the goodness thereof* is as the flower of the field" (Is. 40, 6). If that were not so then Paul's Gospel would not only be superfluous, it would be positively harmful. The sum and substance of his Gospel is a revelation of the righteousness of God from faith to faith. "We conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." That truth will upset the program of all moral reformers, vice versa.

The reason for this is not difficult to find. The source from which all reformers try to achieve their aim is, as Paul calls it in chap. 2, 8, *ex eritheias*, the mind of an hireling, the expectation of a reward, the *opinio legis*; while Paul's Gospel demands *metanoia*, repentance. *Metanoia*, a change of heart, is what John the Baptist preached in order to prepare the way for the coming Messiah. The risen Jesus told His disciples that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations" (Luke 24, 47). Repentance is what Paul preached on his mission journeys, as witness his words in Lystra and on Areopagus (Acts 14, 15; 17, 30). He faulted the reformer because he hardened his heart in impenitence. Only by way of repentance does the Gospel save a sinner. — Paul does not here say by what means repentance is produced in the heart of a sinner. He merely points out the unreconcilable difference between the

Gospel and the principles of the reformer. The reformer uses the — condemning — verdict of God's natural revelation of Himself and His holy will as a motivation in his efforts at reform, while Paul asks the sinner to bow to their condemning verdict and to accept new life from the Gospel.

Paul did not deceive himself by stressing that a clean and honorable life is better than a life of vice and knavery; that civic righteousness, after all, is something good. And if it is something good, why should he in his Gospel work not approve of it and build on it? Civic righteousness is something good from the social standpoint, but from the spiritual standpoint it is sin. Paul did not confuse these two, he did not make himself guilty of a logical *quaternio*. Nor did Paul deceive himself that the reformers of his day and the schools which they founded were purely civic organizations. He knew that they were operating with the natural knowledge of God and with the highly religious function of the soul, called conscience. He steered clear of begging the question: he did not call an organization which emphasizes the "fulfillment of one's duty to God" as a person's highest obligation: a purely civil organization, without any religious element, — and then console himself that hence cooperation with it would not in itself constitute unionism.

In demanding repentance Paul did not fear failure. Just as he was fully aware that all efforts of the reformers achieved nothing else than to incite the wrath of God to greater fury, so on the other hand he was fully convinced that the Gospel, and the Gospel alone, was able to achieve its purpose of rendering the sinner righteous before God. It is the power of God unto salvation. It is not a weak, carnal implement, but mighty before God to the pulling down of strongholds. Any one who finds it necessary, or convenient and helpful, to supplement his Gospel work with other motives, no matter how much lip-service he may do to the Gospel, in truth does not fully trust the Gospel, he is secretly ashamed of the Gospel. Paul for his person has renounced the hidden things of shame; he does not adulterate the Word of God, but as of sincerity, as of God, in the sight of God he speaks in Christ. He is not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ.

"What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.

Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith" (Phil. 3, 7-9). M.

A SPECIAL APPLICATION OF THE TENTH COMMANDMENT TO PASTOR AND CONGREGATION

(Conclusion)

III. When Does a Pastor Covet His Neighboring Pastor's Property Wrongfully?

First, the property which is his by birth, his natural gifts. The sin of coveting a neighboring pastor's property which is his by birth is committed by jealousy and envy. When one pastor begrudges another his natural gifts he is coveting wrongfully. Jealousy and envy are havoc-wreaking twins in the church. Recently while reading Luther I ran across lines with contents similar to this, that jealousy and envy of one another are the cardinal sins of pastors that wreak tremendous havoc in the church. The Lord not only had jealous, envious apostles in His day, but also has such pastors today. This reveals itself in many ways, in fact so much so that it becomes apparent to the laymen and is the subject of discussion among them.

My wife's grandfather was pastor in a certain conference in which jealousy and envy reigned to such an extent that the man who delivered the conference sermon was to be pitied. When his turn to preach came he did not reach for his seminary sermon, but memorized and delivered one of Walther's sermons verbatim. The criticism as usual was without mercy. After all was over he confessed to the brethren that he never knew that Walther was such a terrible theologian and sermon writer, informed them what he had done, and why, and sat down. In shame the good

brethren realized that with shoes on they had been treading on ground that otherwise was practically worshiped by them — and all because of jealousy and envy.

Jealousy and envy of the neighboring pastor because of his gifts does not make him small, nor does it make me great. It makes me guilty of the Tenth Commandment. "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." — Not the spirit of "I wish to be great," but the spirit of John the Baptist "He must increase, but I must decrease" ought ever be in the hearts of all pastors, and their lives dedicated to making Jesus great in the hearts of the people! For that is the work of the Church, and that is to be the salvation of souls. And what a blessing it would be to all pastors if Christ occupied the right place in the hearts of all members, and would garner the love and respect due Him, for if Christ occupies the right place in the hearts of members, not only Christ, but also His servants, will garner the love and respect that is due them. Get the Church to praise Christ and honor Him as it ought, and God-pleasing praise and honor of servants will be the result.

Secondly, when does a pastor wrongfully covet the property which is his neighboring pastor's by rebirth? It is my opinion that the answer to this question will be found in the answer to the third: When does a pastor wrongfully covet that which is his neighboring pastor's by virtue of his call? So no time will be devoted to answering this question separately.

We shall proceed at once to: When does a pastor wrongfully covet the property which is his neighboring pastor's by virtue of his call?

First, he does so when he becomes envious and jealous of his neighboring pastor because of the congregation which is his by virtue of his call. The congregations of Christians which call men to administer the keys in their midst are not all of the same size. They do not pay equal salaries, have like parsonages, and are not all located in Milwaukee, Manitowoc, or Maribel. It definitely appears to be a greater advantage to be called by the

one congregation than the other. The temptation to be envious and jealous therefore is ever present. As soon as a pastor yields to this temptation he sins against the Tenth Commandment, covets wrongfully what is another pastor's by virtue of his call. And this happens too often. Why is it that the Holy Ghost makes so many mistakes and calls the wrong men? According to some conversations He always blunders. Is He actually so ignorant that He does not know His man? Or is it that the devil triumphs and makes the seed of envy and jealousy sprout in many cases? The Holy Ghost moves in a mysterious way, but not on the path of error. When doing your work as a pastor in your congregation, what comfort to know this: not by mistake but by divine guidance I am where I am! — What pangs of conscience, however, must be his who sees not God's but his own hand in his call!

No pastor should covet his neighboring pastor's field. He should be content with his own and work faithfully there where the Lord has placed him. He should not at heart live a life of spiritual adultery.

In life one man frequently covets another man's wife because she is more beautiful than his; another man would be rid of his wife because of what she is, her weaknesses. He took her for better or worse, but the worse does not appeal to him. We condemn such action in our sermons, and rightly so. It is unfaithfulness. It is sin.

In church life it is spiritual unfaithfulness when a pastor covets a neighboring pastor's congregation because it is more appealing to him than his; and desires to be rid of his own congregation, because he does not see the beauty in it that he does in the other, or because of the worse in it, the crosses his Lord asks him to bear in shepherding it. Faithfulness to the Great Shepherd includes being faithful in this respect also. Let us not forget the relation of pastor and flock. It is thine and mine, mine and thine, joined together by God through a divine call. Here also the words apply: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." Let the Lord do the moving. He has His way of doing so; and if the Lord would have us at a place He will get us there without our help.

Nor should a pastor at any time feel that he is too big a

man for his congregation and therefore has a right to be dissatisfied with the place the Lord has given him and dare covet another. The fact is that he who is too big for the job the Lord has given him usually is too small for another, yea, not worthy of the one he has. So let us all be satisfied there where the Lord has placed us, not long for other fields, but pray for strength and wisdom to be faithful shepherds in the field in which we are. Longing for other fields makes dissatisfied pastors; praying for strength and wisdom to shepherd one's own field makes contented, faithful pastors.

And what is true of pastors also applies to synods. There should be a fervent desire, a burning zeal in a synod to spread the Gospel, preach the Word in ever greater fields to the glory of God and the salvation of souls. The Lord would not have the Christians live in ease in Jerusalem and neglect mission work. Synods should preach the Gospel from the housetops. They should go into the highways and byways and do this. But it should ever be remembered that a sister-synod's field cannot be classified as highways and byways. And that preaching from the housetops or in any other manner in a sister-synod's field is sin.

Paul was forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the Word in Asia. He assayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered him not. Acts 16, 6-7.

There still are Asias, Bithynias in the world today. The Holy Ghost still forbids. When the Holy Ghost calls a synod to do work in a certain field, sister-synods should be careful not to violate brotherly love and create an offense by trying to make it their field.

But what about Matthew 28? And what about love for lost souls? Matthew 28 was in effect at Paul's time. Love for lost souls, the desire to save, burned in his heart. But did Paul argue Matthew 28 with the Spirit? Or did he plead love for lost souls, go into Bithynia, and attempt to justify his action with his desire to save souls? Indeed not! He obeyed the voice of the Spirit, lived another love, the love of God: And this is the love of God that we keep His commandments. And he lived Matthew 28 also, for he preached the Gospel in all other, unforbidden places whithersoever the Spirit led him.

Synods should do the Lord's work as Paul did. They can live Matthew 28 without entering sister-synod's fields. And true love of God, not a distorted love of souls, should be behind all their mission efforts. The Church will not suffer therefrom. What Christian, knowing God's Word, will venture to say that any of God's elect in Bithynia were lost because Paul in doing the Lord's work did it the Lord's way? Had Paul disregarded the voice of the Spirit and gone into Bithynia, more souls would not have been saved there than were, more would today not be in heaven, but more sin would be in the history of the world; for Paul would have sinned. So when a synod goes into an Asia, a Bithynia, a sister-synod's field, into forbidden territory, not the Savior, but sin is served; more souls are not saved, but the sin against brotherly love is committed, and the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace is destroyed, which, according to Ephesians 4, 3, we are to endeavor to keep.

When Jesus sent the Twelve forth the first time, He did not send them all to one place to do a grand bit of competition work. He sent them forth two by two, scattered them, not that they might build a great, impressive organization that could exert political influence, and match its outward greatness with the anti-Christ, but that they might, cooperating with one another though scattered, preach the Gospel to many to the salvation of "the few."

Nor did Jesus fail in this, when He sent forth the Twelve the first time, that He spoke most indefinitely to them, so that they knew not their field. "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not," He said. They knew from His Word where they were not to go. And one of the places was Samaria, where the fields were ripe and ready for the harvest. They could pass through Samaria (which they no doubt did as they traveled from Judea to Galilee, and from Galilee to Judea) but they were not to do mission work there. And then He added: "But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." — And Jesus does not fail to speak definite language today. His "do's" and "do not's" are clear. Read Scripture and your call. Truly, His speaking often is not clear enough for our sinful flesh, which hears but hears not, because it does not so desire.

And when the Savior sent out the Seventy He dealt not other-

wise. He sent them two by two before His face into every city and place, whither He Himself would come.

Some upon reading these words might object and argue: You cannot draw all kinds of conclusions, make all manner of deductions, find all sorts of doctrines for us to follow in what Jesus did when He sent forth the Twelve and the Seventy. That indeed is true. But it also is true: "All Scripture is given by the inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Hence there must be doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction for us in the manner in which Jesus sent forth the Twelve and the Seventy, otherwise it would not be in Scripture. Let us find it. And Jesus says: "Follow me." Let us follow Him.

The despicable false apostles at Paul's time did not go out into new fields to conquer. They followed Paul and built on his foundation. What Paul had gathered they attempted to gain for themselves. They were noxious parasites, not missionaries, feasting on what other men had built up with arduous, wearying labors. — Yes, Paul already had parasite trouble. But Paul was no parasite. One thing he never did was to build on another man's foundation, to preach the Gospel where it had already been preached and was being preached by the Lord's preachers. Paul's calling was ever to be first with the Gospel, ever to conquer new fields, not to sneak in and build on a field already worked. "Yea, so have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." Rom. 15, 20. Let us heed the warning in this passage and not become guilty of boasting of things without our measure, that is, of other men's labors made ready to our hand, 2 Cor. 10, 15-16.

Lest this paper never come to an end we shall break off with this point and move on to another, namely, a pastor wrongfully covets the property which is his neighboring pastor's by virtue of his call, when he desires to gain the individual member of the neighboring congregation otherwise than in line with decency and order.

An Onesimus is not to be desired or received. Onesimus came to Paul. His coming, however, was not decent and in order. Paul was in need of a servant. Paul, however, did not

take advantage of the situation. Had he, he would have made himself a thief. Likewise pastors turn into thieves, sin against the Tenth Commandment, when they glad-hand the "begruntled gruntlies" of a neighboring pastor at their church door on Sunday morning, take advantage of an undesirable situation, and with desire gobble them up, only to suffer from stomach cramps later on in many cases.

Who profits if an impenitent soul finds a haven in your visible church? The impenitent soul does not. Your action makes him no saint. You do not profit. You suffer as a thief thereby. And 1 Pet. 4, 15 the Lord says: "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a busybody in other men's matters."

A pastor's work is to call men to repentance, and not merely to build a congregation large; it is the former, even when the pastor is the shepherd of a mission congregation which is as much in need of members as Paul was in need of a servant.

But what about an excommunicated member? First, let it be stated, that no neighboring pastor has an excommunicated member. An excommunicated person is no more a member, a sheep, than a heathen and publican. No pastor can point to an excommunicated member and truthfully say: My member. — What does that mean? Does it signify that such a person is to be sought and received into one's congregation when he applies for membership? Indeed not! Such a person is to be treated as a heathen and publican, when he comes; for Jesus says: "Let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." But just what does that mean? Jesus gives us the answer; His actions over against the heathen and publicans do. How did Jesus treat heathen and publicans? Did He avoid them? He sat down and ate with them; but He did not sin with them, nor support them in their sin in any way. His conduct was never such. And when He sat down with them, He called them to repentance. They were no Christians. He did not treat them as such.

An excommunicated person is no Christian in his impenitence. He is not to be treated as one either, but to be called to repentance as any heathen and publican. He is not to be coveted but converted. He is not to be supported in his sin, but led back to the

sin he committed, the Savior he forsook; he is to be shown his sin in all its damnableness, his Savior in all His grace.

And when it is stated he is to be led back to the sin he committed, that is meant literally. He is to be led back to the very surroundings where he sinned (unless this is impossible), to the Christians who excommunicated him; and this not because of any legalism. Love demands it. And decency and order require it. Love of our brethren should move us to lead the impenitent one back in his penitence, so that the brothers who have been sinned against can rejoice with the angels in heaven. And love of the one who has erred should prompt us to do the same, so that the penitent one can hear from the lips of the very ones who excommunicated him the most comforting words: Son, thy sin is forgiven. What comfort for him to hear them just from those lips.

But what about the "avoid them" of Romans 16? Romans 16 speaks of false teachers, not excommunicated persons. Not Romans 16, but Jesus' action over against heathen and publicans is to be our guide. We should long for, pray for the conversion of an excommunicated person as much as for the conversion of other heathen and publicans. Naturally we must never forget the Lord's Word, however, and make the mistake and cast the pearl before the swine in our dealings. — But an excommunicated person is not classified as a swine off-hand by the Lord. He can be that. Our dealings with him will reveal whether he is or not.

But does what has been said agree with 1 Cor. 5, 11: "With such an one, no, not to eat"? That passage does not speak of false teachers, does it? A study of this passage will reveal that there is no conflict. Paul is speaking of the Agape. The Corinthian Christian should not eat the Agape with an excommunicated person. That all company and contact with excommunicated persons is not Scripturally forbidden verses 9 and 10 of 1 Cor. 5 point out.

In this connection it might be mentioned that it is to be remembered that not until the final step in Matthew 18 has been taken is a person involved in disciplinary action an excommunicated person.

And it no doubt would do no harm to call attention to the fact here that a person who has broken the bond of peace with the Christians in a local congregation has by his act not only

broken the bond of peace with them but has also lost the peace with all Christian brethren on earth. To receive such a person as a brother means denying the brotherhood of those with whom he has broken.

What about the member of the neighboring pastor who has moved into one's territory?

First, it is ever to be remembered that a neighboring pastor's member in our territory is still his member and as such cannot be treated as mission material. The neighboring pastor is still responsible for the sheep.

Secondly, there is no Scriptural law which says he must become your member; and therefore you have no right to attempt to force him into your congregation. On the other hand, his pastor can find no Scriptural basis to stand on, if all is in order, if he refuses to release said person to you, and seeks by means of force to retain his member. It is the member's Christian liberty to make his own decision. A pastor who deals in such a manner is guilty of coveting a right which belongs to his member by virtue of his Christian liberty.

When a neighboring pastor's member comes into one's territory, it is time to practice not covetousness, but love and wisdom. And love and wisdom is that one ascertains if the one who has moved in belongs to a neighboring pastor; and if so, then to notify the neighboring pastor of the presence of his sheep. Love and wisdom also demand that one show the neighboring pastor's sheep true, sincere friendliness.

If one bears these things in mind and acts accordingly, matters will adjust themselves under normal conditions, take an orderly course; and begging a neighboring pastor's sheep to become a member, or lecturing it into membership will not take place, causing ill will and often the loss of a member one could have and would have received.

Wrongful coveting of a neighboring pastor's property which is his by virtue of his call also takes place when a pastor desires and attempts to serve his neighboring pastor's flock in any other way than in line with love, decency, and order. A neighboring pastor's sick calls are his calls. "Feed the flock of God which is among you." His baptisms are his baptisms, etc. His members

should be hearing his sermons. A neighboring pastor's disciplinary case belongs to him and his congregation. It is not the business of a former pastor, or of a nephew-pastor of a member of the congregation.

But what if a neighboring pastor's member comes to you for advice regarding the internal affairs of the congregation? Surely, then you can give advice without sinning? Perhaps, and perhaps not! Who is the man? Who sent him? It should ever be remembered that no self-appointed agent or committee is a representative of the congregation. To deal with such a man or committee is not in line with decency and order. If a congregation designates a man to contact another pastor for advice, that is different, that is orderly. The right to act for the congregation in representative capacity is not the property of an individual member or a clique, but only his who has been given the right by the congregation.

In concluding this third part of the paper, we wish to call attention to one more bit of wrongful coveting, and that is, that which predecessor and successor can so easily practice. David's son stood at the gate and stole the hearts of his father's subjects. How easy for a predecessor, yet how sinful for him, to stand at the gate of his successor and try to steal the hearts from the successor, to attempt to hinder them from being given to him to whom they belong.

And how easily cannot the successor covet that which is his predecessor's, his honor, respect, and good name in the flock he served. It is well for predecessor and successor to look to Jesus and John the Baptist for guidance. True, the relation of Jesus and John the Baptist was not simply that of predecessor and successor. Yet they serve well as a guide. John the Baptist said of Jesus: "He must increase, I must decrease." That should be the spirit of a predecessor. His desire should be that the successor, the pastor and shepherd of the flock he once served, should grow in the hearts and minds of the sheep. And Jesus said of John the Baptist: "Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: Notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." That was truthful praise. That was

a building up of John's good name. Thus a successor should deal over against his predecessor.

Now there is much more that could be written on this theme: "An Application of the Tenth Commandment to Pastor and Congregation." It could yet be pointed out in detail what coveting of the neighboring pastor's property should be practiced, since there is not only a coveting that is sinful, but also a God-pleasing coveting as 1 Cor. 12, 31 reveals. But we shall conclude this paper rather abruptly with the prayer that the Lord in His grace give us pastors the strength to avoid sinful coveting on the one hand, and on the other the strength to help our neighbor "improve and protect his property and business," "to urge them to stay and do their duty," to act over against a neighboring pastor's member as Paul did over against Onesimus, Philemon's slave. And may God in His grace so lead that this paper will be to those who read it, what it has been to him who prepared it, namely, a blessing. We ask it in the name of Him who kept this and all other commandments perfectly for us, who with His blood also paid for all our sins of omission and commission against this and all other commandments. We ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.

H. H. ECKERT.

MODERN DEVELOPMENTS OF PHILOSOPHY ¹⁾

Fritz Heinemann in his valuable work, *Neue Wege der Philosophie*, Leipzig, 1929, points out that the ancients centered their thought about the cosmos, the scholastics of the middle ages about God, and the philosophers of modern times about man. Whatever the differences in the trends of modern philosophy may be, whether they be those of Realism or Idealism or Materialism, ²⁾ man is the pivot upon which everything turns. From Descartes to Dewey modern philosophy has this characteristic. This means that philosophical speculation has become anti-metaphysical, has done away with antecedent being altogether, and no longer maintains the distinction between the thing-in-itself and the human consciousness. Human consciousness is the alpha and omega of modern philosophy.

Since Kant and his Critique of Pure Reason the method of philosophy has been that of Criticism, *i. e.*, an investigation of the nature and limits of reason and knowledge. In our day it is Dialecticism, which is a child of Criticism. Dialecticism wants to be anti-metaphysical more than Kant had the courage to be, and does not want to recognize any form of antecedent existence. Kant had substituted the notion of the brute facts, *die Materie*

¹⁾ A paper read before the *Professors' Conference* in Watertown, August 4-5, 1947, here published by resolution of the Conference. The paragraph on dialectical materialism and the footnotes have been added.

²⁾ It is not the purpose of this article to evaluate the differences of the various isms of modern philosophy, since it is often only a matter of emphasis whether the view of a modern philosopher is deemed realistic or idealistic or even materialistic. It is also to be noted that the main strands of contemporaneous philosophy: naturalism, idealism, pragmatism, and realism, although they can be unmistakably distinguished from one another, are nevertheless interwoven and interpenetrating. Heinemann even declares in his "Nachwort als Vorrede" (p. XI) that our standpoint must be on the other side of the line of demarcation by which we differentiate between the traditional philosophical systems, in order to be able to detect the inner relationship of modern philosophical developments. It is the purpose of this article to show how modern developments of philosophy center about man, about autonomous man, and how these very developments have influenced theology.

der Erfahrung, for the thing-in-itself. As a limiting notion it led to the idea of infinite regress, to the so-called bad infinite. Again Kant's notion of the transcendental unity of apperception, his categories and pure principles of the understanding, led to the idea of infinite regress, to the bad infinite, back to a blank. A new principle was the need of the hour and Dialecticism supplied this principle. It is the principle of continuity, an evolutionary principle, of which all differentiations of form and matter, of logic and fact are to be mere subdivisions.

But not only the method, also the "knowledge" of the philosopher has undergone a radical change. His "knowledge" is the art of creating a new world and not merely of interpreting the universe. His aim to discover Reality is the *Will to Live*, his *Will to Live* is the *Will for Power*. The modern philosopher is a man of great responsibilities, an educator, a reformer, who evaluates and promotes life, who molds human destiny, who makes man recognize and exert himself as the master of his own fate. How should it be otherwise? Man only understands that which he creates and forms. Consequently the philosopher's knowledge must always be an applied knowledge, his philosophy a practice, a way of life. Theory and practice must finally merge into the one central category of *Operari, Schaffen*, Creating. This definition of a philosopher does not only hold when speaking of Marx and Nietzsche, but also when studying James and Dewey. We shall not only meet with autonomous man, but also with the autonomous philosopher, as we now begin with the study of the Philosophy of Life, continue with the Existential Philosophy of Kierkegaard and his successors, and close with the Pragmatism of James and Dewey.

I

Lebensphilosophie or *Philosophy of Life* wants to answer the question: What is life? This question had already been asked by Friedrich Schlegel, 1827, in 15 lectures under the caption "Philosophie des Lebens." Again, in 1920 the Heidelberg professor Heinrich Rickert wrote his book, "Die Philosophie des Lebens, Darstellung und Kritik der philosophischen Modestromungen unserer Zeit." The *Lebensphilosophen* agree in this that

the question regarding the very essence of life must first be asked and answered before the quest for knowledge and ethics and God can at all begin. In short, the philosophers of life are seeking a definition for culture. How can that life as seen by the biologist develop into a highly cultured life as viewed by the philosopher. The exponents of the *Lebensphilosophie* know that science, in this instance biology, cannot fix the meaning of the word "life." "Life includes the mystery of man and the universal mystery," Kroner tells us in his book "The Primacy of Faith," 1943 (p. 155). And Heinrich Rickert in the above mentioned work emphasizes the fact that mere life is not the highest of gifts, "das blosse Leben ist der Gueter hoechstes nicht." In other words: *vitalism*, which holds that living organisms are something more than automata and that there is a vital principle which exercises control of them, is not able to evaluate life for us. The question as to the *essence* of life must be followed up by the question as to the *value* of life.

Now science by virtue of the intellect is no more able to give us an evaluation of life than it is to give us a definition of life. Consequently Henri Bergson in his work "Creative Evolution," 1911, affirms the primacy of intuition over against the intellect as the faculty by which we learn to realize the nature of reality, *i. e.*, of experience, for experience is reality. Certainly, Bergson in speaking of intuition thinks only of the intuition of evolution. Therefore this faculty is more akin to instinct than to intellect and may be defined as instinct guided and informed by intelligence. By means of it we may attend to the pulse of life within ourselves and sense the flow of our consciousness, realizing that this is but a part of the same dynamic stream that constitutes the universe itself. The flow of our consciousness is the reality of which we are fully aware. In this universe of all embracing flux modern spirit finds one of the most congenial homes.

Bergson's philosophy is merely traditional mysticism expressed in novel language and flavored by modern science. Still the great feat which Bergson accomplished as a mystic was to combine mysticism with a belief in the reality of time and progress. Bergson is not a mystic of the old school who takes to contemplation, but one who believes in activity and "life," who places implicit faith in the reality of progress. Progress, emotion, growth are

the watchwords of his philosophy. Time, for instance, is not a series of separate moments — to this he gives the name of space — but a continuous growth which is always genuinely new, in consequence of which the earth is always growing fuller and richer due to the *élan vital*, this original life force that has passed from one generation to another.

Again it is not surprising that the interest of these *Lebensphilosophen* is centered not so much in the mathematical science as in the so-called *Geisteswissenschaften*, especially in the study of history. And on the strength of Bergson's definition of time history can be but a continuous flux of events without being governed by the principle of cause and effect. Since Hume and Kant have shown that the principle of cause and effect is not an essential part of the historical events, but has its origin in the mind of man or in his intellect, the application of this principle to these events is a questionable venture. We will do well to let Goethe remind us of this with these words:

"Mein Freund, die Zeiten der Vergangenheit
Sind uns ein Buch mit sieben Siegeln.
Was ihr den Geist der Zeiten heisst,
Das ist im Grund der Herren eigner Geist,
In dem die Zeiten sich bespiegeln."

In order, therefore, to find the truth we must not depend solely upon the faculty of the intellect, of abstract thinking, which can only set the stage for us. We must have the vision of an artist, the capacity to see things in such a manner that they reveal themselves to us and that we do not have to define them for ourselves and for others. Of course, one who has this vision does not distinguish between good and evil, between true and false, but simply perceives and apprehends phenomena as contemplated and visualized by himself. While the moralist only loves himself, the *Lebensphilosoph*, from his esthetical view-point learns to love the things he sees and to agree with Goethe: "Man lernt nichts kennen, als was man liebt, und je tiefer und vollstaendiger die Kenntnis werden soll, desto staerker, kraeftiger und lebendiger muss die Liebe, ja die Leidenschaft sein." As Goethe visualized a morphology of plants, thus Spengler visualizes a morphology of cultures in his *Untergang des Abendlandes*, 1918/22. In

Spengler's view of things one culture is not the cause of another culture. Every culture, the Greek, the Roman, the medieval, the modern, is an organism which has taken root in its own realm and which has its own legitimate structure. Therefore Spengler speaks of the "antike apollinische, arabisch-magische, abendlaendisch-faustische Kultur." In order to study and to understand these different cultures one must follow in the footsteps of Graf Keyserling in his "*Reisetagebuch eines Philosophen*," 1919, in which he seeks to feel his way into the cultures of India, China, and America. The same aim is pursued by the followers of Stefan George (b. 1868), in their monumental works on Shakespeare and Goethe, on Caesar and Napoleon, on Plato and Augustine and others. Here we find not only the quest for truth but the reanimation of the great men of history whose actual lives must not be sought merely in their biography, but in their *mythos*. Rosenberg in his *Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts* wanted to set forth the essence of German history and culture by means of his *Rassenmythos*. He also spoke of the *Mythos des Bodens, der Gemeinschaft und des Fuehrertums*. The *mythos* originates in life, in the depths of human existence, and of the world, and at the same time reveals to us the ultimate meaning of life. It is the last word on life, it "always closes," as Nietzsche says, "the horizon of a culture."

It goes without saying that the philosophers of life lay great stress on religion, although Idealism had separated morality and religion from one another, as Wundt informs us in his readable little book, "Die Nationen und ihre Philosophie," 1915. Still Friedrich Schlegel had already written: "Mit der Religion, lieber Freund, ist es uns keineswegs Scherz, sondern der bitterste Ernst, dass es an der Zeit ist, eine zu stiften. Das ist der Zweck aller Zwecke und der Mittelpunkt. Ja, ich sehe die groesste Geburt der neuen Zeit schon ans Licht treten." As Schlegel and Novalis looked upon genuine Christianity as a religion of the future, thus Graf Keyserling says: "Die wahre Stunde von Christus und Buddha kommt erst, kann erst kommen, wenn der Sinn ihrer Lehren ganz verstanden sein wird und dieser sich deshalb ungehemmt wird auswirken koennen." The *Lebensphilosophen* are waiting as Walter Rathenau, assassinated 25 years ago, waited

for the dawn of coming things, "die Morgenroete kommender Dinge," all of these *Lebensphilosophen* being more or less of an eschatological frame of mind, all expecting a great miracle to happen, namely the rebirth of man. The machine-age had robbed man of his soul. Now the soul endeavors to retrieve this loss in its desire to gain possession of man again. We must, of course, prepare ourselves for such a rebirth, must penetrate into the nature of man, of the world, and of God himself. Albert Schweitzer is looked upon as an outstanding example of one who under the influence of the spirit of this *Lebensphilosophie* left the professor's chair to minister as physician to the helpless natives of Africa. Activism, which is but a theoretical topic of discussion for others, has been practiced by him and has had a greater influence on his contemporaries than all the writings of the *Lebensphilosophen*. Schweitzer himself in his book, "Das religioese Deutschland der Gegenwart," 1928, quotes the philosopher Jacobi: "Man kann ein Held keiner Art werden, wenn man nicht ein Held im Glauben ist" (p. 333). The longing for such a faith has found a stirring and portentous expression in Rolf Lauckner's play "Wahnschaffe," written after World War I:

Das edelste ist uns doch der Glaube.
 Mit ihm liegt unser Menschentum im Tod! — —
 Hat damals Wissenschaft den Gott entthront,
 Jetzt zweifelt Gott in uns an den Gelehrten! —
 Wir brauchen einen neuen, starken Glauben,
 Sonst fressen wir uns an wie wilde Tiere! . . .
 Wir brauchen Glauben um der Liebe willen!
 Der Himmel schweigt, so soll die Erde klingen!
 Aus allen Tiefen quellend muss ein Wind
 Aufsteigen, der die halberstickten Seelen
 Erloest, entkohlt, enteignet und entrechtet,
 Der Not des Bruders aufbricht, Hilfe lehrt,
 Und ueber Rassenbann und Staatenenge
 Und Herr und Knecht und arm und reich die Zeit
 Mit Hoffnung wieder fuellt und Wundertaten!
 Die Koepfe wurden voll, die Herzen leer! —

As experience wrought by our consciousness is self-sufficient and constitutes "the very stuff of reality," thus faith, "justifiable faith," is that which satisfies the total personality. And God, the true God, is the God of consciousness and of experience. There-

fore the faith of the philosophers of life is a belief in a god who is in the making. Ever and again we hear modern philosophers, be they idealists or realists, speak of God as in the making, even as all things are in the making. And as there is no end to the making of things, thus there is no end to the making of God. God is inexhaustible activity and limitless freedom. In Bergson's philosophy God is the central, animating point from which the *élan vital* radiates in ever widening circles of experience and energy and vitality. From God experience surges outward and ever outward, creating life and focusing itself a myriad times over in individual human consciousness. It is the god of evolution whom we meet with here and whom the Neo-Realist, Samuel Alexander, represents to us in his work "Space, Time and Deity," London, 1927, "as the everlasting upward thrust of the Real by means of emergent evolution to a higher level. The world in its infinity tends towards infinite deity. God does not exist, since to say that he exists would be to say that Reality has already risen to its utmost heights. God is in the making." It is surprising, however, to hear this Neo-Realist also speaking of religious emotion in which we have the direct experience of something higher than ourselves which we call God, which is not presented through the ways of sense but through this emotion. The emotion is our going out or endeavor or striving towards this object. Philosophic speculation has "the modester task of inquiring," Alexander tells us, "what conception of God is required, if we think of the universe as Space-Time, engendering within itself in the course of time the series of empirical qualities of which deity is one next ahead of the mind." The answer is: "God is the whole world as possessing the quality of deity. . . . As an actual existent, God is the infinite world with its *nisus* towards deity, or, to adapt a phrase of Leibniz, as big or in travail with deity" (II, 351f.). We are also being warned by Santayana (b: 1863) that the images of our religious experience, as for instance goodness as a God, have no real existence, since matter in motion does not give them physical embodiment. They are myths and symbols, not objects and substances. And Bertrand Russell (b. 1872), one of the most eminent and distinguished logicians and mathematicians of the day, frankly states that logic and science are fatal to ordinary

religious belief and that the reality of the sciences leaves no place or reason for entities like immortal souls and gods. But the disappearance of such beings need not leave us without worship. Goodness and beauty "subsist" in all their completeness and all their splendor, even though they nowhere exist concretely except in fragments and broken gleams. And it is of beauty, truth, utility, and goodness as four expressions of the Absolute Spirit, of which Benedetto Croce (b. 1866); the Italian idealist, speaks as of four forms of the Absolute Life interpenetrating one another in such wise that everything that exists has value of some sort. And Santayana emphasizes that the contemplation of them alone is sufficient to satisfy the mind and to bring it peace. Rickert with his transcendental idealism goes a step farther by evaluating them as the only transcendentals of our consciousness. He assigns to philosophy the one task of studying *die Welt der Werte*, the realm of values, and to bring them into a relationship to the realm of realities, *der Welt der Wirklichkeiten*. In short, philosophy must fix the absolute values of culture. "Philosophie sei nicht Leben, sondern Denken ueber das Leben."

The phenomenological movement, one of the most recent trends of modern philosophy, has laid the greatest emphasis on the values of culture. Max Scheler, one of the leading exponents of this movement, has given us his interpretation of the "value qualities of being," of emotional experience in his many writings dating from 1900 to 1933. In these he argues that the emotional experience, such as love and hatred, is the key for the disclosure of being. The emotions are not simply an activity of the subject but rather the reaction of the object itself. The emotions disclose the world to us, while the phenomena, as objects referred to and intended by consciousness, are to be classified as so many manifestations. Heinemann compares Scheler's idea of the phenomena with that of Augustine's idea of revelation and asserts that "auf geradezu wunderbare Weise sich der Begriff des Phaenomens mit dem augustinischen Begriff der Offenbarung verknuepft." Scheler's thesis is that of the emotional *apriori*. It reads: "In letzter Linie ist der Apriorismus des Liebens und Hassens . . . das letzte Fundament alles anderen Apriorismus und damit das gemeinsame Fundament sowohl des apriorischen Seinserkennens als des

apriorischen Willens von Inhalten. In ihm, nicht aber in einem 'Primat', sei es der 'theoretischen', sei es der 'praktischen Vernunft', finden die Sphären der Theorie und der Praxis ihre *letzte* phänomenologische Verknüpfung." Scheler's purpose is to construct an absolute a priori emotional philosophy of morals for the "total personality." In this total personality God is ever growing and the growth of God is as dependent on man as the growth of man is on God. But if we object — and Scheler states in "Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos," 1930, that many have done so — that we cannot reconcile ourselves to the idea of a growing God, we must be reminded of the fact that metaphysics is no life-insurance agency for frail persons who are in need of support. Only in the course of man's development and growing self-knowledge will the individual grow conscious of his cooperation with the deity. Prayer and child-like trust must be replaced by elementary activity of the total personality whereby it identifies itself with the deity.

II

The Philosophy of Life with its emphasis on the total personality naturally leads us to the *Philosophy of Individualism* as we find it sponsored by Kierkegaard (1813-1855) and his successors, Heidegger (b. 1889) and Jaspers (b. 1883). The *Individual* of these philosophers is to be inclusive of all reality and existence. As Hegel in his concept of *Spirit* sought to include all that Christianity teaches about God and man, thus the *Individual* of existential philosophy is to go Hegel one better and is to include not only the God-and-man distinction of Christianity, but also the Spirit of Hegel's philosophy. In short, Kierkegaard sought a universal so comprehensive that it is unique because of its all-inclusiveness.

What is the meaning of *Existenz*? Before letting Kierkegaard define it for us, we will do well to note the more general meaning that Heineemann gives this term in designating Feuerbach, Marx, and Kierkegaard as the three exponents of existential philosophy. His definition reads as follows: "Dieses Leben, das in sich geformt und gestaltet ist, das ueberdies seine Formungs- und Gestaltungsprinzipien in sich enthaelt und sich dessen bewusst ist, nennen wir Existenz" (p. 373). It should not take us by sur-

prise that Heinemann places two extreme materialists next to Kierkegaard. All three were greatly indebted to Hegel for much of their philosophy, all three used the dialectical laws of Hegel to apply them to the respective realms of their philosophy, all three were one in combating the abstract, speculative, systematical, and purely objective thinking of the Idealists and in prying loose everything purely intellectual from their concept of life. Feuerbach (1804-1872), who sought to resolve the opposition of spiritualism and materialism, regarded Nature as the sum total of all sentient forces. Marx (1818-1883), who substituted social for supernatural values, accepted the teaching of Hegel that Reality is a process and moves according to the "dialectical" law of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. Consequently everything that possesses any sort of reality has the character of a changing unity, is in process of self-transformation, since it is made up of opposing factors. Applying these general principles of dialectics to human society, Marx traced the interconnected forces of social evolution to their base and their superstructure. He saw growing out of their base a social superstructure of laws, governments, arts, sciences, religions, philosophies, and the like. Every transformation of these forms of society is preceded by conflict and even passes on into an acute stage of revolution, as in the case of the class struggle of the proletariat. The human mind, although produced by Nature, is nevertheless an active and causal force in this whole social process. It copes with the past to overcome it, with the future to conquer it. The creation of a cosmos newly created by the mind of man is the aim of dialectical materialism. It is for this reason that Mead in his *Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century* terms the philosophy of Marx "idealism." "I call it 'idealism,'" he tells us, and adds: "The philosophy, of course, is ordinarily termed 'materialism'. It makes the industrial process essential in the community. But the movement is fundamentally an idealistic movement, for it is one that has looked toward the reorganization of society, toward a reorganization lying in the future. Such a movement is exactly what we term idealistic, and this movement certainly was of that sort. It is one of the outgrowths of the Hegelian movement which we ought to recognize particularly" (p. 228). This goes to show that

the conventional use of philosophical terms, such as materialism and idealism, does not always suffice to portray adequately the nature of a development of modern philosophy. Therefore new terms have to be coined and "Existenz" is one of them. Philosophizing, as carried on by existential philosophers, is nothing less than *Existenzmitteilung*. Now it is quite evident to all of us that Marx has actually communicated an entirely new "existence" to modern man. His influence has been "enormous," to quote Ueberweg in his *Geschichte der Philosophie*, 1923 (IV. p. 229).

But what kind of an "existence" do Kierkegaard and his successors, in applying the dialectical laws of Hegel's philosophy to the *Individual*, want to create for modern man. Certainly, this form of *Existenz* hidden away in the *Individual* cannot be so readily discerned. Kierkegaard himself confesses that *Existenz*, as he himself termed it, is "a difficult category to deal with." The more so, since "when we think existence, we thereby abrogate and destroy it." We cannot, according to Kant, demonstrate anything about the world of reality by means of logic. We cannot demonstrate that a stone exists. We can only demonstrate that some existing thing is a stone. A true principle of individuation, *i. e.*, of fact must be wholly non-rational in character. To say *cogito ergo sum* with the emphasis on *cogito* may raise no further question in our minds. But when emphasizing *sum* we do ask, what is existence. Existential philosophy has taken it upon itself to answer this question.³⁾

Let us begin with the meaning of this word which the average German puts into it in every-day language. In a post-war letter written by a German mother we read: "Mein Sohn hatte eine glaezende Existenz," *i. e.*, he had an excellent profession, in this case as a physician, he had a large practice, a sizable income, and a good standing in the community. Now after the War he has

³⁾ "Existentialism", 1947, by the French existential philosopher Jean Paul Sartre, serves as a practical introduction to Kierkegaard's philosophy, published by the Philosophical Library, Inc., 15th East 40th Street, New York, N. Y. The volumes translated from the Danish by David F. Swenson and Lillian Marvin Swenson and published by the Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, offer the American student an opportunity to read Kierkegaard.

lost it all. While the word *Existenz* as used by this mother, in no wise covers the meaning of *Existenz* as used by Kierkegaard, still the "loss" of one's existence is a necessary premise for a practical approach to the *Existenz* of existential philosophy and is often used by Kierkegaard as such. He himself passed through more than one serious crisis and was therefore in a position to speak in his writings of such a critical stage in the life of an individual which effects every phase of life and brings about a complete disillusionment. Everything which till then had appeared to be very essential for life, "wealth, power and influence," suddenly loses its meaning and value. The individual is thus thrown back upon himself, upon his ego, yet always conscious of his innermost misery and wretchedness as of a "very frail but reasoning reed." Kierkegaard realized that philosophy with its abstract terminology and speculation does not meet such a situation at all. Speculating philosophers had given no thought to such experiences. On the contrary, they had put them aside as one places his walking-stick or his umbrella into some remote corner. Existential thinkers, however, do not only give these experiences their undivided attention but view them *sub specie aeternitatis*. The existential philosopher does not aim to erect an edifice of philosophical speculation, but rather regards all thinking and reasoning as something that determines his very existence, whereby "the roots of life penetrate ever deeper into the fibres of existence." But how can we enter in upon this mode of existence? Certainly not by means of some philosophical speculation. In this connection we understand Kierkegaard when he says: "Es gibt etwas, was sich nicht denken laesst, das Existieren."

Kierkegaard's answer to our question can be found in one word which he often uses in his writings: *Inwardness*. It is the new method of preserving genuine individuality and reality. Kierkegaard warns us not to identify the category of *Inwardness* with philosophical immediacy and with the internal movements of the empirical ego. He loathes the "easily perspiring individual" as much as the "shrieking superlatives of a southern people." And logical immediacy, as used by Hegel, sweeping all individual facts of reality into functions of a syllogism is altogether out of the question for this student of Hegel. Philosophers using these

methods deny, as he expresses himself, the breach between God and man. For only after the breach has taken place can there be any question of a true God-relationship or of perfection. Therefore Kierkegaard demands a concrete rather than an abstract universal. *Inwardness* is such a universal.

It is, of course, a process, a process that is higher than that of understanding based on the old method of abstraction. *Inwardness* is faith *sensu strictissimo*, faith referring to "becoming," even where this becoming bears the stamp of absurdity, as for instance in the birth of Jesus Christ, where God has come into being in time, has been born and has grown up. When proceeding on this basis of *Inwardness* we are not dealing with finished quantities and certitudes, but with the process of becoming. Therefore the true subjective thinker is constantly occupied in striving. He "strives infinitely," Kierkegaard tells us, is constantly in process of becoming. And this, his striving, "is safeguarded by his constantly being just as negative as he is positive. . . . System and finality are pretty much one and the same, so much so that if the system is not finished, there is no system." According to Kierkegaard Lessing was right when he said that if God held eternal striving in His left hand and eternal finished truth in His right, he would choose the left. Therefore Kierkegaard does not recognize a direct revelation of God to man in history, does not recognize a counsel of God which determines and reveals history. History is defined by Kierkegaard as a petrification of true subjectivity. No less is Kierkegaard hostile to the Christian idea of God as a self-sufficient being. In Kierkegaard's philosophy God and his relation to men are included in the Idea of the Individual that stands above both. Everything is contributed by the subject, wherefore the term subjective is often used instead of existential. Existential philosophy has converted the idea of rationality into the idea of growth. Because of this idea of growth the real time of the modern era is the future, of which autonomous man is the ultimate determiner. ⁴⁾

⁴⁾ Cf. Van Til, "The New Modernism", Philadelphia, 1947. Van Til's study does not only give the reader a theological opinion of modern developments in philosophy, as held by an orthodox Reformed theologian, but also aids him to gain a real understanding of the philosophy of Kant, Kierkegaard, Heidegger, a. o.

Edmund Husserl in his *Ideen zu einer reinen Phaenomenologie*, 1913, argues that man has a direct insight into pure possibility. Phenomenology, the knowledge of which is imperative for a better understanding of existential philosophy, is a subjective method of finding existence and takes no pre-judgments for granted, claims to have found the *Urregion*, the Primal Region, "in which all determinate modes of being find their common root." Here the pure consciousness of an individual knower and experiencer is set for a complete and radical understanding freed from naive assumptions, and all that remains is the experiencing being in the stream of pure experiences. According to Husserl the science of pure possibilities must everywhere precede the science of real facts. The knowledge thus obtained may be said to be "prior" knowledge in the same sense in which pure mathematics is prior to applied mathematics. The concepts of metaphysics, such as being, reality, object, etc., are referred back to the rudimentary level of experience from which they first derive their sense. The philosophy made possible therewith is meant to precede all questions of metaphysical interpretation. Idealism and Realism in their current forms are declared to be absurd in principle. Phenomenology representing the philosophy of immediate experience claims to be the foundation of all scholarship in a most important respect. The literature of phenomenology, therefore, includes studies in psychology, psychiatry, logic, philosophy of mathematics, law, social science, philosophy of art, ethics, and philosophy of religion.

Martin Heidegger in his *Sein und Zeit*, 1931, emphasizes that Phenomenology is methodology and has as its maxim: Let's get at the facts. He stresses the idea that in the phenomenal world we do not deal with reality. Nature is only a *Grenzfall des Seins*, or a *Grenzsituation*, only a surface concept. Space and time are not true space and time. To illustrate this Heidegger, preceded by Kierkegaard, explores many unexplored phenomena which ontology has hitherto disregarded. *Angst, Sorge, Verzweiflung, Krankheit und Tod* are explored for their existential significance. *Sorge* or Concern is evaluated by Heidegger as the basis of all being *par excellence*, the very structure of consciousness. *Angst* or Dread is pointedly described as the feeling of

being on the verge of nothing, as such representing an eminently transcendental instrument of knowledge. Death is not the end of anything nor even the end of everything. Death is the simple possibility of reality and again the simple nothingness of reality. "Was im Augenblick verschwindend, jedoch ewig ist, das ist Existenz," Kierkegaard had already said. Death is the "existential Moment," being the point of intersection of time and eternity. In speaking of Concern, Dread, and Death Heidegger raises something universally human to the fundamental principle of being and seeks to give an elementary analysis to the basic constitution of human existence. By doing so he does not only endeavor to show that existential understanding of reality lies beneath all the surface activity of observation and classification, but that reality is man understanding and controlling himself, that reality is purely subjective. "In der Subjektivitaet ist die Wahrheit," Kierkegaard tells us.

In other words the study of existence precedes that of being. We must differentiate, as Heinemann in his *Neue Wege der Philosophie* tells us, between *Personsein* and mere *Sein* of anything, let us say of a stone. Not Nature, as with the Greeks, not God, as with the medieval philosophers, but man himself is to aid us in understanding the *Wesensart* of man. The following quotation from Heinemann may serve as an illustration. I do not venture to quote from Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit*, which would be the logical thing to do. But I have found no passage in this work which would serve as a fitting example to make things clear to us at the first and second reading. It is difficult enough to understand Heinemann when he copes with Heidegger's line of thought. In endeavoring to explain Heidegger's philosophical treatise on the phenomenon "Death," Heinemann has this to say:

"Er (der Tod) wirft den Menschen auf seine eigenste, unbezuegliche, unueberholbare Moeglichkeit zurueck. Das gewisse und in jedem Augenblick realisierbare Sein zum Ende bietet die Moeglichkeit fuer ein existentielles Ganz-sein des Daseins. Und zu diesem auf sich selbst geworfenen Menschen, den nicht der Raum und nicht die Zeit, sondern der Tod vereinzelt, spricht die Unheimlichkeit des In-der-Welt-seins: das Gewissen. In ihm spricht das Dasein zu sich selbst, die verborgene Goettlichkeit des

Daseins ruft sich selbst, ruft den Menschen auf zu seinem eigenen Sein-koennen, zu seinen eigenen Moeglichkeiten, bringt erst das Selbst zu sich selbst. Durch das Rufverstehen wird das eigene *Dasein* in der Unheimlichkeit seiner Vereinzelung erschlossen, es wird aus der Unentschlossenheit als dem Beherrschtsein von der oeffentlichen Meinung, aus dem Verlorensein in das Man aufgerufen zu seiner eigenen existentiellen Moeglichkeit. Dieses Angerufenwerden aus der Ewigkeit ist der letzte Sinn des menschlichen Daseins. Denn durch diesen Gewissensaufruf waehlt sich der Mensch in seinem eigenen Schuldigsein, in seiner existentiellen Bestimmtheit durch das Sein zum Tode. Gewissen, Tod, Schuld sind hier also die eigentlichen Existenzphaenomene" (Heinemann, *Neue Wege der Philosophie*, p. 383). Man, who is thus being called unto himself, his individual-self, to his own existential possibilities, is the autonomous man of existential philosophy.

III

This autonomous man is also to be found in *Pragmatism*, a typical American philosophy, as it has been developed by Wm. James and John Dewey. One writer states that for once American philosophers caught German professors napping when discovering this type of philosophy. While this philosophy is nothing new, being an off-shoot of English Empiricism, its method does represent a reversal of form. The method consists in bringing the pursuit of knowledge into close relationship with the realities of every-day life. It is the philosophy of practicality, a business philosophy which demands results. It has a bread-and-butter view of life which aims at consequences. Its prime criterion is success. The originator of this philosophy, Charles Sanders Peirce (b. 1839), is called the Daniel Boone of Metaphysics. His method has blazed a trail which is that of the pioneer and the adventurer. No dogma is accepted, no tradition is recognized. We must find out the truth for ourselves. What will work for me, whether it is some science or some religion, some idea or some experience, is for me to decide. This is my and your philosophy, and when we hear James and Dewey talking United States to us, we ourselves begin to dream of performing the feats of a Daniel Boone of Metaphysics. But we are warned that to traverse the

forests primeval without a guide and without knowledge of woodcraft and forest lore is a rash undertaking. In short, there is such a thing as a treasure of past experience, as a funded knowledge, whose inheritors we are. We are not to overlook that there is nothing new under the sun, that Peirce traces his original pragmatic ideas back to Kant, who in his *Metaphysics of Morals* establishes a distinction between pragmatic and practical. The latter term, practical, applies to moral laws which Kant regards *a priori*, whereas the former term, pragmatic, applies to the rules of art and technique which are based on experience and are applicable to experience. Therefore Dewey in his *Reconstruction in Philosophy* chooses the word "experience" in place of "world" or "mind" as a term of widest inclusiveness. Pragmatism does not want to be anything else but an exploration of the varieties of human experience, thereby hoping to call philosophy away from its various excursions into blind alleys back to the well-beaten path of actual experience. This exploration cannot be undertaken, however, without a strong faith in human intelligence, the mind of man being an "instrument" of exploration. Intelligence has to find the effective means for achieving an adequate moral and social life. Faith in this intelligence is the *sine qua non*.

This again brings us near to autonomous man, who does not think of adhering to traditional, ethical, and religious absolutes. The basis of Pragmatism is a certain kind of scepticism: "Better risk loss of truth than chance of error" is James' advice. Religion is to be considered only then as true, if it serves our purpose, if it gives us emotional satisfaction. Truth is not something fixed and absolute, it is provisional and man-made. As Samuel Alexander sees nothing else in reality, and even in deity, than an independently functioning space-time continuum, and as Heidegger regards reality as a self-sufficient temporal mass, thus James also speaks of a "continuum of experience," which the mind of man only makes explicit. This continuum he describes as a general confused blur which the mind of man breaks and cuts up into the world of separate objects which we know. Thus the things themselves and the relations between the things are actually given in experience, only that the mind of the perceiver according to his interests and training converts them into concepts

and general ideas. But thus identifying realities and method, the philosophy of Pragmatism endeavors to overcome all dualism and therefore does not differ in essence from the existential philosophy of Heidegger and from the Phenomenology of Scheler. As these philosophies do not recognize any pre-judgments, thus Pragmatism looks away from first things, principles, and categories, and looks towards last things, fruits and consequences and facts. All knowledge is prospective in its results. Not until "all the facts have been bagged," as James puts it, can truth be realized. Therefore Pragmatism does not insist upon antecedent phenomena but upon consequent phenomena, not upon precedents but upon possibilities of action. The very terminology of Pragmatism, as soon as its proponents state the nature of their philosophical speculation, reminds one of the phraseology of existential philosophy. Still more so when we hear James speaking of a universe still "in the making," "in the process of becoming." The future of Heidegger's philosophy may be a more ominous one, while that of James and Dewey puts on the appearance of a future highlighted with success; but the facts of Heidegger's existential philosophy are the same as the facts of Dewey's pragmatism or instrumentalism. In both instances they are, to use the terminology of Dewey, "correlations of existential changes statistically standardized."

In short, autonomous man gives to the future and to the world its intrinsic value, since reason has a creative function. Conceptions and theories are instruments, which, according to Dewey, can serve to constitute future facts in a specific manner. Pragmatism and instrumentalism are synonymous terms and Dewey's philosophy is known by the latter name. He defines instrumentalism as "an attempt to constitute a precise logical theory of concepts, of judgments and inferences in their various forms, by considering primarily how thought functions in the experimental determinations of future consequences" (Twentieth Century Philosophy, p. 463f.). To do justice to this definition let us keep in mind that conception and classification are purely teleological weapons of the mind. Not the origin but the application of a concept becomes the criterion of its value. "The prag-

matist spreads the radical preachment that man proposes and also disposes."

In comparing the foregoing philosophical trends with one another, we find that they all have certain outstanding features in common. All hold to the one unshakable hypothesis that a fact can never be a created fact. Not God, but man's reason must create facts. God as Creator has no place in these systems, and the existence of God still less. God is but a symbol for something that man must strive to reach, knowing that he will never reach it. The other outstanding feature that they have in common is that autonomous reason is never conditioned by God or by anything that God does. Even Kant by means of his categories was not looking for facts already existent. He was looking for raw material which can join with the categories in the formation of facts. Only that which has been categorized by ourselves has significant reality for us. Eddington in his *Philosophy of Physical Science*, 1939, distinguishes between an objective kingdom of fishes and fishes that have scientific standing. The former must somehow exist so as to make the latter possible. The latter consist of such as have been caught in the net of the fisherman. A fish of scientific standing is a fish that meets the requirements of the net. It must be of certain size and it must actually be caught. Eddington says: "What my net can't catch isn't fish." In other words there are according to Eddington and also to Heidegger no brute facts in scientific description. It is only in terms of a *universal* that a fact may be said to be a fact.

But how about the noumenal world, that real world as opposed to the appearance world, how about that objective kingdom of fishes? Did not Kant leave well enough alone by saying that the real world cannot be known? Van Til in his study, "The New Modernism," answers this question by declaring that in Kant's thought the autonomous man virtually claims legislative powers for the noumenal as well as for the phenomenal realm. And then he proceeds to point out that Kant keeps his phenomenal realm safe from the intrusion of God and of antecedent being. But by doing this Kant denies God's creation and providence, relativizes God's revelation, generalizes prophecy and miracle, and ends up

in robbing antecedent and transcendent being of practical importance in any field of man. Autonomous man wants to be a law unto himself. And the Neo-Kantians, who are still more anti-metaphysical in their philosophies, incorporate all antecedent beings into the process of continuity that is higher than abstract logic and higher than things-in-themselves. The logic of Parmenides of old, who maintained that only that is real which the human mind can think consistently, was, to use one of Van Til's telling comparisons, "an old blunderbuss which could shoot in one direction at a time; the critical logic, or, as James called it, the pragmatic rule, is like an automatic revolving machine gun that can say 'yes' in one direction and 'no' in the other, without feeling internal strain." This is also an excellent illustration for Husserl's thesis of what he calls his "transcendental-phenomenological idealism," namely that the old traditional problem, the relation between objects of consciousness and things-in-themselves, is spurious and of no concern anymore to existential philosophy.

These philosophical trends have had an exceedingly great influence on modern theologians and educators. Barth, whose influence has been felt in Germany, England, and America is the champion of Dialectical Theology, of the Theology of Crisis. In his Commentary on Romans and in his "Kirchliche Dogmatik" he tells us of his debt to Kant, Kierkegaard, and Heidegger and argues that man's relationship to God must be dialectical rather than systematical. All logical mediation, all historical connection, and all direct experiences of God are taboo in his theology. We know in a very general way that Barth when speaking of the Word of God does not mean the inspired and inerrant Word of the Scripture; when mentioning Paradise, and Adam and Eve he does not recognize these as historical entities; when referring to Christ's resurrection he does not evaluate it as an event in time, and finally when entering in upon the present-day discussion of the natural knowledge of God he denies its very existence. What is the philosophical background for these denials? We can answer this question best by briefly presenting, according to Van Til, Franz Overbeck's *Urgeschichte*, primal history, to be found

in his *Christentum und Kultur*, Basel, 1919.⁵⁾ Overbeck, a friend of Nietzsche, contrasts primal history with ordinary history. The former is the realm where the individual is confronted with pure contingency, with events that may come to pass and also may not come to pass. Primal history is the realm where the *Individual* can be truly himself, where he functions in pure possibility, where he stands in empty space, where origin and eschatology are truly one. While ordinary history is the realm of relativities and correlativities, primal history is the realm of the absolute in a non-historical or superhistorical dimension. The true man in man is a resident of this realm, like Plato's man a member of an ideal world. Christian theology, according to Overbeck, should therefore not seek an alliance with a history which as a whole tells no intelligible tale and in which nothing is ever finished. It should not seek to make the historical Christ the center of history. Such a theology is called by Overbeck the "Satan of religion." True Christianity deals with primal history, where it can start *de novo*, where it can speak in a dimension that is above the relativities of history. All this is, of course, a direct application of the principles of phenomenology with its *Urregion* to the realm of history.

Now Barth in his *Dogmatik* applies the concept of primal history to revelation, to the incarnation and to the resurrection of Christ. We quote the following from his *Dogmatik*:⁶⁾ "Als urgeschichtliches Ereignis bezeichnen wir die Fleischwerdung des Wortes, die Offenbarung Gottes in Jesus Christus. Unter Urgeschichte verstand Franz Overbeck . . . die hinter den neutestamentlichen Quellen als grosses X sichtbare . . . Entstehungsgeschichte der christlichen Kirche und Verkuendigung. Der Begriff

⁵⁾ Fr. Overbeck, 1837-1905, was professor of New Testament and ancient and medieval church history at Basel. Neve in "A History of Christian Thought", Vol. 2, p. 174, informs us that Overbeck had severed all ties with Christianity and that he spoke merely as a historian expecting "nothing but ein sanftes Verloeschen (peaceful extinction) of the Christian religion."

⁶⁾ We are quoting from the first edition of Barth's *Dogmatics: Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes, Prolegomena zur christlichen Dogmatik*, 1927. In the second edition, entitled "kirchliche Dogmatik" instead of "christliche Dogmatik", Barth wants to rid himself of all entangling alliances with

war fuer Overbeck also ein geschichtswissenschaftlicher Hilfsbegriff. Wir nehmen ihn hier auf als theologischen Begriff zur Bezeichnung des eigentuemlichen Verhaeltnisses von Offenbarung und Geschichte, mit dem wir es in diesem Paragraphen zu tun haben. Offenbarung ist Urgeschichte." But what is the value of history? we ask. "The value of history," Barth answers in his commentary on Romans, translated by Hoskyns, 1933, "lies in the *Krisis* within which all history stands, in the sickness unto death. . . . After this fashion the Genesis narrative is composed. It is a history which hears and speaks; it is filled with contemporary history, with the history of men whose ears and lips have been unsealed by the *Krisis* in which they have been engulfed. . . . Of course, they present non-historical history; but they do so because it is precisely the non-historical factor which forms the veritable substance and quality of all history. Since they themselves start from the non-historical and move towards it, they perceive that all history bears inevitable witness to its non-historical beginning and its non-historical end" (p. 146f.).

As history bears witness to its non-historical beginning and its non-historical end, thus the holy Scriptures only *bear witness* to the revelation of God (p. 344), are an echo of the voice of God. Therefore Barth in his *Dogmatik* has this to say on the Bible: "Es gibt aber auch in der Bibel kein erstarrtes, konserviertes, von Gottes handelnder Person zu abstrahierendes Wort Gottes. Die Bibel ist nicht Gnadenmittel auch *extra usum*, wie die alten Lutheraner meinten. . . . Die Bibel redet als Zeugnis von der Offenbarung und als Norm der fortgehenden kirchlichen Verkuendigung. Die Kraft ihres Redens ist aber die Kraft der Person Gottes. Das Wort Gottes geschieht also auch heute in der Bibel, und, abgesehen von diesem Geschehen, ist sie nicht das Wort

philosophy. Still Van Til warns us not to regard this as a "turning toward orthodoxy." On the contrary, back of Barth's theology, also in this revised edition, lies, according to Van Til, "the assumption of the autonomous man" (p. 221) and "as in the *Dogmatics* so in the *Church Dogmatics*, it is, in effect, by the idea of primal history that Barth does away, on the one hand, with the orthodox ideas of God's eternity and, on the other hand, with the orthodox idea of God's direct revelation in ordinary history" (p. 227).

Gottes, sondern ein Buch wie andere Buecher. Insofern gibt es durchaus kein objektives Wort Gottes oder vielmehr das Objektive ist auch hier das Subjektive, naemlich das Subjektive, die Person Gottes, sofern sie in der Bibel auf den Plan tritt" (p. 63f.). Again it is only in the realm of the subjective, *i. e.*, of primal history that the Triune God speaks to us and here it is that we may hear him when he speaks. No less are we to use this existential method in our study of Christ's birth and of his resurrection. How Barth wants this to be done we cannot endeavor to show here. Van Til shows it in detail in his study, "The New Modernism." His final judgment on the Dogmatics of Barth has great weight. It reads: "This theology is still nothing but an anthropology of autonomous man" (p. 159).

As we meet with autonomous man in existential theology, we are also face to face with him in the existential pedagogy of our day. Heinemann defines the aim of this pedagogy to be, to force a way through all appearances until existence has been reached and to combine this existence with that of Society and of the State. Existential pedagogy is not to be regarded as an information bureau. All mere knowledge, all outward strata, which Heinemann classifies as *Unexistentielles*, are to be discarded, and only that which is related to and associated with the innermost nature, the existence of man, is to be considered. Of course, the instructor must have an adequate realm for such a method. This is none other than the one to which Wilhelm von Humboldt had already called attention: "Was also der Mensch notwendig braucht, ist bloss ein Gegenstand, der die Wechselwirkung seiner Empfaenglichkeit und seiner Selbstaendigkeit moeglich macht. Allein, wenn dieser Gegenstand genuegen soll, sein ganzes Wesen in seiner vollen Staerke und in seiner Einigkeit zu beschaeftigen, so muss er, der Gegenstand, schlechthin die Welt sein, oder doch (denn dieses ist eigentlich allein richtig) als solche betrachtet werden" (p. 407). Into this world man is to be integrated, not only as an intellectual, not only in action, but all of man. "Verknuepfung des Ganzen mit dem Ganzen ist also das leitende Ziel" (*ibid.*).

In our country this existential pedagogy, of which Dewey is the mentor, is called Progressivism. While Heinemann speaks of the *world* as the great realm of this pedagogy, the exponents

of Progressivism prefer to use the term *life*. While Heinemann still speaks of man, autonomous man, Progressivism only speaks of the child, *i. e.*, of the autonomous child. "School is life and children learn what they live as they themselves accept it to live by." This learning by doing is the so-called "project method" of Progressive education. By means of it the child becomes the integrated personality, the *summum bonum* of Progressivism. The parents and teachers are not disciplinarians and directors, they solely are guides. The student, not the teacher, is the leader. As an integrated personality the child is to embody in itself the best of the cultural inheritance, is even to add to this inheritance. The realm, where this inheritance is to be found, is the democratic world. Consequently the child is to accept the democratic obligation to improve the standard of surrounding social life. Education is a process of living and not some kind of preparation for future living. In education the process and the goal are one and the same.⁷⁾ "In the last analysis," James writes, "education consists in the organizing of resources in the human being, of powers of conduct which shall fit him to his social and physical world."

This autonomous child is not only to be found in our public schools, where Progressivism is exerting its influence, it is to be met with in our own homes and schools. Many Lutheran parents are consciously and unconsciously applying the principles of this philosophy of education to their own children. Therefore this philosophy is a vital issue for all of us. The influence of existential philosophy may not yet have made itself felt in the orthodox Lutheran church of America. Still we should heed Van Til's warning in *The New Modernism*, 1947: "Barth's attack on the orthodox Protestant position is, it appears, now more vigorous than ever." And Herman Sasse in his book *Here We Stand*, 1946, asks: "What is the secret of this power over the minds of men which Barth exercises far beyond the limits of the German-speaking world?" (p. 155). Yet our primary question is not: To what extent is Dialectical Theology or even Dialectical

⁷⁾ Cf. "Progressive Education" in the *Encyclopedia of Modern Education* by Rivlin and Schueler, published by the Philosophical Library of New York City, 1943.

Philosophy exerting an influence on the Lutheran Church of America? The primary question is: To what extent are we prepared to repudiate its teachings? This question includes the other question: To what extent are we acquainted with the philosophy which permeates the theology and pedagogy of our day? It will not do to wait till Dialecticism has run its course and is replaced by some other ism. It will not do to leave it to Critical-Realism or to Neo-idealism to counteract the extremes of modern subjective philosophy.⁸⁾ That, in the last analysis, is nothing less than casting out devils by Beelzebub. No, we must know the false doctrine that is lurking in modern philosophy, whether it is that of Realism or Idealism or Materialism, the doctrine of autonomous man or even of super-man: "The Superman is the meaning of the earth. Let your will say: The Superman shall be the meaning of the earth." This *hybris* we can only combat with "the weapons of our warfare that are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds," 2 Corinthians 10, 4.

P. PETERS.

⁸⁾ How strong the trend back to a metaphysical philosophy actually is may be gleaned from a lecture delivered by the 89-year-old Nestor of German science and the last president of the *Kaiser-Wilhelm Gesellschaft zur Foerderung der Wissenschaften*, Dr. Max Planck, world-famous for his theory of *quanta*. In his lecture, which was held in the presence of a large audience in the *Aula* of the University of Goettingen some months ago, Dr. Planck — his death on October 3 has been reported since — contended that the aim of the scientist is to create a new *Weltbild* which cannot be questioned by anyone. The basis for creating such a *Weltbild* is faith in the metaphysical Absolute. While science will never gain final access to the metaphysical realm, still the scientist is subject all his life time to a higher power, which cannot simply be ignored, although it cannot be fathomed. The only possible attitude of the individual is to submit to this higher power. A pure mind and a strong sense of duty is our highest treasure, which cannot be taken from us. (*Die Zeit*, Hamburg, July 3, 1947.) — While this is always yet the language of autonomous man who creates his own *Weltbild* and who has his own faith and pure mind, nevertheless it is also a testimony to the truth of Scripture, Romans 1, 19: "That which may be known of God is manifest in them: for God hath showed it unto them" — unto the scientist and philosopher of our day no less than to the scientist and philosopher of Paul's time.

Additional Bibliography

- 1) Twentieth Century Philosophy, Living Schools of Thought, edited by Dagobert D. Runes, Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. 1947.
 - 2) Deutsche Philosophie im XX. Jahrhundert von Hans Leisegang, Jedermanns Bücherei, Breslau. 1928.
 - 3) History of Philosophy by Weber and Perry, Charles Scribners Sons, Chicago. 1925.
 - 4) History of Philosophy by B. A. G. Fuller, Henry Holt & Co., New York. 1945.
 - 5) A Survey in Philosophy and Religion. Experience, Reason and Faith by Eugene Garrett Burkes, Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York. 1940.
 - 6) The Story of Philosophy, The Lives and Opinions of Greater Philosophers by Will Durant, Garden City Publishing Co., Inc., Garden City, N. Y. 1930.
 - 7) The Development of American Philosophy, A Book of Readings by Mueller & Sears, Houghton Mifflin Co., Chicago. 1940.
 - 8) American Thought, From Puritanism to Pragmatism by Woodbridge Riley, Henry Holt & Co., New York. 1915.
 - 9) The Spirit of Modern Philosophy by Josiah Royce, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York. 1892.
 - 10) Main Currents of Modern Thought by Rud. Eucken, Charles Scribners Sons, Chicago. 1912.
 - 11) An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education by Michael Demishkevich, American Book Company, Chicago. 1935.
 - 12) Philosophy, Education and Certainty by Robert L. Cooke, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids. 1940.
 - 13) The Dictionary of Philosophy edited by Dagobert D. Runes, Philosophical Library, New York. 1942.
-

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Chicago — What Does It Mean? We are speaking, of course, of the Centennial Convention of the Missouri Synod, particularly about the meaning of its resolutions on the question of union with the American Lutheran Church. Much was expected from this convention. Just what did it decide?

On the present status of the negotiations it was resolved:

2. That Synod declare that it is not ready at this time to enter into fellowship with the A. L. C.; and
3. That Synod declare its willingness to continue doctrinal discussion with the A. L. C.

The thought of further negotiations produced the following resolutions:

1. That Synod declare that the 1938 resolutions shall no longer be considered as a basis for the purpose of establishing fellowship with the American Lutheran Church; and
2. That Synod encourage its Committee on Doctrinal Unity to continue discussion on a soundly Scriptural basis, using the Brief Statement and such other documents as are already in existence or as it may be necessary to formulate; and
3. That Synod's Committee on Doctrinal Unity be instructed to make every effort to arrive ultimately at one document which is Scriptural, clear, concise, and unequivocal; and
4. That Synod urge all its members to give thorough and prayerful study to the problems of Lutheran Unity for the purpose of achieving greater clarity in its own midst.

So far the record is clear. But the interpretations of these resolutions vary widely.

We have heard it said that they constitute a sweeping victory for the conservative wing of Missouri, that the 1938 Union Resolutions are annulled, that the ship is back in safe waters. Having attended the convention, this writer is ready to grant that the Conservatives have given a better account of themselves than in many a day. In the matter of setting aside the 1938 Resolutions as a "basis" for further negotiations they gained an important point since this resolution was made a test of strength by the all-out effort of the not-so-conservative group (the word "liberal" is in disfavor) to defeat it. That this effort failed, even after a strenuous debate that carried through several days, is surely a significant success for the Conservatives. But we have grave doubts whether the actual situation between Missouri and the American Lutheran Church has been changed in any great degree.

The *Lutheran Standard* (A. L. C.) is naturally quite cautious in its

analysis of the resolutions. In its issue of August it is "studying" the Missouri decisions on Fellowship. But it nevertheless states that Missouri's action in voting to continue discussions "is being interpreted as significant progress in the direction of Lutheran unity." It even regards the withdrawal of the 1938 Union Resolutions as "significant." Just what it signifies is not said. But it is clear that on the strength of the resolution "to continue discussions" A. L. C. is clinging to the thought that something may still come of its hopes — on its own terms, since Missouri's were expressly rejected by last year's Appleton Convention of the American Lutheran Church. We doubt whether this is what Missouri meant at Chicago.

We wonder, for that matter, to what extent the conservative element in our sister synod will agree to the interpretation given to the action of the convention in an editorial in the *Lutheran Witness* of August 26 which speaks of the "determination not to give the appearance of a Church that changes its doctrinal position from one triennium to the next," and then goes on to say: "Synod gave its final answer to those who found 'doctrinal error' and 'false teaching' in the doctrinal union basis adopted in 1938. No part of that basis was rescinded." If this stands — and we are inclined to think that it will stand — much of what they worked for so manfully at that convention will have been undone. The Conservatives certainly are in no position to rest on their laurels. We suggest that they look back long and earnestly, and ask themselves the key question: Chicago — just what does it mean?

E. REIM.

The Society of St. James. According to a report in a recent issue of *Una Sancta* (Vol. VII, No. 5, p. 16), the Society of St. James was able to hold its first conference in many years on May 20 and 21 at Valparaiso University. Our readers will recall that this Society has set itself the goal of studying the Liturgies of the Church. The general theme of the conference was: "The Eucharist in the Holy Church." The report continues:

"The highlights of the Conference was the Choral 'Eucharist' on May 21 at 9 A. M. in the University Chapel. The 'Celebrant' for this 'demonstration service' was the Superior of the Society; the 'deacon,' the Rev. M. Alfred Bichsel; the 'sub-deacon,' the Rev. Charles P. Feuerstein; the Preacher, Dr. O. P. Kretzmann. The Choir, recruited from the University student body, creditably chanted the Propers for the Feast of the Ascension of Our Lord. The Canon of the Mass that was employed is written in the PENTECOST issue of *Una Sancta*, pages 8 to 10."

We know that the forms of the Liturgy are an adiaphoron. There is nothing in the term "Canon of the Mass" that is wrong in itself. Luther continued to use the expressions after he had purged the mass of its

Roman errors. But we do question the wisdom of reintroducing this term after it has fallen into disuse in our circles. We have even more serious misgivings about the form of service which was used at this demonstration, particularly the introduction of the Elevation of the Host. To be sure, the author of this particular Liturgy explains, "the Elevation is the primitive elevation, not the one resulting from the dogma of transubstantiation." But when we refer to the Liturgy that was used (*Una Sancta*, Vol. VII, No. 4, p. 10) we find that this elevation occurs immediately after the Eucharistic Prayer, but still apart from the distribution, and is accompanied by the words: "Behold the Body and the Blood of your Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God." If this is not language which is in perfect keeping with the dogma of transubstantiation, what is it?

We appreciate highly much of the material which is presented in these two issues of *Una Sancta*. We appreciate particularly the note to this new Liturgy which states that, "the Agnus precedes the Pax because it makes sense that way. Coming after the elevation, the latter furnishes the reason for the Agnus. The petitions of the Agnus are answered in the Pax. The Lord who died for us did not remain in death, but conquered death and greeted his own with 'Peace be unto you.'" But looking back at these other matters we cannot refrain from voicing a vigorous protest against this tendency to reintroduce a terminology and traditions which are reminiscent of Rome.

These matters surely should be subjected to closest scrutiny lest under the cover of old usage we receive old error. Even when it can be argued that such error has been eliminated we should still ask whether it is wise to restore a function which once served as the liturgical expression of false doctrine, and with which this same error is still so closely associated in the Roman church. We may have the right, but is it wise to exercise it? "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not." (1 Cor. 10: 23.)

E. REIM.

Increase in Lutheran Church-Membership. The Lutheran churches of the United States and Canada gained 150,966 members in 1946 to bring their total membership to 5,672,662, an increase of 2.5 per cent over 1945, a Religious News Service Release informs us. These figures represent an increase of confirmed membership by 63,464 persons to a total of 3,941,121, a gain of 1.6 per cent. Distributed among the 16,241 local congregations, this would indicate an average accession of 3.9 adult members per church during the past year, while baptized membership rose an average of 9.4 per congregation. The highest numerical increase was reported by the Missouri Synod, which had a gain of 47,541 baptized members, an

increase of 3.2 per cent. The greatest advance on a percentage basis is reported by the Evangelical Lutheran Church with its 40,736 additions representing 6.1 per cent of the total membership of 700,474. The United Lutheran Church, the largest of the Lutheran bodies, reported an increase of 29,465 members or 1.6 per cent. Over against this increase there is a decrease of 188 ordained Lutheran ministers, their number having dropped to a total of 14,200. A total expenditure of \$116,931,582 during 1946 represents an increase in giving of \$12,684,791 over 1945.

P. PETERS.

Fortsetzung über die kirchliche Lage Deutschlands. In Fortsetzung seines Briefes vom 20. März 1947 bringt Pfarrer i. R. O. Gerß in einem Briefe vom 5. Mai noch folgendes über die kirchliche Lage Deutschlands:

3.

„Vor mir liegt eine maßgebende programmatifche Äußerung des ‚Präsidenten der Evangelifchen Kirchenkanzlei‘ Hans Asmuffen, des einflußreichften Theologen und Kirchenführers der Landeskirchen heute nächst Karl Barth. Sie ift unter anderem unter dem Titel: ‚Wohin führt der Weg der evangelifchen Kirche‘ abgedruckt im Braunschweigifchen Volksblatt vom 16. März 1947. Das Volksblatt gibt diesen Artikel als Antwort auf viele Fragen von Lesern nach dem Weg, den die Landeskirche jetzt gehen will, als maßgebende Antwort ‚aus berufener Munde‘. Asmuffen fagt darin zusammenfassend über Weg und Ziel der Ev. Volkskirche: ‚Wir wünfchen und erstreben in der Tat einen Einfluß auf das gefamte öffentliche Leben, und zwar ohne jede Hilfe des Staates.‘ Ich habe also mit Recht auf Seite 2 meines vorigen Briefes als die entscheidende Richtung gebende Triebfeder des landeskirchlichen Handelns das Streben nach Macht im öffentlichen und politischen Leben genannt. Fügt Asmuffen freilich hinzu: ‚ohne jede Hilfe des Staates‘, fo habe ich unter 1) des vorigen Briefes nachgewiesen, daß das Gegenteil der Fall ift. Die Landeskirchen brauchen und wollen durchaus die Hilfe des Staates bei ihrem Machtstreben. Asmuffen hätte schreiben müssen: ohne jede Beeinfluffung durch den Staat, in völliger äußerer Freiheit von ihm, ja in Beherrschung des Staates.

„Indem Asmuffen Aufgabe und Ziel der Ev. Landeskirche fo formuliert, wie er es tut, und zwar zusammenfassend, ohne etwas anderes etwa noch hinzuzufügen, hat er die eigentliche geiftliche Aufgabe der Kirche, die Menschen durchs Evangelium aus Sünde, Gericht und Tod zum ewigen Leben, zur Seligkeit zu führen, abgelehnt und verworfen.

„Alle Kraft der Landeskirchen, alle ihre Tätigkeit foll vielmehr auf Erringung der politischen und öffentlichen Macht gerichtet fein. Das Fragen und Trachten nach der Seligkeit, nach der Gnade Gottes, würde eine Ablenkung von dem eigentlichen Ziel Asmuffens bedeuten und muß deshalb möglicht zurückgedrängt werden.

„Dazu eine merkwürdige und kennzeichnende Aeußerung Asmuffens aus diesem seinem programmatischen Artikel: ‚Ich glaube,‘ schreibt er, ‚daß die Zahl wirklicher Christen in Deutschland so groß ist wie selten in der Geschichte.‘ Er stimmt ferner einem Wort von John Mott zu, daß ‚die guten und großen Tage vor uns liegen, weil die Zahl der wahren und echten Christen heute (in der ganzen Welt) größer ist, denn je zuvor.‘

„Nachdem wir Jahre hindurch von Asmuffen und allen seinen Freunden nichts anders gehört haben, als daß Deutschland das gottloseste Land der ganzen Welt ist, das deshalb von Gottes Zorn besonders getroffen werden müßte, muß diese Aeußerung Asmuffens überraschen, zumal von allen Kennern des kirchlichen Lebens in Deutschland geurteilt wird, daß auch in den letzten Jahren von einer wirklichen Glaubensbewegung in Deutschland nichts zu merken ist. Nur im Zusammenhang der ganzen Aeußerungen Asmuffens wird jene Aeußerung über die große Zahl wirklicher Christen in Deutschland verständlich. Wahre und echte Christen sind ihm eben alle diejenigen, die mit Eifer die Erringung der politischen Macht durch die Kirche erstreben. Und da wird es stimmen: von dieser Sorte ‚Christen‘ sind in den evangelischen Landeskirchen heute so viele da, wie noch nie in ihrer Geschichte. Daher denn auch die ‚guten und großen Tage‘, die wir denn ja alle heute so reichlich genießen können in Deutschland.

4.

Die Landeskirche und die Union.

„Es gab nicht wenige, die gehofft hatten, daß, wenn der Druck und Einfluß des preußischen Staates auf die Kirche aufhören würde, dann auch die Preussische Unionskirche wie von selbst sich in Konfessionskirchen auflösen würde. Diese Hoffnung freilich zeugte von einer ganz erstaunlichen Unkenntnis des kirchlichen Lebens in Deutschland. Heute gibt es keinen preußischen Staat mehr. Und doch besteht die Preussische Unionskirche weiter. Ja die Union von lutherischer und reformierter Kirche und von beiden Kirchentümern mit dem Religionswesen des liberalen Idealismus ist so durchdringend und umfassend, wie nie zuvor. Diese Union beruhte ja nur zum allergeringsten Teil auf dem Druck des preußischen Staates. Sie beruhte vielmehr von jeher und besonders heute auf dem freien Willen und Neigung der großen Mehrzahl der Pfarrer und des Kirchenvolks der Landeskirchen. Sie wollten ja alle Union und wollen sie heute erst recht. Asmuffen hat ganz Recht, wenn er sagt: Die breite Masse des Kirchenvolks hat den Willen zur Einheit der Landeskirchen. Ihre Zusammenfassung zu der einen Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland, wie sie heute erfolgt ist, entspricht sicherlich dem Willen der großen Masse des Kirchenvolks der Landeskirchen, besonders aber dem Willen aller theologischen und kirchlichen Führer. Es wird nicht einer unter diesen sein, der wirklich im Ernst eine Loslösung etwa der lutherischen Landeskirchen von der einen EKd erstrebte. Eine solche Loslösung erhoffen, hieße sich ganz haltlosen Illusionen hingeben und die kirchliche Lage in Deutschland völlig verkennen. Der maßgebende Wille zur Macht der Kirche im öffentlichen

und politischen Leben verlangt selbstverständlich die Einheit und Einigung aller Landeskirchen. Er verlangt weiter die unbedingte Erhaltung der Volkskirche, der das ganze Volk umfassenden Kirche, ohne Rücksicht auf die Verschiedenheit in Lehre und Glauben, ohne Rücksicht darauf, ob die Kirchenglieder gläubig oder ungläubig, christlich oder antichristlich sind.

„Damit ist gegeben, daß die ‚Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland‘ eine unierte Kirche sein muß, eine Kirche, in der die lutherische und die calvinische Lehre, dazu auch die Lehre des theologischen Liberalismus, der neumethodistischen Allianzbewegung und was sonst von religiösen Ansichten im Raum der Landeskirche findet, gleichberechtigt sind. Damit kommt aber nur eine Entwicklung zwangsläufig zur Vollendung, die seit Jahrzehnten im Gange war. Alle Volkskirchen in Deutschland waren de facto schon bisher unierte, nicht nur in der Art der Preussischen Union von 1817, sondern in einer viel weitergehenden und tiefergehenden Art der tatsächlichen kirchlichen Gleichberechtigung aller Richtungen. Auch die Bekennende Kirche hat diese Union durchaus praktiziert und anerkannt, ja ihr recht eigentlich zu vollem Siege verholfen, indem sie bei ihrem Kirchenkampf auch die schlimmsten Leugner und Fälscher der biblischen Wahrheit als Brüder anerkannt und jede Unterscheidung von ihnen, erst recht jeden Kampf gegen sie vermieden hat. Für die heutige Leitung der EKd ist die Erhaltung der Volkskirche und die Erhaltung und Herstellung der Einheit der die Landeskirchen in sich zusammenfassenden Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland eine Selbstverständlichkeit. Eine solche Kirche ist natürlich eine unierte, auch wenn das Wort Union vermieden wird. Der Unionscharakter der EKd wird noch besonders unterstrichen durch die Barmer Thesen vom 31. 5. 34, die von der EKd zur verbindlichen Auslegung der reformatorischen Bekenntnisse erklärt und so zum entscheidenden Oberbekenntnis der EKd gemacht sind. Sie wollen damit lutherisches und calvinisches Bekenntnis miteinander vereinigen, sind ein Unionsbekenntnis. Alle Landeskirchen, auch die lutherischen alle, haben dies Bekenntnis angenommen und haben sich in diese Union hineinbegeben.

„Eine Selbstverständlichkeit ist auch für die EKd und für alle in ihr zusammengeschlossenen Landeskirchen die Gemeinschaft und organisatorische Eingliederung in die ökumenische Bewegung, in die Organisation dieser Bewegung und ihre Arbeit, in der 90 in Lehre und Glauben verschiedene, ja einander darin widersprechende Kirchen zu einer angeblich christlichen Brudergemeinschaft, zu einem Weltkirchenbabel, mit wesentlich politischen Zielen zusammengeschlossen sind.

„Was kann es angehts der genannten Tatsachen nun noch bedeuten, wenn die lutherischen Landeskirchen in der Ev. Kirche in Deutschland sich noch zu einer besonderen lutherischen Gemeinschaft auf irgend eine Art zusammenschließen wollen? Verhandlungen in dieser Richtung sind im Gange. Sie werden auch von uns nicht abgelehnt, sondern sollen ‚erst genommen und durchgeführt werden‘. Selbstverständlich aber bleibt für ihn und für alle maßgebenden Kirchenführer der Landeskirchen, daß durch einen solchen lutherischen Zusammenschluß die Einheit der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutsch-

Land nicht gefährdet werden darf, daß die Barmer Thesen als Oberbekenntnis auch für die lutherischen Kirchen zu gelten haben, worin diese schon gewilligt haben, daß die Eingliederung in das ökumenische Kirchenbabel für alle Landeskirchen bestehen bleibt, daß alle in einer allgemeinen kirchlichen Arbeitsgemeinschaft und in einer christlichen Brüdergemeinschaft verbunden bleiben, die sich dann natürlich auch in Abendmahlsgemeinschaft darstellen wird und muß. Wer kann denn überhaupt noch ein Verständnis dafür aufbringen, daß ein Bahrer und ein Westfale nicht gemeinsam zum Abendmahl gehen sollen? fragt Msmussen.

„Er rührt übrigens mit dieser Frage geschickt und richtig an eine Hauptschwierigkeit einer besonderen kirchlichen Verbindung der dem Namen nach lutherischen Landeskirchen auf Grund des lutherischen Bekenntnisses in Unterscheidung von den unierten Landeskirchen. Wodurch unterscheiden sie sich denn heute noch voneinander? Msmussen hat ganz recht: nicht durch das, was das Wesen der Kirche ausmacht, nicht im Glaubensstand ihrer Glieder, nicht in der Lehre des Evangeliums, das in ihnen gepredigt wird, sondern lediglich in ihrer Zugehörigkeit zu einem besonderen Land und Staat: die eine Kirche ist bairisch, die andere westfälisch. Und nun sollen lutherische Christen nicht miteinander kirchliche und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft haben, bloß weil der eine in Bayern, der andere in Westfalen wohnt?

Gewiß wird heute in dem ‚lutherischen‘ Bayern oder Hannover mehr reines Evangelium gepredigt und werden mehr rechte lutherische Christen sein, als in der unierten Provinz Sachsen oder dem unierten Baden. Aber in dem ‚unierten‘ Westfalen oder Pommern oder Ostpreußen ist gewiß mehr reines Evangelium gepredigt und sind mehr lutherische Christen vorhanden, als in dem ‚lutherischen‘ Mecklenburg oder Thüringen oder Hamburg oder Holstein. Und nun beachte man doch, wie sich seit Jahrzehnten schon die Christen und Kirchenglieder aus unierten und lutherischen Kirchen auf ihren Binnenwanderungen durcheinandergeschoben haben, wie religiöse antilutherische Bewegungen wie die neumethodistische Allianzbewegung oder die ökumenische Bewegung sich an keine Landes- und Staatsgrenzen gekehrt, sondern dem Namen nach lutherische Landeskirchen genau so überflutet haben wie die unierten, man beachte doch weiter, wie heute Millionen von Kirchengliedern der unierten Preussischen Kirche sich unterschiedslos in unierte und lutherische Landeskirchen ergossen haben und Tausende von Pfarrern dergleichen, — entspricht es da wirklich noch den elementarsten Wahrheitsbegriffen, wenn man den Bekenntnischarakter einer Kirche in Deutschland lediglich nach ihrer Zugehörigkeit zu einem bestimmten Land und Staat und dem daher stammenden Namen dieser Kirche bestimmen will? Es ist ganz richtig: Wer das tut und von da aus kirchliche Sammlung und Scheidung treiben will, der baut auf Sand, der wird heute und in Zukunft mit Recht kein Verständnis bei wirklichen Christen finden, weil er an der Wirklichkeit der Kirche vorbeigeht und mit leeren Hülfen und Begriffen und Namen spielt. Wir leben nicht mehr im 16. oder 17. Jahrhundert. Es gibt kein: cuius regio, illius religio mehr. Wir sollten um der Wahrheit

wissen denn auch nicht so reden und tun, als ob es das noch gibt. Die nominell lutherischen Landeskirchen in Deutschland sind keine lutherischen Bekenntniskirchen mehr und können es auch als solche nie mehr werden. Kein Bischof und kein Kirchenregiment und kein Synodalbeschluss kann heute, auch den besten Willen vorausgesetzt, eine Landeskirche zu einer wirklich lutherischen Bekenntniskirche machen. Jede Volks- und Landeskirche in Deutschland muß und wird heute Unionskirche im weitesten Sinn des Wortes sein. Wir müssen deshalb die Zumutung, an diesen Tatsachen vorbeizusehen und kirchliche lutherische Sammlung durch irgendeine Zusammenfassung nominell lutherischer Landeskirchen zu treiben, durchaus ablehnen. Wir müssen vielmehr die Gefahren eines solchen Zusammenstufes für wirkliches Luthertum und eine wirkliche lutherische Kirche erkennen. Er wird ja gar nicht dazu betrieben, um eine wirkliche lutherische Bekenntnis-
 kirche aufzurichten, sondern sie möglichst zu verhindern. Es spüren ja nicht wenige heute in allen Landeskirchen die Gewissensverpflichtung, in der ungeheuren kirchlichen Verwirrung der Zeit sich um die lutherisch-biblische Wahrheit von neuem zu sammeln in einer rechten lutherischen Bekenntnis-
 kirche. Das ist in den Augen der heutigen kirchlichen Führer, auch der der lutherischen Landeskirchen, eine Gefahr für ihre über alles geliebte Volks-
 kirchen. Es könnten Abpflitterungen erfolgen, Scheidungen eintreten, die der alles umfassenden Volkskirche und ihrem Machttreiben schädlich wären. Um das zu verhindern, bereibt man nun eine Art besonderer Zusammenfassung der nominell lutherischen Landeskirchen innerhalb der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland und sagt nun den lutherisch gesinnten Kirchengliedern: Da habt ihr ja, wonach ihr euch seht, eine besondere selbständige lutherische Bekenntnis-
 kirche. So will man das eigene Gewissen und das Gewissen der lutherischen Kirchenglieder wieder einschläfern mit leerem Schein und leeren Namen, hinter denen, wie jene Kirchenführer selbst sehr gut wissen, keine Wirklichkeit steht und stehen kann. Aber nun hat denn ja die Volkskirche wieder gerettet und die Bildung lutherischer freier Bekenntniskirchen verhin-
 dert, bis die heutige gefährliche Stunde vorüber geht. Darum predigt man denn uns und allen lutherischen Kirchengliedern wieder wie schon so oft in kritischen Stunden des kirchlichen Geschehens: abwarten! Nur abwarten!

„Abwarten! Nur abwarten! Ja abwarten, bis die eine alles umfassende ihrem Wesen nach unierte Volkskirche wieder einmal gefestigt und gerettet ist, und bis die noch in ihm vorhandenen Bestände lutherischen Christentums vom Calvinismus, Liberalismus und Romanismus aufgezehrt sind. Wir müssen diese Zumutung durchaus ablehnen. Die Stunde verlangt von allen, die wirklich beim lutherischen Bekenntnis bleiben wollen, nicht ‚abwarten‘, sondern aktive Sammlung um dies Bekenntnis und Scheidung von den Landeskirchen, die es verleugnet und verfälscht haben.

„Man mahnt uns, nicht zu vergessen, daß in den lutherischen Landes-
 kirchen wohl mehr wirklich lutherische Christen vorhanden sein werden, als die lutherischen Freikirchen in sich umfassen. Es fällt uns aber gar nicht ein, das zu leugnen oder zu vergessen. Wir vergessen auch nicht, daß das auch

für die unierten Kirchen zutrifft. Wir sind vielmehr gewillt, diese biblisch-lutherischen Christen, wo sie auch sein mögen, als solche, als unsere Brüder, anzuerkennen, zumal wenn sie ehrlich für die lutherische Wahrheit eintreten und kämpfen wollen. Wir wollen mit ihnen ernstlicher als bisher Gemeinschaft suchen und sie in ihrem Ringen um die Wahrheit auf alle Weise, die uns möglich ist, unterstützen. Haben wir aber gewissenmäßig erkannt, daß zu solchem Ringen, wenn es ehrlich ist, schließlich die kirchliche Scheidung von den heutigen Landeskirchen gehört, so können wir den lutherischen Brüdern in den Landeskirchen doch nicht den Rat geben, in diesen Landeskirchen zu bleiben. Wir würden damit unserer Scheidung von den Landeskirchen das sittliche Recht entziehen und jene lutherischen Brüder falsche Wege weisen, die doch endlich zu ihrem Untergang führen müßten. Wir dürfen auch nicht, wenn jene Brüder bei ihrem Ringen um das lutherische Bekenntnis zwangsläufig in Gegensatz und Kampf mit ihren Kirchenregimenten und Kirchenführern geraten, die ja alle um der Erhaltung der einen Volkskirche und ihrer öffentlichen Machtstellung willen, das lutherische Bekenntnis verleugnen, nun mit eben diesen Kirchenführern in Verhandlungen treten und versuchen, mit diesen rechte kirchliche Sammlung zu treiben, was doch unmöglich ist. Das hieße den wirklich lutherischen Christen in den Landeskirchen in den Rücken fallen und ihren Kampf lähmen und unmöglich machen.

„Nein, wir haben mit jenen lutherischen Brüdern in den Landeskirchen Gemeinschaft zu sehen und zu pflegen, um ihnen zur Befreiung von den Fesseln des Landeskirchentums mitzuhelfen, in denen sie mit ihrem Bekenntnis sonst müssen zu Grunde gehen. Wir haben dabei wohl alle Bescheidenheit, Geduld und Liebe zu beweisen, aber auch alle Entschiedenheit im Bekenntnis der Wahrheit. Nur so wird eine wirklich lutherische Bekenntnis-kirche in Deutschland erhalten, von neuem gesammelt und gemehrt werden.“

In einem Briefe vom 28. Juni versichert uns Pastor Gerß, daß er, trotz seiner geringen Arbeitskraft und trotz großer Inanspruchnahme durch ein ihm übertragenes Referat und durch die Korrespondenz mit früheren Gemeindegliedern, den letzten Abschnitt seines Berichtes bald schicken wird. Dieser Abschnitt wird die Stellung der heutigen evangelischen Landeskirchen zur römischen Kirche und zur heutigen nihilistischen Zerstückelung des natürlich-sittlichen Lebens enthalten. Der Verfasser weist darauf hin, daß dieser Abschnitt besonders wichtig und die darin beschriebene Stellungnahme für die evangelische Landeskirchen heute charakteristisch ist.

P. Peters.

Melanchthon the Humanist. In our comments on Melanchthon in the July number of this quarterly (p. 210) we called attention to his Semi-pelagian teachings regarding original sin and free will. It will repay us to follow up this development of Melanchthon's theology as found especially

in the three editions of his *Loci*. This has already been done by Walter Sohm in his *Probevorlesung* on *Die Soziallehren Melanchthons*, which the undersigned happens to have in a typewritten copy. This *Probevorlesung* was held on the 29th of July, 1914; on the 10th of August, 1914, this promising Melanchthon scholar fell in one of the early battles of World War I. Since Walter Sohm in this his first lecture dwelt on questions which are under discussion in our own midst, the undersigned is certain of performing a service to the readers of the *Quartalschrift* by presenting the main line of argument of this *Probevorlesung*.

Sohm begins the main part of his lecture by pointing out that the old problem of the Middle Ages, the relationship of the *sacerdotium* to the *imperium*, of the visible church to the state, reappeared and reasserted itself in Melanchthon's writings. The development through which Melanchthon's study of this problem passed can best be traced within the course of some twenty years of his life, from 1521 to 1543, from the first to the third edition of his *Loci Communes*.

It is noteworthy, Sohm carries out, that the first edition of Melanchthon's *Loci* does not yet contain a special chapter on the *ecclesia*, and that in the chapter *De lege*, no connection is to be found between the Decalog and the laws of the magistrate or the government. While the Decalog is simply defined as the sum total of the *leges divinae morales*, it is evaluated solely in reference to the spiritual and religious life of the believer. It is of greater importance to Melanchthon to emphasize that the Gospel frees us from the Law than to give thought to the connection obtaining between the *lex* and the social life. Of course, the magistrates are now already looked upon by Melanchthon as a positive and definite order of God. Still he lays the greatest stress on the fact that it is a matter of indifference to the Christian, whether he lives under this or that form of government. Melanchthon also does not fail to state in this connection that in the end we are to obey God more than man. 'Life,' to quote from one of Melanchthon's writings of the same year, 'is pure piety and the external ordinances pass away with the flesh and are without life. . . . *Breviter: iustitia mundi non est vita, sed mors et peccati poena.*'

It is important to know, Sohm continues, that these statements from Melanchthon's writings did not appear any more after 1525, *i. e.*, after the Peasants' War. It was then that the humanist came to life in Melanchthon. And in his *Declamatio de legibus* of 1525 Melanchthon does not speak of the *lex* of the Decalog, as he had done in his *Loci* of 1521, but of the common law. In other words the *Declamatio* culminates in an artless description and estimation of the statute laws and in a very precise appraisal of human ordinances. In addition to this Melanchthon argues that *pietas* demands that the positive law must be studied diligently and fostered and pursued religiously.

The humanist in Melanchthon now endeavors to place the secular ordinances on a scientific basis and to show up the connection between them

and the Christian doctrine. His search for a scientific or philosophic basis led him back to the principles of Aristotle and to Cicero's "light of reason." The result of this endeavor was the use of the expression "natürliches Sittengesetz" as a synonym for the Decalog and to give Luther's conservative and purely religious manner of dealing with the social order a philosophic formulation. Luther had emphasized the pure inwardness and spirituality of religion. Melanchthon contended that the Christian theologian can, nevertheless, avail himself of pagan philosophy.

In his *Commentaries* on the *Politics* of Aristotle (1530/5) Melanchthon proceeds from the premise, *ius naturae vere esse ius divinum*, and concludes that all civil legislation, although it is to be classed as a natural law, is nevertheless to be regarded as a divine law. Henceforth Melanchthon appealed to both the natural law and the divine law or the Bible in support of the social ordinances, especially of the ordinance of marriage as the *prima societas*. He placed the institution of slavery and of governmental rule under the law of nature and of the Fourth Commandment. According to the natural and the divine law and in opposition to the enthusiasts he granted to every citizen the right to private property. Finally both rulers and subjects are to recognize the laws of the land according to the natural and the divine law. This appraisal of the social order deeply imbedded in the natural and divine law began to permeate his whole theological system. *Decalogus*, *lex*, and *magistratus* are now in close alliance with one another. And all this, as Sohm warns, cannot remain without an influence on the doctrine of the *societas* of the believers, of the church, and without influence on the certitude of the pure spirituality of all religious life. This stage of Melanchthon's development characterizes the second edition of his *Loci* of 1535.

Sohm now calls our attention to the fact that the *locus* on *lex* of the first edition has been increased in the second by two chapters, the one entitled *Decalogus* and the other *De lege naturae*. Again the *locus* carrying the title *de magistratibus* has received the additional title *de dignitate rerum politicarum*. Finally three new *loci* are added in this second edition, all three significant for tracing and gauging Melanchthon's further development. They are: *de regno Christi*, *de ecclesia*, and *de politia ecclesiastica*. These terms are, as Sohm pointedly remarks, *Sozialbegriffe*. Therefore they justify the assumption that Melanchthon in treating the *lex divina*, the *lex naturae*, and the *decalogus* will endeavor to demonstrate the close connection between all three. This is actually the case and represents a far-reaching divergence from the edition of 1521, in which the Decalog was only discussed to describe the moral *habitus* of the Christian. Now the Decalog is not only regarded as the *lex spiritualis*, but also as the *lex naturalis* having the *officium civile* to discipline every man. Consequently Melanchthon begins to praise the human ordinances as never before, designating them as *opera et beneficia Dei* and emphasizing that by respecting the various offices, the civil government, the military, matrimony, etc.,

the Christian is serving God. But — and this must be kept in mind — Melanchthon is proceeding in the evaluation of these ordinances from the premise of the free will of man in the realm of the “outward,” the civil righteousness. Therefore the *lex* is not only to be evaluated in as far as the *religiosus* comes into consideration, but also according to its own moral and “natural” meaning. In short, Melanchthon must now learn to differentiate between a *iustitia spiritualis* and a *iustitia civilis*. Next to the morality of the Christian which is sanctification, we now also have a morality of the individual as a citizen. Sohm calls this differentiation between morality and morality a “zukunftsvolle Scheidung” and in as far as Melanchthon speaks of a twofold morality in reference to the Decalog a comingling of evangelical and social ideas pregnant with danger or, at least, with obscurity.

The inadequacy of Melanchthon’s social system also becomes evident in considering his idea of the *disciplina*. The civil magistrate is the guardian of the *externa disciplina* and as such the keeper of both tables of the Law. God has ordained the magistrate *ad hanc disciplinam*. Note well, the main part of this *disciplina* is the *reverentia erga Deum*. On the strength of this the magistrate becomes a *membrum ecclesiae*. The development of Melanchthon’s social ideas finally ends up in a doctrine of the church, while the whole dead weight of ancient philosophy is carried over into the system of this theology. Even the idea of the free will must eventually force its way somehow into the *ecclesia*. It is the *ecclesia* of the Christian-humanistic pedagogue and educator demanding discipline, presupposing the freedom of the human will in the moral realm and the civic sphere, and believing in the possibility of an objective knowledge due to the *lumen naturale*.

But what is this *ecclesia* like? Luther did not recognize a church which laid claim to secular power. The communion of saints was to Luther an invisible, purely spiritual body. The power of this church was to be sought in the preaching of the Word alone, in the Gospel. The idea, however, that Melanchthon had of the church since 1535 was that of the *ecclesia visibilis*. Since 1546 he even quite strongly opposed the idea of an invisible church. In his *Declamatio de discrimine ecclesiae Dei et imperii mundi*, 1546, he argues: *agnosci igitur ecclesia, exaudiri et cerni potest, quia genus doctrine habet certum et ritus habet incurrentes in oculos*. And then he adds: *comprehendo in definitione ecclesiae et legem moralem, recte intellectam*. Only the humanist, Sohm inserts, could speak such a language, the humanist, to whom the word of God is discernible in an objective manner due to the “natural” characteristic of every language, even of the language of God, and due to the ability of man to recognize the “natural.” But still more important is Sohm’s statement that Melanchthon was convinced that the idea of the invisible church would finally lead to “anarchy,” while the good order, the *eutaxia*, of the church must be maintained *ad disciplinam et tranquillitatem*. This is the language of

the pedagogue, of the *praeceptor Germaniae*, Sohm exclaims. Even the *ecclesia* must have a *politia*, and in this *politia ecclesiastica* as in the *politia civilis* training for the purpose of furthering moral discipline is the business of the magistrate.

This idea of the Church was fully developed by Melanchthon in the third edition of his *Loci*, 1543. His aim was to gain recognition for the government as a member of this *ecclesia*. Both the ecclesiastical order as well as the secular order were to serve as a disciplinary force of mankind. Indeed, Melanchthon's influence is focused on the moral influence of the commonwealth. He is not any more concerned about the invisible, purely inner-religious life of the *ecclesia*, but about the *administration* of the Word and Sacraments discernible in an objective way due to its "natural" characteristics. *Der rationalistische Humanist*, Sohm adds, *behält das Wort*.

Of course, Melanchthon did not look upon the *ecclesia visibilis* as upon some exclusive organization but rather as upon a school whose members are scattered throughout the world. Still his pet idea of a consistory, a *Kirchengericht*, always again forced this humanist, to whom ethics and pedagogy were so vital, into the idea of a non-religious outward union of the "visible" church.

The theoretical and fundamental unclarity and inadequacy of this definition of the church as it gradually took on form in Melanchthon's sociological doctrines has had a most practical influence on Germany and on all phases of Lutheran endeavor and influence — Sohm concludes his lecture. In conformity with Melanchthon's teachings Lutheranism, in its own way, became subservient to the Christian *Polizeistaat*. Although this doctrine with its demonstrating force and conservative character excluded all enthusiasm and radicalism, still it did not succeed in producing a system of government of its own, as can be said of Calvinism. Melanchthon simply identifies the *Konsistorium*, i. e., the newly created territorial-ecclesiastical administration with the *ecclesia* which is to administer discipline. Speaking of the *magistratus politicus* Melanchthon is able to say without any reservation: *nunc enim dico de gubernatione propria ecclesiae*. The result is none other than that Melanchthon's idea of church and state, as it was evaluated and ethicized by him, brought about the servitude of the visible church to the *Polizeistaat*. The great question of the Middle Ages concerning the relationship of the *sacerdotium* to the *imperium* was answered: The imperial state had gained the victory and the state church was established in the full sense of the word. Melanchthon's definition of the church paves the way for a moral-pedagogic culture, in which the church and the school work in common in training the Christian citizen. And in view of the emphasis laid on discipline and authority they even produce the state characterized by officialism and militarism and culminating in the idea of a state sustained by a heartfelt piety and finding its model in the Christian family and in the Christian education of the family.

Melanchthon, the ethically inclined humanist, did not only become the *praeceptor Germaniae* for the German school-system, but also for the family and the state and the church, for the whole social life of Germany.

In view of the present-day developments in the Evangelical Church in Germany and in the Lutheran churches in America Walter Sohm's commentary on Melanchthon's *Soziallehren* as applied to church and state deserves our consideration and study, in order to lead us always deeper into a critical comparison of the three editions of the *Loci Communes* and into a more careful weighing of the theology of Melanchthon, the Humanist of the Lutheran Church.

P. PETERS.

Lutheran Parochial Schools. The first Protestant parochial school of Rhode Island has been opened in Pawtucket by St. Matthew's Evangelical Lutheran Congregation of our sister-synod, the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri a. o. St. According to *Religious News Service* (9/5/47) it is the first Protestant Parochial school to be operated by Lutherans in the East, north of Bristol, Connecticut. It is conducted in the Sunday school rooms with a total enrollment in the first two grades limited to 20 pupils. New grades are to be added each year, and plans are being studied for the construction of a school building. There are now 21 parochial schools operated in the Atlantic District of the Missouri Synod. Mr. A. C. Stellhorn, secretary of schools for the Synod, has expressed the hope that the example set by St. Matthew's will induce many others in New England to open such schools.

Reformed Parochial Schools. The Seattle Christian School Association started a parochial school last year in the Ravenna Boulevard Presbyterian Church with 42 enrolled. This year it has overflowed, the *Religious News Service* informs us (9/12/47), into the Green Lake Free Methodist Church, and the total enrollment of the two schools is 106. Two teachers instruct the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades at the Ravenna church, while five teachers comprise the staff at the Green Lake church, where the first nine grades are taught. All pupils have transferred from public schools.

Catholic Parochial Schools. Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of the Boston archdiocese reported before the 38th Annual Institute for Teachers and Administrators of Catholic Schools that the Catholic school attendance will reach a new high record of 2,865,600 in 10,800 schools staffed by 101,000 teachers. (*Religious News Service*, 8/26/47.)

P. PETERS.

REVIEWERS' DESK

What Lutherans Are Thinking. A Symposium on Lutheran Faith and Life. Published under the auspices of the Conference of Lutheran Professors of Theology. Edited by E. C. Fendt, Dean of the Theological Seminary and Professor of Systematic Theology, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio. 592 pages, 5¼x8½. Buckram binding with title on front cover and backbone. Price: \$3.50. — The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio.

This symposium consists of twenty-eight essays by as many authors, representing seven different Lutheran bodies. It would not be possible to discuss each essay adequately in the limited space at our disposal; yet in order to give the reader a general overview over the territory covered by the twenty-eight writers, we list the titles. I. The Heritage of Lutheranism. — II. The Word of God. — III. The Sacred Text: The Lutheran Evaluation of Biblical Criticism. — IV. Revelation Today. — V. Old Testament Theology. — VI. New Testament Theology. — VII. God. — VIII. Man. — IX. Salvation. — X. The Person and Work of Christ. — XI. The Work of the Holy Spirit. — XII. The Church. — XIII. The Means of Grace. — XIV. The Ministry. — XV. The Life Everlasting. — XVI. Faith and Reason. — XVII. The Symbols of the Church. — XVIII. Lutheran Unity. — XIX. Worship. — XX. Church Music. — XXI. Lutheran Piety. — XXII. The Lutheran View of Christian Ethics. — XXIII. The Church and Society. — XXIV. Church and Family. — XXV. Church and State. — XXVI. Lutheran Parish Education. — XXVII. Lutherans and General Education. — XXVIII. Lutheran Missions. — To each essay is attached a Bibliography. — The whole book is prefaced with some orienting remarks by the Editor; and appended are Biographical Notes on the contributors.

When scanning the list of topics for the first time the undersigned was disappointed in not finding an article on Justification, the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*. Although the matter is treated in essay IX under the general head of "Salvation" (by Dr. W. Arndt) yet the absence of a special article on this vital point, while room was allotted, *e. g.*, to the last ten titles, seems significant, indicating a veering into a new trend.

The book as such is a fruit of "cooperation in externals" and stands as a monument to such cooperation. We quote from the Preface: "In June, 1943, Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois, was host to the first free conference of Lutheran Theological Professors in the United States and Canada. . . . One of the results of that conference was the resolution to project the publication of a volume on Lutheran faith and life which could serve as an introduction to the various fields of theological study" (p. 5). — Dr. Paul H. Buehring (Capital University) in a review of the book calls attention to the fact that, although similar symposia

have been published before, e. g., *Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies of the Ev. Lutheran Church in the United States* (1893) and Vergilius Ferm's book *What is Lutheranism?* (1930), the present book represents a new departure. The book of 1893 emphasized the existing differences, and the one of 1930 merely raised the question, the book of 1947 shows that "twenty-eight different writers representing seven different synods today can and do think alike and in harmony with the basic principles of the Lutheran Church."

This is a book on theology, as the sub-title has it: on *Lutheran Faith and Life*. Is theology an external? It seems that the professors' free conference which projected the publication, that the committee of six which planned it, selecting the themes and the essayists, that the essayists themselves considered it as such. Else, how could they have cooperated in the undertaking?

An old maxim is: *Quod non est Biblicum, non est theologicum*. All Lutheran thinking, all Lutheran theology, is strictly limited by the authority of the Bible, and to the truths presented by the Bible. *In ecclesia non valet: Hoc ego dico, hoc tu dicis, hoc ille dicit, sed: Haec dicit Dominus* (Augustine). In the present volume, however, there are not only "variations in terminology" and "differences of emphasis," but "there has been no attempt to 'harmonize' divergent opinions of various writers" (Preface, p. 5). In the publication of the book it was evidently presupposed that "there exists an allowable and wholesome latitude of theological opinion." The article on *The Symbols of the Church* (T. G. Tappert, Philadelphia) states it in these words: "The church must have room in it for a variety of *Richtungen*, provided these tendencies are not in conflict with the basic confession. To deny this measure of theological freedom within the church would transform the church into a sect" (p. 354).

Luther did not believe in *Richtungen*. He said: *Darum soll man in Gottes Wort beruhen und stille halten, darin soll man hoeren, was er uns verheisst oder droht. . . . Das andere alles aber, so uns im Wort nicht offenbart ist, soll man einfach fahren lassen; denn ohne Gefahr und Schaden kann man sich darin nicht versuchen* (St. L. I, 1084, 318). The first essay of the Symposium (by Dr. Dau) concludes with the timely warning: "Lutheranism is completely bound up in, and definitely restricted to, the Word of God. Let the present heirs remember an axiom current among Lutherans in Reformation times: *Quo propior Luthero, eo melior theologus*." — Or does the position taken by Luther also represent only a *Richtung* that may be tolerated? M.

Aus der Johannes-Apokalypse, dem letzten Buch der Bibel. Sechs Radio-Vorträge im Studio Basel. Mit zwei Bildbeilagen. Von Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Dr. theol., ord. Professor an der Universität Basel. 61 Seiten, 5x7½, kart. Preis: Fr. 2.60. — Verlag von Heinrich Majer, Basel.

In six radio addresses, naturally, it was impossible to treat the entire Revelation in detail; yet the author attempts to present what he considers as the main content and aim of the last book of the Bible. How well he succeeded may be gathered from the themes he chose for his addresses. They are, in translation: 1. The Apocalyptic Christ: Lion and Lamb. — 2. The four Apocalyptic Horsemen: plagues of the human race. — 3. The Apocalyptic Number 666: the Antichrist together with his satellites. — 4. The Apocalyptic Babel: pride and fall. — 5. The Apocalyptic Church: distress and promise. — 6. The Apocalyptic Kingdom: the Millennium and the heavenly Jerusalem.

The author rejects the so-called cycle theory, which assumes that Revelation does not attempt to portray the future events of history in chronological sequence, but presents them in parallel columns from different angles in ever new symbols. He declares emphatically: *In Wirklichkeit sind aber die dort geschilderten Akte fortlaufend gedacht* (p. 28).

The addresses throughout contain some keen and penetrating observations filled with warning and comfort; and the reader will find himself well rewarded for his study of the book. Yet the author's main thought cannot be accepted. In his last address he reaches the climax, and that is the expectation of a Millennium here on earth preceding the final consummation of the Kingdom in heaven; so that the sequence of events will be: Millennium, Tribulation, Heavenly Jerusalem. Of course, he rejects any form of *chiliasmus crassus*, and accepts the interpretation of J. C. Lavater (1801) as essentially correct. Lavater's remark, *dass die juedische Nation wieder zu Gnaden angenommen werden soll* (Rom. 11, 25f.) he expands to mean *die leidende und streitende Kirche aus Juden und Heiden*. His remark in this connection: *Die voellig einzigartige israelitisch-juedische Existenz ist entweder bare Sinnlosigkeit oder goettliche Sinnhaftigkeit* (p. 57) is very correct; but that does not presuppose a restoration of Israel as a nation. Although Israel is not rejected of God, yet since it failed in the decisive moment of its history its continued existence without fusing with other races presents a solemn warning to all nations not to trifle with the Gospel of Christ. — Concerning the duration of the Millennium he says: *Auf die Zahl 1000 kommt es dabei kaum oder ueberhaupt nicht an*, since according to 2 Pet. 3, 8, and Ps. 90, 4, "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

The added pictures are reduced copies of woodcuts by Albrecht Duerer, representing the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, and the Hymn of the Elect in Heaven.

Aside of exceptions, such as mentioned above, a person may in general subscribe to a review by the *National-Zeitung*: *Der Verfasser versteht es ausgezeichnet, das Bleibende und Ewige der neutestamentlichen Apokalypse aus dem rein Historischen (better: Symbolischen) herauszuheben und fuer unsere Zeitverhaeltnisse deutlich zu machen.*

M.

Vater
lo

Uebersetzungen, Koncordanzen und koncordante Uebersetzungen des Neuen Testaments. Von D. theol. Wilhelm Michaelis, Professor an der Universität Bern. 224 Seiten, 5½x8. Leinwand. Titel auf Deckel und Rücken. Preis, Fr. 9.60. — Verlag von Heinrich Majer, Basel.

This book was written for the purpose of meeting the desire of many *zu erfahren, warum so viele verschiedene Uebersetzungen notwendig geworden sind, wodurch diese sich voneinander unterscheiden, in welchem Masse sie im Einzelnen der Aufgabe gerecht werden den Urtext getreu und doch verständlich zu übertragen, in welchem Umfang auch die sogenannten abweichenden Lesarten berücksichtigt sind, und welcher Anteil überhaupt den Ergebnissen und Erkenntnissen der heutigen Bibelforschung hierbei zukommt* (p. 5). After a page of introductory remarks the book devotes 84 pages (10-93) to an investigation of the following two points: *Schwierigkeiten und Lösungen in alter Zeit*, and *Die klassischen Uebersetzungen der Reformationszeit und ihre Revisionen*. The two classic translations produced during the Reformation period are the Luther Bible and the Zurich Bible. Then, on 124 pages, later German translations are discussed (p. 94-184), and the advantages and limitations of concordances, and the difficulties of concordant translations are presented (p. 185-217). — Our readers will probably be interested chiefly in the review of three of the later German translations: The so-called Weizsäcker Bible is well known. The Schlachter Bible was quite extensively used by our pastors because of its convenient size (pocket format, printed on very thin paper). In recent years the Menge Bible was bought pretty freely for study purposes.

Anyone seeking an answer to the questions mentioned above from the *Vorwort* (p. 5) will find a wealth of material between the covers of this book. M.

Government in the Missouri Synod. *The Genesis of Decentralized Government in the Missouri Synod.* By Carl S. Munding, Ph. D., XIV plus 247 pages, 6x9. Buckram; gold title on front and back-bone. Price, \$3.00. — Concordia Publishing House.

This volume, the first one to be published, is No. IV of a planned series of twelve, to be known as the Concordia Historical Series. As the subtitle indicates, the aim of the book is to trace the genesis of the form of synodical government as it was established in the Missouri Synod. The Table of Contents shows how the plan was carried out. "I. Luther's Concept of Church Government. — II. A Pastorate in Saxony, 1830-1840. — III. Stephan and Stephanism. — IV. Chaos in Missouri. — V. Emerging Forms of Church Polity. — VI. Crystallization of Governmental Forms. The Organization of the Missouri Synod. — VII. Conclusions."

The book is well documented throughout, incorporating in numerous and extensive footnotes much hitherto little known source material.

Regarding the evaluation of some of the historical facts one may not always agree with the author. Chap. VII, *e. g.*, smacks a little too much of the methods of history "debunkers." We quote a few remarks from other parts of the book. "At first the Saxon ministerium, including C. F. W. Walther, resisted these laymen most vigorously" in their demand for "participation in the government of the Church." . . . "The situation was threatening to get out of hand. . . . The clerical party was rapidly losing caste and disintegrating. . . . The colonists generally were utterly confused. In this extreme exigency *Walther made a virtue of necessity*," etc. (p. 212f.). — In another connection we read: "*He (Walther) used a trick that promised to be effective*" (p. 147). — One certainly has no reason to object if any misinformation of historical facts is corrected; but the expressions cited above are not statements of fact, they are passing judgment on motives. Are they supported by the known facts? One will welcome a re-evaluation of facts if subsequent events make them appear in a new light. But is it proper to impugn the motives of the fathers without incontrovertible evidence? — If one bears in mind the implicit, idolatrous faith which the Saxon immigrants had placed in their leader Stephan and the shock which their consciences suffered when he was unmasked as a fraud; if one takes note of how they were groping in their remorse for the proper way of remedying the evil and avoiding future mistakes; if one realizes their danger of misinterpreting their guilt, of finding the sinfulness of their actions in some elements that were not sinful, and of casting away the grace of God in their confusion: one is hardly justified in speaking of "tricks" of Walther, and that he "made a virtue of necessity."

It seems like a misinterpretation of the constitutional provision: *Sachen der Lehre und des Gewissens werden allein durch Gottes Wort entschieden*, to say: "A certain amount of power was taken away from the laity" (p. 183). Neither pastor nor layman has any authority in matters of doctrine and conscience by virtue of his position: how then can the afore-mentioned provision abrogate some rights which neither pastor nor layman ever possessed?

Luther's position is misunderstood when his calling on Elector John to inaugurate a visitation is interpreted as though Luther acted thus because he considered that "a well-organized, compact Church was an absolute necessity" (p. 13); that "the Great Commoner was not trusting commoners in 1527. To be safe, he wanted a rule that had punch" (p. 15). Luther was concerned about the salvation of souls. He called on the princes as *Praecipua membra* of the Church to lend their assistance. They were *praecipua membra*, not by virtue of their office as princes, but because of the special training and experience which was theirs. By this special gift

which God had given to them they were under obligation to use it in the interest of the Church. The common people still were babes in church affairs, as their misinterpretation of spiritual liberty plainly showed in the Peasants' War. In 1532 Luther wrote about the Corinthian form of service that he would hesitate to reintroduce it: *Denn die Leute sind jetzt zu wild and zu vorwitzig*. He added that St. Paul does not insist on a certain form but *dass es solle ordentlich und ehrlich zugehen* (St. L. XX, 1676, 27). Very much ground work still had to be done immediately after the Peasants' War, and Luther called on the advanced members of the Church to help do it. He must not be blamed if the princes in later years set aside his principles and claimed special prerogatives in the Church by virtue of their secular offices. How little Luther trusted in "punch," in "organization" or "compactness" may be seen from his attitude over against the Protestant league which Philip craved, and from the fact that he left his hideout in the Wartburg against the wish of Frederick. Luther was no doctrinaire who for the sake of some pet theory would jeopardize the safety of the Church. The Gospel is not a set of rules; it is the divine charter of our liberty and a power of God unto salvation.

In general, Dr. Mundinger's book is well written and contains much valuable information on "the most crucial period in the early history of the Missouri Synod." M.

Prayer and Its Power. Written by C. Havig-Gjelseth. Translated by Bernhard H. J. Habel. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Price: \$.75.

This treatise was originally written in Norwegian. The translator has succeeded in rendering it into very readable English. And this is not said with reference to the diction only but because in the garb of a tongue foreign to the author we are made to feel the pulsations of a heart throbbing with love for the Savior and the brethren. The book contains 99 pages of text besides the title page, the preface, and the table of contents. The chapter headings follow: 1. The Nature and Importance of Prayer; 2. The Possibilities of Prayer; 3. The Prayer Life of Jesus; 4. Prayer in the Apostolic Church; 5. The Prayer Life of Paul; 6. The Laws of Prayer; 7. How God Answers Prayer; 8. Intercessory Prayer; 9. The Difficulties of Prayer; 10. The Symphony of Prayer; 11. The Quiet Hour.

The author believes with all his heart in the inerrancy of the divinely inspired Scriptures. They are for him as for us the only source and norm for a Christian's faith and life. He bases his elucidations on the Scriptures, and throughout the whole book it is his purpose to show what the infallible Word of God has to say on the subject under discussion. With respect to the tenth chapter a word of caution: While each

and every Christian should be encouraged to make full use of his royal priesthood to pour out his heart in prayer before his Savior and King, to enjoy his privilege as a child of God to speak to his heavenly Father — in his closet privately; in a public prayer meeting, before the assembled congregation, only the duly called minister of Christ, the pastor, has under ordinary circumstances the divine right to offer up prayers of supplication and thanksgiving for and on behalf of the congregation.

As this reviewer has perused this small booklet with spiritual profit to himself, so he is recommending it to his brethren for their edification.

L.

A Century of Grace. A History of the Missouri Synod, 1847-1947. By Walter A. Baepler. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. 1947. Price: \$1.50.

This history is issued in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the Missouri Synod. It was authorized by a resolution of the General Convention of 1941. It was written by Professor Walter Baepler of the Theological Seminar at Springfield, Illinois, at the request of the Centennial Committee of the synod. We quote from the Foreword: "As the century ends, we pause, and our eyes naturally turn to the past; we see abounding evidence in this history that God has been with us; and as a memorial of our gratitude to Him we inscribe it: 'A Century of Grace.' And as we turn again and look toward the future, we are encouraged by the history of the past to take up the work anew, and with confidence we pray with Solomon: 'The Lord our God be with us, as He was with our fathers' (1 Kings 8:57)."

Although this book does not claim "to be an exhaustive study or a documentary history of the Missouri Synod," the author has, in the estimation of this reviewer at least, succeeded in achieving his purpose "to acquaint the reader with the antecedents, organization, growth, and doctrine of this important part of the Lutheran Church in America." The book is admirably suited to arouse and hold the interest of the general reader, not the student of church history only. While the presentation is thorough enough to induce the scholar to delve into the study of this period of the history of the Lutheran Church in America in the light of the history of our Church from the time it was first planted on American soil, its diction and phraseology is lucid enough, and the story here told comprehensive enough to satisfy the average reader.

The tone of our book is objective, and does not offend the Christian reader outside of the Missouri Synod or the Synodical Conference. One is favorably impressed with the spirit of humility manifested throughout. It glorifies the grace of God so richly bestowed upon our sister synod;

it is irenic in the true sense of the word, and at the same time it is firm in its confession of the truth of the Word of God, and in its condemnation of error wherever found — in friend or foe — and just for that reason irenic in the true sense of the word.

M. LEHNINGER.

Evangelisch-Lutherischer Volkskalender auf das Jahr 1947. Evangelische Verlagsanstalt G. m. b. H., Berlin. Druck von Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau (Sachsen).

Obgleich das laufende Jahr 1947 schnell seinem Ende entgegengeht, möchten wir doch noch den oben genannten Kalender zur Anzeige bringen. Unter diesem oben stehenden Namen haben wir den vor dem Kriege unter dem Titel „Hausfreund-Kalender“ im Kreise der deutschen (früher sächsischen) Freikirche erscheinenden Kalender vor uns. Wir begrüßen den alten Bekannten mit dem neuen Namen. Wir freuen uns, daß die unter uns vorteilhaft bekannte Firma „Johannes Herrmann“ noch existiert, wenn sie auch nicht als Verlag des Kalenders, sondern als Druckerei aufgeführt wird. Auch die Buchhandlung des Schriftenvereins, Geschäftsführer Emil Klärner, Zwickau (Sachsen), bringt sich den Lesern, wie vor dem Kriege, in empfehlende Erinnerung.

Der Kalender bringt, wie früher, gesunden Lesestoff. Wir wünschen dem alten Bekannten ein fröhliches Gedeihen in der schweren Nachkriegszeit.

M. Lehninger.

Let Us Return Unto the Lord. Radio Messages of the First Part of the Thirteenth Lutheran Hour by Walter A. Maier, Ph. D., Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Price: Single copy @ \$2.00 postpaid; dozen copies @ \$1.60 plus postage.

Christmas. An American Annual of Christmas Literature and Art by R. E. Haugan, Editor. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1947. Price: \$1.00.

* * * *

All of the above items may be purchased from our Northwestern Publishing House, 935-937 North Fourth Street, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin.