CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 41 Number 4

OCTOBER 1977

Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, Indiana

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

CTQ

ISSN 0038-8610

Issued Quarterly by the Faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary

The *Concordia Theological Quarterly,* a continuation of *The Springfielder,* is a theological journal of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, published for its ministerium by the faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

The CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY is published quarterly in January, April, July, and October. Changes of address for Missouri Synod clergymen reported to Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri will also cover the mailing change of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY. Other changes of address, paid subscriptions, and other business matters should be sent to Mrs. Esther M. Stahlke, c/o CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Concordia Theological Seminary, 6600 North Clinton Street, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46825.
Annual subscription rate: $4.00.

Announcements

A CENTER FOR LUTHERAN CONFESSIONAL STUDIES

To celebrate the quadricentennials of the Formula of Concord in 1977 and the Book of Concord in 1980, Concordia Theological Seminary has decided to establish an International Center for Lutheran Confessional Studies. The new institute is to have a building of its own on the Seminary campus. Here world-renowned scholars will be able to continue their study of the Lutheran Confessions and Seminary students will be able to undertake special research projects. Concordia Theological Seminary is seeking the support of all confessional Lutheran scholars, pastors, and laymen in this endeavor.

The International Center for Lutheran Confessional Studies is also to sponsor an annual symposium on the Symbols. The first annual symposium is entitled "Lutheran Confessions in the Contemporary Church" and is set for January 4 - 6, 1978. Lectures will be given by the Seminary's own professors and other scholars from various nations. The purpose of this first symposium is to involve laypeople in the study of the Lutheran Confessions and their viability for the church today. A tentative schedule of the first symposium follows.

The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod has consistently used the word "Concordia" as a trademark of confessional orthodox theology. The International Center for Lutheran Confessional Studies will be dedicated to preserving this "Concordia," the Book of Concord, as the living heritage of all Lutherans.

The Editors

LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS IN THE CONTEMPORARY CHURCH

January 4—6, 1978

Convocation Sponsored by the
International Center for Lutheran Confessional Studies
Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, Indiana

Wednesday, January 4, 1978

8:00 A.M.— 1:00 P.M. Registration

1:00 P.M.	Introduction: "The Need for Confessional Reapplication in the Contemporary Church" President Robert D. Preus, Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana
1:30 P.M.	"Survey of Protestant and Catholic Confessional Statements in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century" Dr. C. George Fry, Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana
3:00 P.M.	Coffee Break
3:30 P.M.	"The Confession-Making Process: The Origin of Confessions and the Possibility of New Confessions" Dr. Lewis W. Spitz, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California
5:00 P.M.	Dinner—Recess
7:30 P.M.	"Confessional Emphasis on Law and Gospel for Our Day" Dr. Eugene Klug, Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana

Thursday, January 5, 1978

8:30 A.M.	"Confessional Lutheranism: Churchly or Sectarian Movement?" Dr. Jobst Schone, Church Superintendent for Berlin, Independent Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany
10:00 A.M.	Coffee Break
10:30 A.M.	"Contemporary Denials of the Lord's Supper" Dr. Tom Hardt, Stockholm, Sweden
12:00 Noon	Lunch—Recess
1:30 P.M.	"The Lutheran Confessions as a Distinctive Contribution to World Christianity" Dr. Henry P. Hamann, Luther Seminary, North Adelaide, Australia
3:00 P.M.	Coffee Break

3:30 P.M.	"Confessions and Apologetics as the Church's Mission" Dr. John Warwick Montgomery, Melodyland School of Theology, Anaheim, California
6:00 P.M.	Banquet—"Future of Confessional Lutheranism in the World" Dr. Samuel Nafzger, Commission on Theology and Church Relations, Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, St. Louis, Missouri

Friday, January 6, 1978

8:30 A.M.	"Confessional Influences for Lutheran Ecumenical Practices" Dr. Ralph A. Bohlmann, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri
10:00 A.M.	Coffee Break
10:30 A.M.	Discussion Groups
12:00 Noon	Lunch—Recess
1:30 P.M.	"Church Discipline: A Study in The Lutheran Confessions with Application to Lutheranism Today" Professor Kurt Marquart, Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana
3:00 P.M.	Summation, Dr. Robert Preus
3:30 P.M.	Closing Devotion

The symposium attendance fee is $35 (covers lectures and banquet). The attendance fee on a *per diem* basis without the banquet is $10. The room charge is $5 per night or $10 for two nights, payable in advance. Meals are available for a nominal cost at the cafeteria.

AN INSTITUTE FOR BIBLICAL LANGUAGES

Recent college entrance tests show a remarkable decline in ability to use the English language properly among high school graduates. Parallel to this phenomenon is a decline in the knowledge and use of the Biblical languages among seminary students, professors, and pastors. The number of seminaries requiring a working knowledge of Hebrew and Greek has been growing smaller. One cause of this slighting of the Biblical languages is a shift in theological education from a theocentric attitude to a humanistic one. Psychologically oriented counseling courses have eroded away the exegetical and dogmatic core of the curriculum in most seminaries.

Recent conventions of the The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod have renewed the church's commitment to the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God. This means that our Synod has taken a theocentric attitude and not a humanistic one. God and His word are at the center of our theology. At the roots of theocentric theology is a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, especially in the languages in which the Holy Spirit inspired them. This kind of Biblical commitment presupposes a new zeal for the study of Greek and Hebrew. Unfortunately, many pastors and students who share the Synod's understanding of the Bible do not feel adequately equipped to use the Scriptures in their original languages. Some have forgotten much of what they once learned, others have never had the opportunity to learn Hebrew and Greek. The problem for many is that intensive study of a Biblical language generally involves a large block of time which many, especially pastors, are unable to afford.

Concordia Theological Seminary has, therefore, established an Institute for Biblical Languages to meet these needs. Beginning with the summer session of 1978, the Institute will offer basic and intermediate courses under the direction of Dr. Theodore Mueller, professor of languages at the University of Kentucky and an adjunct professor of the Seminary, a well-known pioneer in transformational linguistic education. The Institute for Biblical Languages will also publish materials evincing a commitment to the Scriptures as the written Word of God and designed to maintain the highest standards of scholarship in the service of the church. Further information follows.

The Editors

INSTITUTE FOR BIBLICAL LANGUAGES

Concordia Theological Seminary

Fort Wayne, Indiana

Objectives

Since theology is predicated on the Word, the study of the original languages in which this Word was written is of primary importance. Therefore, the Institute promotes the study of Greek and Hebrew through

- expert teaching
- scholarly publications
- materials which reflect the latest linguistic developments

Courses

During the summer session (June–July) courses in Basic and Intermediate Greek and in Basic Hebrew are offered. They are designed for

- the student who never learned a foreign language
- the student who wants a refresher course or further in-depth study of the language
- the pastor who wishes to recapture a lost linguistic skill.

Methodology

The courses are built upon the most recent theories of transformational linguistics and use the latest developments in foreign language acquisition:

- individualized instruction
- self-instructional and programmed materials
- tapes
- visual aids.

For information write to:

Institute for Biblical Languages
6600 N. Clintin Street
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46825

A Reformation Hymn

Douglas Judisch

By grace alone salvation sure
Unto our fallen race has come,
Alleluia, Alleluia!
Christ Jesus has atoned for all
And struck the conquered demons dumb.
Alleluia, Alleluia!

Through faith alone in Jesus Christ
We are made right with God again,
Alleluia, Alleluia!
We could do nothing for ourselves,
Christ is the only hope for men.
Alleluia, Alleluia!

From Scripture only do we know
These teachings are forever sure,
Alleluia, Alleluia!
Its holy pages clearly show
In Christ we are a people pure.
Alleluia, Alleluia!

So to the Father and the Son
And Holy Spirit we shall sing,
Alleluia, Alleluia!
Unto our triply gracious God
We shall forever praises bring.
Alleluia, Alleluia!

Why Did the Reformation Succeed?

C. George Fry

Authorities agree that the Protestant Reformation was a success. Rudolf Eucken, the celebrated German philosopher, for example, regarded the Reformation as "the animating soul of the modern world, the principle motive-force for its progress . . . ."[1] Gerhard Ritter, dean of the German historians, considered it a major "reorganization" of Western society at the close of the Middle Ages.[2] J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, Swiss theologian and historian, viewed the Reformation as one of history's two most important revolutions.[3]

A UNIQUE MOVEMENT

Why, however, did the Reformation succeed? On this issue the authorities disagree. This is a difficult question to answer because there is little in the history of Christianity that is like the Reformation. Parallels for the purpose of comparison are either lacking or are incomplete.

1. There was nothing like the Reformation before the sixteenth century. Earlier efforts at reform had failed. Peter Waldo, the businessman of Lyons, had advocated church renewal in the twelfth century, but his reward had been excommunication and obscurity. Francis of Assisi, the gentle Italian saint, had sought a spiritual revival in Christendom in the thirteenth century, but he succeeded only in establishing a new monastic movement. John Wycliffe, the Oxford professor sometimes described as "the Morning Star of the Reformation," had urged a regeneration of Christianity in the fourteenth century, but his achievements were limited largely to the Lollard sect in Britain. John Hus, the brilliant preacher of the Bethelehem Chapel in the city of Prague, had called for a purification of the church in the fifteenth century, but his voice was silenced and his body was consumed in flames at Constance. A half century later, Girolamo Savonarola, an Italian Dominican monk, had proclaimed repentance in the city of Florence, but, like Hus, he reaped only his own martyrdom. By the end of the fifteenth century, wrote Denys Hay, "Spiritual revival and reform was . . . confined."[4] In the face of four hundred years of frustrated reform efforts the amazing success of Protestantism becomes all the more puzzling.

2. There has been nothing like the Reformation *since* the

sixteenth century. The past four hundred and fifty years have not produced any movement that can compare in both quality and quantity with the Protestant Reformation. The Puritan Revolution of the seventeenth century, though profound in its beneficial impact on Britain and America, did not effect the masses of Continental Christendom. The Methodist Revival of the eighteenth century, fathered by the devout and dedicated John Wesley, resurrected the biblical emphasis on holiness, spread the Gospel among England's poor and America's pioneers, and resulted in a host of social reforms, but its salutary influence was largely confined to the English-speaking nations. The world-missions movement of the nineteenth century, inaugurated by the Baptist cobbler-preacher, William Carey, swept the Atlantic community with a passion for souls, but this awakening, though strong, has subsided, leaving India, China, and much of Africa still unconverted to the Gospel. The ecumenical movement of the twentieth century, described by Archbishop William Temple as "the great new fact of our era," has, nevertheless, after some fifty years failed to produce the results its founders anticipated.

THE ROLE OF SECULAR FORCES

Why then did the Reformation succeed? Some have suggested that its achievements were due to secular forces. Four of these are frequently mentioned.

1. It has been remarked that Protestantism prospered because of the support of the princes and political authorities. These writers point out that the Reformation was not successful where it did not convert the rulers to the Protestant cause. In France, where Francis I and Henry IV refused to establish the Reformed faith, it remained a minority movement. In Spain, where Charles V and Philip II opposed Protestantism, it was virtually eradicated. On the other hand, Protestantism was frequently successful where the magistrates endorsed it. Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elisabeth I nurtured Anglicanism in England. Elector Frederick the Wise protected Luther and Lutheranism in Saxony. Philip sustained Protestantism in Hesse. The town councils of Zurich, Geneva, and Strasbourg respectively upheld Zwingli, Calvin, and Bucer. Gustavus Adolphus defended the Lutheran faith in Sweden and in the Empire. In light of this, some historians have tried to explain the triumph of Protestantism in purely secular terms, and some actionist clergy have advocated that Christians today should seek political power in order to enforce their principles and their programs upon society.

These assumptions, however, fail to grasp the real connection between chancel and chancellery, pulpit and throne in the

Reformation Era. The support of the secular authorities was as often the result of prior evangelical successes as it was a cause of later Protestant growth. According to S. T. Bindoff, writing in *Tudor England,* Henry's

> . . . 'faithful commons' did what he asked them to do, not simply because he asked them to do it, but because it was what they themselves would have done if they, and not he, had been responsible for shaping policy.[5]

Henry VIII was able to establish Anglicanism in England because the leading people of the realm were sufficiently spiritually prepared for a break with Rome by the preaching and teaching of evangelical pastors and professors to support him. The rapid expansion of evangelicalism under Edward VI and its survival during the brutal persecution of Mary Tudor indicates that its strength depended upon more than royal decrees.

In Germany, meanwhile, the Lutheran reformers certainly profited from the protection afforded them by the princes, but Luther steadfastly insisted that the Gospel should not be compromised through political necessities. The Wittenberg professor maintained that

> If the civil magistrate interferes in spiritual matters we must "rather lose our head" than obey. If an emperor or prince asks a man's faith, he must declare it, since it is his duty always to confess his faith before men. But if he commands this or that belief, says Luther, "I would answer, 'Dear sir, mind your secular business.' "[6]

In keeping with this position, Luther steadfastly refused to use the sword to spread Protestantism. At the height of his pamphlet popularity, he might have joined with the Revolt of the Imperial Knights in 1522–1523 to launch civil war in Germany, but Luther did not confuse political with spiritual power. Three years later in 1525 when the social-actionist clergy, such as Thomas Muentzer, were inciting the peasants to revolt to attempt to usher in the Kingdom by violence, Luther carefully drew the sharp distinction between revolution and reformation. At Marburg in 1529 when Prince Philip of Hesse urged Luther and Zwingli to arrive at doctrinal consensus, especially on the Eucharist, so that the theological basis would be present for a Saxon-Swiss military alliance, both reformers refused to compromise spiritual principles for this secular purpose. It can be said, therefore, that the evangelicals in the Empire obtained the support of the princes and town councils, but that this was not done by political intrigue or by doctrinal indifference, but instead by converting the statesmen to the Gospel. The Electors, knights, and councilmen rallied to the

Protestant preachers and teachers because they were convinced, in the words of Swedish King Gustavus Adolphus, that one should "rather die a hundred times than abandon the Gospel." The rulers, therefore, would have been unable to endorse Protestantism had it not already won the hearts of their subjects and, indeed, had it not already captured the allegiance of their own consciences. Governmental favor, necessary in a time when the established Roman Catholic Church frequently relied on secular force to squelch reform, was as often as not a result, rather than a cause, of the success of Protestantism. One cannot, therefore, explain the appeal and power of the Protestant Reformation in purely political terms.

2. It has been observed that Protestantism spread and triumphed because of significant sociological factors. Scholars have indicated that Protestantism expanded along the international trade routes—across the Baltic and North Seas, along the Rhine, and beside the inland trails of commerce. It established itself in the heavily populated areas of Northwestern Europe and thrived in the metropolitan centers of the sixteenth century. Socially inclusive, the Protestant fellowship numbered not only kings and councilmen, but the businessmen of the market, the craftsmen from the guilds, the peasants behind the plow, and the soldiers in the armed forces. Popular among the intellectuals, the evangelical cause was born in a college and won the commitment of students. Bridging the generation gap, it challenged Europe's youth with the Gospel. A "folk movement," the Reformation swept along with mass conversions among the nations of Northern Europe. The social inclusiveness of sixteenth-century evangelicalism has been described by Gordon Rupp as follows:

> And how many and various they were and from all layers of society: from the statesmen and the civic officers, Vadianus, Spengler, Thomas Cromwell, to physicians and lawyers, artists, gentlemen and servants, from noblemen like Caspar Schwenckfeld and von Hutten and Philip of Hesse, from the jobbing gardener, Clement Ziegler of Strasbourg to the cobbler, Hans Sachs of Nuremberg, or the poet, Nicholas Manuel of Bern, and the artists like Albrecht Duerer and Matthaias Gruenwald.[7]

The Reformation, then, was the most socially comprehensive evangelical awakening since the Age of the Apostles. Its inclusiveness, however, like that of pristine Christianity, was due to theological, not sociological, factors. The broader, deeper fellowship prevailing between the classes and the masses was the result, not the cause, of Protestant success. This was because the reformers had a message that transcended earthly

distinctions in the face of the one difference that ultimately matters: whether one is in Christ or not.

3. It has been commented that the Reformation was successful because it employed superior men, measures, and methods. The fathers of Protestantism were surely a gifted minority. Martin Luther was described by Swedish Archbishop Nathan Soederblom as a "religious genius." Ulrich Zwingli was hailed by historian Arthur Cushman McGiffert as a far-seeing visionary who was "the first modern man." John Calvin has been esteemed as one of the five most profound theologians in church history. Philip Melanchthon still stands unmatched in his brilliance as a Christian educator. Thomas Cranmer is yet "the devotional and liturgical genius" of the English language who collects have placed successive generations of Protestants in his debt. Certainly not since Pentecost had such a congregation of leaders appeared in the Church of God.

The reformers were also masters of the communicative arts. They revived powerful, popular public speaking; they restored the ancient practice of hymn-singing, composing texts which proclaimed the Gospel; they re-established vernacular services of worship which were characterized by piety and lay participation; they skillfully utilized the printing press, an invention as new and significant for the sixteenth century as television is for the twentieth, to spread the Word. The "talented tenth" of the Reformation boldly used appropriate methods and measures to disseminate their message.

Men, measures, and methods alone, however, cannot account for the pheonomenal success of the Reformation. A spiritual movement, though assisted by intellectual brilliance and effective public relations, does not derive from them. The fathers of the first century church, like Peter the fisherman and Matthew the tax-collector, were simple men, yet they altered the history of the West more than the philosophers of Athens and the literati of Alexandria. Furthermore, gifted men are not necessarily saintly men. Among the chosen twelve it was Judas, in many ways the most talented, who became an apostate. It could very well be that the reformers became instruments of the Word as much in spite of as because of their many and varied abilities. The intellectual giants of the sixteenth century—as the Italian "men of genius," the Humanists, and the celebrated Erasmus—frequently failed to make the transition from Humanism to Protestantism. Finally, there are men equally gifted as the reformers in nearly every epoch, yet not each generation has a Reformation. The causes of the success of the Reformation rest deeper and must explain why such brilliant men as Luther and Melanchthon devoted their skills to church renewal.

4. It has been written that the Reformation of the sixteenth century succeeded because the time was right. Europe was in a state of great unrest during the era. There was runaway inflation due to the influx of precious metals from the mines of the New World. Strikes, riots, and social upheaval rent the cities and stirred the countryside. Conflict between rival dynastic houses plunged the Continent into the Hapsburg-Valois Wars which extended through the century. While there was competition between the Christian states within Europe for hegemony, there was the constant threat from without of conquest from the East by the Muslim Turks. Europe was ripe for revolution.[8]

This crisis, however, did not necessarily have to lead to a spiritual awakening. It might have ended in class conflict (as occurred in the Russian Revolution of 1917), or in civil strife (as in the French Revolution of 1789), or in a secessionist movement (as in the American Revolution of 1776), or in a constitutional crisis (as in the British Revolution of the 1640's). It resulted, however, in a religious reformation. Why? Because in this particular situation there appeared the right men, men "of God's own choosing," using appropriate methods, witnessing in the strategic places, to win all elements of the populace to a transforming message.

THE ROLE OF BIBLICAL FAITH

The right message—this is the crux of the matter. We continue to remember the reformers not primarily because of their works, which have been eclipsed by more recent events, but because of their confession of faith which remains relevant. The reformers succeeded because they passed beyond the babel of human voices and behind the confusion of history's events to recover the eternal Word of God. Protestantism's patriarchs were, in the fullest meaning of the term, "Radical Theologians."

The reformers were "Radical Theologians" because they uncovered the very roots of the Christian religion in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ ("radical," deriving from the Latin, *radix,* "root"); because they advocated a return to the first principles of the primitive Church ("principle," deriving from the Latin, *principium,* "beginning" or "origin"); because they reverted to the only source and norm of Christian doctrine, the Sacred Scriptures. The Reformers succeeded because they produced a thorough-going "Radical Theology" that consistently insisted on reviving the original message of Christianity—salvation by grace alone through Jesus Christ! If Protestants today are to be equally successful, they must forsake the false gospels of secular and sensationalist

theologians and, like Luther and Melanchthon, "put first things first."

This need to return to the inerrant Word and the pure Gospel has been indicated by the advent of an imitation "Radical Theology" in the last decade. Its presence reveals a need to recover Christianity's primary loyalties; its popularity speaks of a longing, particularly among the young, for an authentic faith stripped of false accretions; its indistinct doctrinal position and its inability to satisfy the soul's deepest hunger testify to its essential lack of perspective and power. It is instructive, however, to compare the "Radical Theology" of the twentieth century with classic Protestantism of the sixteenth to learn why the first is failing and why the latter was filled with success.

1. The "Radical Theology" of the twentieth century starts with the statement that "God is dead" while that of the sixteenth began with the affirmation "God is alive." Surrounded by a scientific-technological culture, twentieth century theologians have often sought to accomodate the ancient confession to modern circumstances by abandoning the supernatural. This is, in effect, the worst kind of materialism, theological naturalism. A process that started in the Enlightenment, it has climaxed in the current generation with the affirmation that even God is expendable for a theologian!

The reformers, on the other hand, in the midst of the secular, self-confident society of the Renaissance, preached God's absolute sovereignty and man's total dependence upon Him. Luther saw God as sovereign because of His amazing grace which alone was powerful enough to absolve and transform human personality. Zwingli saw God as sovereign because of His abundant energy and creative might displayed in the world of nature. Calvin saw God as sovereign because of His intelligent direction of the events of history to accomplish His eternal purpose. The reformers thus spoke to the new psychology, science, and history of their day by showing how God lives and rules in the realms of personality, nature, and society. In doing this, the Protestant fathers returned to the initial and fundamental affirmation of biblical faith: "God is."

The Scriptures commence with the testimony, "In the beginning God," and they close with Christ's promise, "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end" (Rev. 22:13). When Moses, early in the Old Testament revelation, asked God His Name, the Lord replied, "I am who I am," thus revealing His perpetual presence and power. God, the Eternal Contemporary, was called by the Israelites *Elohim,* a name conveying the concepts of preeminence and strength. Syrian Christians centuries later used a similar Semitic root, *Alaha,* the "Sovereign One," as the

name of God. Jesus opened His model prayer with a confession of faith in "Our Father, who art in heaven." The Apostles' Creed begins with the affirmation, "I believe in God the Father Almighty." The first commandment is a similar statement of the unity and omnipotent sovereignty of God: "I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no other gods before Me." Luther in his explanation of this injunction expounds the very first principle of religion: "We should fear, love, and trust in God above all things." The Heidelberg Catechism in similar fashion taught that the chief end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever. The reformers thus returned to what Jesus, in His commentary on the Law, called "the great and first commandment," the invitation to "love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind" (Matthew 22:37).

The corollary of this commandment is the confession of man's total dependence upon God. Modern technology and material prosperity have done little to eliminate man's need for the Lord. On the contrary, wrote the British Methodist pastor-teacher, C. Cyril Eastwood,

> . . . every new discovery increases our moral and spiritual responsiblity. The truth is: man is now more dependent upon God, not less. His fundamental needs have not changed, neither has God's capacity to supply them. In every age God hands to man a new key that he may unlock the door to greater wonders. . . . Does this mean that man is now good enough to handle this new gift? Certainly not. Man is never good enough to handle God's great gifts. God does not wait until man is good enough. That is the essence of grace. God gives in love and expects man to receive in faith.

2. The "Radical Theology" of the twentieth century states that "God is silent" while that of the sixteenth was assured that "God speaks." Contemporary theology, intimidated by "scientific semantics" and philosophical linguistics, has come to question the ability of man to say anything meaningful about God. Historical criticism has increased the loss of confidence; modern theologians have researched, reduced, demythologized, and remythologized Scripture to the point that no clear proclamation remains. The reformers on the other hand, asserted that the Scriptures are the very Word of God.

Humanism, with its concern for rhetoric, manuscripts, and the ancient tongues, paved the way for the Biblical Renaissance. Lorenzo Valla, a Humanist writer employed by the Pope, prepared *Notes* on the Greek New Testament for scholars. Cardial Ximenes of Spain had the *Complutensian Polyglot* compiled for the use of his students. Erasmus of

Rotterdam produced a remarkably error-free edition of the text of the Greek New Testament for the priests. This historical-grammatical study of Scripture resulted in the revival of the biblical languages, the appearance of a purer text of the canon, and the publication of many aids for Bible study. For the Humanists, however, the critical method too frequently replaced the message, and so, in the pattern of Erasmus, they often failed to pass from documentary research to doctrinal reform. It was Luther who was to go beyond the method to the message, behind manuscript study to the Saving Master, from the critical apparatus to the appearance of Christ.

Luther's career, like that of Erasmus, began in a monastic cell in the scholarly study of Scripture. To Luther, as to his contemporaries, God at first seemed silent and distant. There was no Word of certainty—only the conflict words of tradition, reason, philosophy, councils, decretals, and commentaries. While preparing lectures on Romans, Galatians, and the Psalms, however, Luther discovered that he was dealing with something other than ancient religious documents. In the canon Luther encountered Christ and learned the meaning of the Master's words, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me" (John 5:39). For Luther the Bible was the very Word of God, for in Scripture "Christ speaks" (*Christus loquens*). Study of the Bible ceased to be just an academic enterprise—it become a personal conversation between Luther and his Lord. Dr. Carl Henry, long-time editor of *Christianity Today,* was persuaded that just as Luther believed that Christ was "in, with, and under" the earthly elements of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper to assure the sinner of salvation, so the Wittenberg reformer was also convinced that the Master was "in, with, and under" the words and text of Sacred Scripture to summon men to faith and to bestow on them the Holy Spirit.[10]

This discovery of the Word of God, what Dr. Henry calls "the inscripturated Christ," solved for Luther the problem of the silent and distant Deity. Since the Ascension, Christ, the Personal Word, is present among the faithful in the Written Word of Scripture and in the Sacramental Word of Baptism and the Eucharist. These two—Word and Sacrament—are the "means of grace" whereby forgiveness is proclaimed and the Church is called into existence. Apart from the Scriptures and the Sacraments there is no Church, no salvation, no Word, no Christ. Luther's position on Scripture implies that Christ's presence is now *mediate,* not *im*mediate.

This teaching has saved Lutheran Protestantism from two dangers: (1.) It has dispelled the temptation to heed false prophecy. The "Spiritualists" of the Reformation Era sought an

immediate word from the Lord apart from the Scriptures. This quest for voices and visions resulted in a demonic summons to heresy and revolutionary violence, as is illustrated in the life of Thomas Muentzer and the strange career of "the Meunster Saints." (2.) This teaching has also checked the natural tendency to substitute the traditions of men for the Word of God. The Church of the Middle Ages allowed this tendency free rein. Nineteenth-century divines, more influenced by the spirit of the age than by the Spirit of the Scriptures, spoke of a "progressive," "continuing," or "evolving revelation." The revelation of God's will is by no means complete, they taught; rather, it is a gradual process unfolding itself in the Church. The Church becomes the creator of the Word rather than the creature of the Word. The real order of events is thus inverted. Since Scripture becomes the "supreme good work of the Church," justification by grace alone becomes unthinkable. Works-righteousness reigns supreme.

In actuality, however, the Word creates the Church. Here is the fundamental reason for the success of the Reformation—the recovery of Scripture. Luther explained his accomplishments in such terms:

> Take me, for example. I opposed indulgences and all papists, but never by force. I simply taught, preached, wrote God's Word; otherwise I did nothing. And then while I slept or drank Wittenberg beer with my Philip and my Amsdorf, the Word so greatly weakened the Papacy that never a prince or Emperor did such damage to it. I did nothing. The Word did it all.[11]

The success of the Reformation-ministry of Luther and his colleagues confirmed anew the promise of the Lord through his prophet Isaiah (55: 10,11):

> For as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return not thither but water the earth, making it bring forth and sprout, giving seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goes forth from my mouth; it shall not return to me empty, but it shall accomplish that which I purpose, and prosper in the thing for which I sent it.

In this text and in its application to sixteenth-century Europe there is a powerful lesson for the Church today. God grant that we may have "ears to hear."

FOOTNOTES

1. Rudolf Eucken, *Can We Still Be Christians?* as quoted by Walter S. Gamertsfelder and D. Luther Evans, *Fundamentals of Philosophy* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1930), p. 620.

2. Gerhard Ritter, "Why the Reformation Occurred in Germany," in Lewis W. Spitz, editor, *The Reformation: Material or Spiritual?* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company), 1967, pp. 68-73.
3. J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century,* translated from the French by H. White (New York: American Tract Society, 1849), I, p. 18.
4. Denys Hay, "The Background of the Reformation," in Joel Hurstfield, editor, *The Reformation Crisis* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965), p. 15.
5. S. T. Bindoff, *Tudor England* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1952), V, 98.
6. John T. McNeill, *Christian Hope for World Society* (Chicago: Willett, Clark, and Company, 1937), p. 105.
7. Gordon Rupp, *The Old Reformation and the New* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 20, 21.
8. This is the thesis of Harold J. Grimm, long-time Professor of History at The Ohio State University. See *The Reformation Era, 1500-1650,* second edition (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1973), pp. 1, 2.
9. C. Cyril Eastwood, *Life and Thought in the Ancient World* (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1964), p. 49.
10. Personal conversation between the author and Carl Henry, July 12, 1967. Compare these comments with the Solid Declaration, Article VII, "Lord's Supper," in Theodore G. Tappert, et al, translators and editors, *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 575.
11. Quoted by Gordon Rupp, *The Old Reformation and the New,* p. 9. For a fuller treatment of the role of the Word in the Reformation, see C. George Fry, "The Reformation as an Evangelistic Movement," *Christianity Today* XIII (October 25, 1968), pp. 9-11.

Was Erasmus Responsible for Luther? A Study of the Relationship of the Two Reformers and Their Clash Over the Question of the Will

TERRENCE M. REYNOLDS
Highlands, Michigan

In the early years of the Reformation, it was often charged by the monks that Erasmus had prepared the way and was responsible for Martin Luther. Erasmus, they said, had laid the egg, and Luther had hatched it.[1] Erasmus wittily dismissed the charge, claiming that Luther had hatched a different bird entirely. Yet, despite Erasmus' protests to the contrary, his part in the development of the Reformation did more to promote Luther's spirit than even Erasmus himself was able to realize. The spirit of reform drove Erasmus years before the Ninety-Five Theses were posted at Wittenberg; in his early writings, Erasmus clearly denounced clerical abuses and called for change, thereby putting himself in the forefront of the Reformation. However, with the dramatic rise of Luther there came charges from both sides; Erasmus was declared a Lutheran, or else he was said to be a Papist. Pressure from his Catholic acquaintances and the violent turn of the Reformation finally forced Erasmus to take up his pen against Luther, an action which enabled the key theological issue to be brought into the open. Erasmus' *Diatribe on the Freedom of the Will* sparked Luther to heights of violent clarity in his reply, *The Bondage of the Will.* Therein, Luther explored in depth the fundamental dogmatic stumbling-block to a peaceful settlement with Rome. Unwittingly, then, Erasmus had ripped away the last vestige of hope for rapprochement and truly paved the way for the Lutheran Reformation. It will be the purpose of this paper to examine briefly the early reforming activities of Erasmus, and the pressures which were brought upon him to write against Martin Luther. Then we shall discuss the issues involved in *The Bondage of the Will,* showing that Erasmus, although not consciously, to a large extent was responsible for the rise of Luther and the subsequent success of the Reformation.

To attempt to trace the early life of Erasmus would require far greater length than would suit the purpose of this discussion. However, certain aspects of his life are worthy of note. An

illegitimate son of a priest and a physician's daughter[2] born around 1466, Erasmus was housed and educated by the Brethren of the Common Life, and experience which was to have an enormous impact on his life.[3] The monks whom he met while in residence had a twofold effect: on the one hand, they discouraged worldly learning (for which they were later called "barbarous" by Erasmus),[4] yet they also deeply instilled in him a passion for the *Via Moderna,*[5] and sparked his constant quest for Christian piety. It would be too simple to say that the Brethren of the Common Life were responsible for the development of such a giant as Erasmus, but their great influence, both positively and negatively, is simply too significant to be overlooked.

After leaving the monastery, he took great pains to educate himself in the humanities and classics, precisely those things which were denied him by the monks. By the time he felt compelled to take up his pen against the abuses in the Roman Church, he had established a firm reputation as one of the most learned men in all of Europe.[6] It followed, therefore, that when Erasmus eloquently expressed his concerns about the Church, he was read and digested by all the leaders of the day.

In short, the purpose of Erasmus' reforming activities was to overthrow the obscurantism, superstition, corruption, and moral laxity in the Church, and to return to the "Christian philosophy" of the Scriptures.[7] In 1504 *The Enchiridion* was published. In it Erasmus rejected the invocation of the saints, fasting, and indulgences,[8] and added some particularly biting words for the monks: "Monasticism is not godliness, but a kind of life, either useful or useless to anyone depending on one's habit of body and of temperament."[9] More importantly, however, Erasmus went to great lengths to outline the Christian life.

As one reviews this early work, it is hardly difficult to understand why the freedom of the will was to erupt as a major issue some twenty years later. Throughout *The Enchiridion,* Erasmus exhorts the reader to use the weapons of Christian warfare, prayer and knowledge,[10] as he fights the evil foe and strives for piety and salvation. As he explains it, the Divine Spirit "lowers herself to your humility, yet you on the other hand are to rise up to her sublimity."[11] Among the Rules for True Christianity which follow, are advice to undertake the way of salvation, to love Christ and aspire heavenward, to remember the rewards offered by God and Satan for one's life, and to always fear impenitence.[12] Clearly, the spirit of Erasmus, even as early as 1504, was not in harmony with the chief tenets of the upcoming Martin Luther.

In some of his later works, Erasmus is equally as harsh. *The*

Praise of Folly (1509) and his *Colloquies* (1518) repeated and increased the attacks found in *The Enchiridion,* and also levelled some sharp criticism at the scholastic theologians, labelling them as "intellectual monsters." He went on to condemn the luxury of the successors of the Apostles, auricular confession, trust in the Virgin Mary, and the worship of relics.[13] In fact, his criticisms were so powerful that Jose Chapiro, an Erasmus scholar, speaks of them in the following manner:

> He attacked all the orders so effectively that it took a long period of counter-reform for them to rehabilitate themselves . . . From top to bottom of the ecclesiastical ladder, from the pope to the humblest priest, he stung them with his sarcasm and his criticism . . .[14]

The more one reads in Erasmus, the more one is struck by his sharp wit and genuine desire to reform his Church. An initial reaction would be great surprise and wonder that two men such as Luther and Erasmus, both filled with Christian piety and a reforming spirit could set upon one another and become bitter foes. Yet the nature of the men themselves and the nature of the times was such that a confrontation became inevitable. It could be said that their confrontation was a result of the Reformation, and also that it resulted in the Reformation. For the spirit of the day forced their dialogue, and their dialogue, in turn, prompted further controversy.

Erasmus' introduction to Luther came in a letter from Spalatin, a mutual friend, in 1516. Spalatin mentioned to Erasmus that a local monk named Luther had questioned Erasmus' understanding of the fifth chapter of Romans, and suggested that he read St. Augustine more carefully on the matter. This seemingly unimportant letter takes on great significance when one realizes that Romans 5 deals with justification, and it was over the will, so closely tied in with justification, that the two later clashed. It has been suggested that Luther already sensed the depth and meaning of the disagreement.[15]

After 1517 and the posting of the Ninety-Five Theses, Erasmus heard a great deal more of Luther and was favorably impressed. In a letter of 1518 Erasmus noted that he had heard good reports of Luther, adding that most of his theses were approved by all.[16] In 1519 he waote to Albert, the Archbishop of Mainz: "The impression of Luther one gets . . . is that of a man who was culpably rash, but who had been provoked beyond endurance."[17]

Basically, Erasmus was in favor of seeing to it that Luther received a fair hearing, and that his justifiable complaints would be dealt with properly. Yet the Church reacted almost hysterically

to Luther's writings, and did everything within its power to silence him. This offended Erasmus' sense of propriety, and in a letter to Frederick the Wise in 1519, he lamented the situation:

> I cannot pass on his opinions because I have barely leafed through his books. I know of no one who does not commend his life. He is free from avarice and ambition . . . Yet no one admonishes him, no one instructs, no one corrects. They simply cry heresy.[18]

Finally, in 1520, the Church issued the bull of excommunication to Luther, a gesture which Erasmus angrily described as "appalling, breathing rather the savagery of the Mendicants than the spirit of the gentle Pope Leo."[19]

Despite his apparent sympathies, it would be a distortion to portray Erasmus as a staunch supporter of Luther from 1517 to 1520. All along Erasmus had reservations about Luther that became increasingly strong as the struggle progressed. Throughout these years, many hoped that the two vanguards of reform, that of peaceful, non-doctrinal Humanism and that of assertive Augustinianism, could join forces, but this was never to be.[20] Erasmus could never find it in himself to accede to the wishes of other reformers and throw his complete support behind Luther.[21] For one thing, Erasmus was never very fond of Luther's language, thinking it to be too vehement in tone, and such that it often rendered reconciliation difficult, if not impossible.[22] In December of 1520 Luther publicly burned the bull of excommunication, thereby upsetting Erasmus immensely. To his mind such an act was totally unnecessary and dreadfully theatrical.[23] When he read the *Babylonian Captivity* and *The Address to the German Nobility,* which both appeared in the same year, Erasmus saw his worst fears realized and commented, "The malady is incurable."[24]

The year 1520 was a decisive one. In the *Babylonian Captivity* and *The Address to the Christian Nobility,* Luther had attacked the very heart of the papal system. Writing to a friend, Erasmus anxiously said,

> If only Luther had taken my advice . . . I shall not become mixed up in this tragic affair. . .[25] I would be happy to be a martyr for Christ, but I cannot be a martyr for Luther.[26]

Unfortunately, events from 1520 to 1524 would not allow Erasmus to remain uninvolved. With Luther having officially been declared a heretic, tremendous pressure was brought to bear upon Erasmus by the adherents of Rome to refute him publicly. In fact, at least one scholar has suggested that the history of Erasmus' involvement in the Lutheran troubles from the beginning of 1520 to September of 1524 could be written in terms of this demand and his reactions to it.[27]

In the course of those years Erasmus was attacked violently from both sides. From the Lutheran quarter came a bitter denunciation from Ulrich Von Hutten, an emotional German knight. He accused Erasmus of cowardice, asserting that Erasmus was a Lutheran at heart, but was too timid to admit it.[28] From the Roman side the words were no less cutting. Aleander, a Papal envoy and sworn enemy of Erasmus, called him "the great cornerstone of the Lutheran heresy."[29] Duke George of Southern Saxony was incensed at Luther's endorsement of Huss, and accused Erasmus of not writing against Luther because he agreed with him.[30] Tunstall, the Bishop of London, urged Erasmus to write, and Henry VIII himself pressed him to repudiate Luther, even suggesting the question of the will as a suitable theme for his essay.[31] To add insult to injury, the poor humanist was accused of writing the *Babylonian Captivity*.[32] "I am a heretic to both sides," he is said to have complained.[33]

Finally, in January of 1523, Erasmus received a crucial letter from Pope Adrian VI. In what amounted to a polite ultimatum, the Pope praised Erasmus as "the one to refute the heresies of Martin Luther by which innumerable souls are being taken to damnation."[34] He made it clear in his letter that the way for Erasmus to justify the Papal confidence and also demonstrate his oft-professed loyalty was to write against Luther.[35] It is a tribute to the strength of the man that he politely refused the Pope, but the pressures had become nearly unbearable. Clearly, if Erasmus hoped to remain in the Roman Church, he would have to write something against Luther; so he chose as his theme that which had been suggested by the King of England, the freedom of the will.

Before beginning work on the *Diatribe,* however, Erasmus published two tracts, *On the Immense Mercy of God* and *Inquisitio de Fide,* which were designed to explain the difference between fundamental and non-essential doctrines.[36] With an eye ever open for reconciliation and peace, Erasmus hoped that these tracts would serve to point out the fundamental agreement of Lutherans and Roman Catholics. In *Inquisitio de Fide,* which appeared only six months before the *Diatribe,* Aulus (a Roman Catholic) questions Barbatius (a Lutheran) on his understanding of the articles of the Apostles' Creed. Barbatius and Aulus agree wholeheartedly on the meaning of the Creed, and Aulus is prompted to ask him, "How comes it about, then, that there is so great a war between you and the orthodox?" Barbatius answers, "Why, indeed?"[37] This was the question asked by Erasmus as he prepared to discuss a "non-essential" matter in his *Diatribe.*

The attitudes of the two men on the brink of this dialogue

could hardly have been more dissimilar. Erasmus had been pressured and was not anxious to write. He still respected Luther, and did not want to harm his efforts too seriously. He expressed this feeling in a letter to Spalatin in 1523: ". . . should Luther go under, neither God nor man could longer endure the monks; nor can Luther perish without jeopardizing a great part of the whole truth."[38] Erasmus was also wise enough to sense the fruitlessness of his effort. R. B. Drummond explains:

> He knew well that he would do no good by it, that he would only exasperate the reform party, who already sufficiently distrusted him; and whether he could satisfy even the less violent adherents of the Papacy, must have seemed to him very doubtful.[39]

He also knew that was not physically or emotionally fit for such a struggle. He had sought peace all of his life, and now as an old man he was not anxious to enter the arena of polemics.[40] He regarded the question of the will as a non-essential matter, yet he opposed Luther because he sincerely opposed dogmas and definitions in religion and the exclusiveness which he felt they promoted.[41] Craig Thompson, in his introduction the the *Inquisitio de Fide,* explains Erasmus' feelings on the issue at hand:

> When he came to write *De Libero Arbitrio,* he chose a topic which he knew to be paramount to Luther but to which he himself could not attach the same importance. To him the problem of the will, though important, was not comparable in importance with the articles of the Creed, nor should differences over that very difficult question be permitted to jeopardize the harmony of the Church.[42]

Luther, on the other hand, saw the bound will as a basic tenet of the Christian faith. In fact, in *The Bondage of the Will* Luther praises Erasmus for attacking at "The essential issue," "the jugular vein" of his theology.[43] At the time of their debate, Luther was in his prime, a robust, powerful man. Unlike Erasmus, he was willing to risk his own well-being and the well-being of the existing order for the assertions which he saw to be clear in Scripture. As he wrote to Erasmus, "You with your peace-loving theology, you don't care about the truth. Suppose the world does go to smash. God can make another world."[44] Such a willingness to risk everything for the sake of a belief was a trait that was quite foreign to his opponent. In addition, Luther delighted in the battle of ideas. He thrived upon such struggles. Martin Bucer, a close associate of Luther's, once described this quality as he had observed it: "An almost deathly shudder runs down my back when I recall the

fury that boils up within the man as soon as he comes face to face with an opponent."[45] When Luther was involved in controversy, he was fully at ease; when Erasmus entered such struggles, his sense of values weighed him down with regret. Thus, when Luther and Erasmus crossed swords, it was a clash between Humanism and the Reformation.

After extended preparation, perhaps because Erasmus hoped to make his work unanswerable,[46] the *Diatribe on the Freedom of the Will* appeared in September of 1524. The work, according to J. I. Packer, a translator of *The Bondage of the Will,* can be divided into three parts. The first two speak of the personalities of Luther and Erasmus, and the last, and most significant, deals with the question of the will.[47]

As Erasmus describes Luther, he is a bit cranky, somewhat conceited, and lacking in a sense of proportion. Erasmus presents himself as reasonable, tolerant, and ever in search of peace.[48] In fact, he insists, on several occasions, that he would prefer avoiding the discussion altogether, rather than engage in a distasteful battle of assertions. Erasmus was a fine classical scholar, but he was not a systematic theologian, and he knew it.[49] Perhaps this helps further to explain his reluctance to enter the dialogue in the first place. Before setting forth his position, Erasmus humbly stated:

> There will be no invective . . . I merely want to analyze and not to judge, to inquire and not to dogmatize. I am ready to learn from anyone who advances something more accurate or more reliable, though I would rather persuade mediocre minds not to argue too stubbornly on such matters. It harms Christian concord more than it helps piety.[50]

Having established his purposes, Erasmus proceeded to discuss the will.

In his writing of the *Diatribe,* it is important to understand that Erasmus was proceeding on the mistaken notion that Luther's view of the will made man into an automaton, a creature incapable of any decision-making. This was not the case, as will be shown later, but this misunderstanding made the debate unnecessarily sharp and bitter.[51] In order to appreciate what was said on both sides, it seems appropriate to examine how each of the reformers viewed the process of salvation. This approach should serve to bring to light each man's estimation of the power of the will in this most crucial of concerns, eternal salvation. After all, Erasmus defined free will as "the power to apply to or turn away from that which leads unto salvation."[52]

Logically, the first place to begin is with the condition of mankind subsequent to the Fall. Only when one understands

the nature of man can he begin to determine what man is capable of doing for himself, and what must be done for him from without. As Erasmus views man, he sees a creature damaged by sin, to be sure, but not totally corrupted by it. Man's free choice, he insists, is obscured by sin, but is not extinguished by it. To prove his point, Erasmus is determined

> to make full use of the Fathers who say that there are certain seeds of virtue implanted in the minds of men by which they in some way see and seek after virtue, but mingled with grosser affections which incite them to other things.[53]

Thus, he pictures man as a creature with the ability to do either good or evil; all depends upon his choice. Hermann Saase criticizes Erasmus at this point, claiming that "he has never been able to understand the depth of human sin."[54]

Having posited man as only partially corrupted by sin, Erasmus is logically able to allow man to cooperate with God's grace in his own salvation. This process is explained by Erasmus in a fashion reminiscent of Thomas Aquinas, a strange style for a man who claims to abhor the Scholastics. Like Thomas, Erasmus is unwilling to say that either God's grace or man's merit is entirely responsible for man's salvation; so he chooses an intermediate theory. God's grace is said to be very active in the process, but it must have reference to some sort of merit on the part of man. Although he does not use Thomistic terminology, Erasmus seems to be distinguishing between merit (*meritum de condigno*) and approximate merit (*meritum de congruo*), which is a distinction commonly made by the Scholastics.[55] Like Luther, Erasmus agrees that genuine merit does not exist, but he argues that God, in his boundless mercy, treats the lesser merit as though it were the greater. In effect, then, a man who does his best on the level of the *meritum de congruo* is given the gift of a special grace whereby he can eventually achieve genuine merit. Mann Phillips describes this process in simpler terms:

> Just as the general is said to win the battle, but the soldiers are not unimportant, or the architect is said to build the house, but the bricklayers have done their part, so in all good actions the inspiration and completion are of God, but man co-operates by opening his mind to God's grace.[56]

Erasmus distinguishes three parts of each action: the initial inspiration, the continuation, and the successful achievement. It is only in the second, the continuation, that man's free will is said to be of any avail. It is essential to point out that when Erasmus speaks of the cooperation of the human will with grace, he never fails to mention that grace must come first:

"Yet . . . in consenting, grace and human will act together, but in such a way that grace is the principle cause, and the secondary cause our will."[57]

When Erasmus speaks of grace in the *Diatribe,* he distinguishes between several kinds. The first type, he says, is possessed by all men by nature. Despite his fall, man continues to be preserved by God, and, even though he has been corrupted by sin, man still retains his freedom to do as he chooses. This is a basic type of grace which Erasmus thinks is forgotten by too many of us. The second type of grace he calls extraordinary grace. With this grace God moves the undeserving sinner to contrition. As the sinner is affected by this grace, he becomes dissatisfied with himself and becomes capable of improving his way of life. This grace too is offered to all men, but if they are to experience true repentance and renewal of life, they must attach their will to it and strive for betterment. If a man devotes his will to the task, a third grace is applied by God, allowing him to succeed. This, in effect, is a sanctifying grace. The final grace is that which offers salvation for his efforts. Erasmus calls these varieties of grace natural grace, operative or efficient grace, and a grace which leads to the final goal.[58] Despite the vast powers of God's grace, Erasmus firmly states that, "No one perishes except through his own fault."[59]

In reading the *Diatribe* one cannot help but be struck by Erasmus' treatment of Pelagianism. Pelagius taught, in the fourth century, that no new grace was needed once it liberated and healed the free will of man. This view was condemned, yet the Scholastic theologians held to a view of salvation which can only be described as Semi-Pelagian. Erasmus supports a similar position. In the *Diatribe,* he makes the rewards of salvation a direct result of man's merits: "If man does nothing, there is no room for merits; when there is no room for merits, there is no room for punishments or rewards . . ."[60] To this he adds, "If man does all, there is no room for grace."[61] His confidence in the powers of man echoes the words of St. Thomas, who said, "Man has free will; otherwise counsel, exhortation, precept, prohibition, reward and punishment would all be in vain."[62] This point was to Erasmus one of the strongest arguments in favor of the free will. He cannot understand the meaning of Scripture if it exhorts man to do that which he is incapable of performing.

His attempts to establish the freedom of the will are somehat obfuscated by his attempt to refute the supposed elements of necessitarianism in Luther as well. At times, this goal leads Erasmus to argue at cross-purposes, but he may only be reflecting the prevailing lack of clarity on this issue in his

time.[63] In his arguments, he relies heavily on common sense and reason. He examines Scripture and argues that over six hundred exhortations to godliness contained therein are clear proof of man's freedom to choose the will of God.[64]. He further illustrates his position with the story of the prodigal son, which he interprets in this way:

> What signifies the son speaking to himself, planning to confess and return home? It signifies the will of man turning towards grace, which has stimulated him . . . What signifies the father who hastens to meet his son? He signifies the grace of God which furthers our will so that we can accomplish that which we wish.[65]

In his conclusion to this section, Erasmus seems uncharacteristically assertive:

> We oppose those who conclude like this: "Man is unable to do anything unless God's grace helps him. Therefore there are no good works of man." We propose the rather more acceptable conclusion: Man is able to accomplish all things, if God's grace aids him. Therefore it is possible that all works of men be good.[66]

The strange similarity of these two conclusions helps illustrate the difficulty which Erasmus encounters in attempting to explain the relationship of the will and grace.

Perhaps, as Roland Bainton suggests, Erasmus' deepest concern is over the doctrine of predestination,[67] which is a logical consequence of a justification entirely by grace. If salvation results from a gift, predestination must follow. Erasmus, "untrammeled by logic," as Bainton puts it,[68] calls predestination a monstrous doctrine. This was certainly a key issue in his disagreement with Luther. Sensing his inability to argue the case convincingly, Erasmus anxiously adds the following:

> . . . I would ask that the reader will also consider whether it is reasonable to condemn the opinion of so many doctors of the Church, which the consensus of so many centuries and peoples has approved, and to accept in their stead certain paradoxes on account of which the Christian world is now in an uproar.[69]

When the *Diatribe* was released, the reaction was much as Erasmus had anticipated. Few were pleased.[70] In a letter to Spalatin, Luther complained, "I can't tell you how I loathe the Treatise on Free Will; I have not yet read more than a few pages of it. It is unpleasant to me to have to reply to so unlearned a book by so learned a man."[71] Other reports indicate that Luther called the book "stupid, impious, blasphemous, ignorant and hypocritical,"[72] and wished to throw it into the fire.[73] Had it not been for problems in Germany with Carlstadt

and other enthusiasts, Luther probably would have answered it immediately. However, more than a year passed, exciting in many the false hope that Erasmus had written an unanswerable book.[74] These hopes were dashed in December of 1525 when Luther published *The Bondage of the Will,* a vehement rejection of the *Diatribe.*

As one would expect, Luther thoroughly rejects Erasmus' distaste for assertions. To Erasmus' plea for peace in doctrinal matters, Luther replies, "Take away assertions, and you take away Christianity." [75] After taking Erasmus to task for his loose treatment of Scripture[76] and for his willingness to abide by faulty decisions of the Church for the sake of concord,[77] Luther launches into the subject of the will. For one thing, Luther criticizes Erasmus for using contradictory definitions of free will. The original definition by Erasmus was "the power to apply or turn away from that which leads unto salvation," and Erasmus set out to prove that man has such power. He later admitted in several places, however, that the will, apart from grace, is not free to perform truly good acts, although with grace it can do all things. Luther justifiably exposes this contradiction:[78]

> Throughout your treatment you forget that you said that "free-will" can do nothing without grace, and you prove that "free-will can do all things without grace! . . . This you did not undertake to prove and, indeed, have denied. Consequently, "proofs" of this sort are nothing but disproofs of the strongest kind. . . . Indeed, the Diatribe itself maintains the same as I do when it asserts that "free-will" by its own strength can will no good, and necessarily serves sin—even though it lays this down in the course of proving the exact opposite![79]

There can be no question that Erasmus seemed to lose sight of that which he was trying to prove, thereby opening a deep wound in his argument.

A fundamental point of difference between Erasmus and Luther is over the condition of man subsequent to the Fall. As we have seen, Erasmus views the damage as partial; Luther feels that it is far more extensive. In fact, Luther feels that the Fall has left man in a perpetual state of sin.[80] Man is not capable of meeting the demands of God, who calls for purity of heart, self-effacement, and complete obedience to the divine will.[81] The effect of the Fall has been that man's back has been turned upon God, leaving him totally unable to please God in matters relating to salvation. The impossibility of man's situation is that the Law requires absolute obedience; salvation by the Law can only come by way of a perfect life. With his back turned to God, man can never fulfill these requirements.

Packer explains that ". . . the truth about him is that deliberately, spontaneously, heartily, voluntarily, he always chooses the way of noncompliance and nonconformity when the full demands of the Law confront him."[82] The question of the condition of man is one which Luther feels to be at the very core of the Gospel. He clearly sees that if man is not totally fallen into sin, there is no longer any need for a Redeemer. This is a concern which he feels very deeply:

> And, finally, if we believe that Christ redeemed men by His blood, we are forced to confess that all of man was lost; otherwise, we make Christ either wholly superfluous, or else the redeemer of the least valuable part of man only; which is blasphemy, and sacrilege.[83]

There is no place in Luther's system for a virtuous man; so there can be no place for merit either. He feels that merit is a completely non-Scriptural, man-made notion which does little more than mislead sincere people. As a result, he tears it apart with the same fervor with which he glorifies Christ:

> . . . what will the guardians of "free-will" say to what follows: "being justified freely by His grace"? What does "freely" mean? How will endeavor, and merit, accord with freely given rightousness? Perhaps they will here say that they assign to "free-will" as little as possible, not by any means condign merit. But these are empty words . . . Paul here gives the answer—there is no such thing as merit at all, but all that are justified are justified freely, and this is ascribed to nothing but the grace of God.[84]

Luther also sees, unlike Erasmus, that the allowance of merit, however minimal, detracts from the power of grace, and from the work of Christ. In Luther's eyes, one either denies merit and works, or else one denies the grace of God. To opt for a combination of the two is to opt for a humanistic distortion of the Gospel which has no basis other than the imagination of man. The two simply cannot be permitted to stand together:

> So, either it is false that we receive our grace for the grace of another, or else it is apparent that "free-will" is nothing; for these two positions cannot stand together, that the grace of God is both so cheap that it may be gained anywhere and everywhere by a little endeavor on the part of any man, and so dear that it is given to us only in and through the grace of this one great man![85]

Along with this flat denial of merit, Luther seeks to reject the Semi-Pelagianism which he finds inherent in Erasmus' thought. He feels that Erasmus and other proponents of the free will are dishonest in their discussion of merit and will not straightforwardly say what they mean. He states:

> . . . the Pelagians confess and assert condign merit . . . candidly and honestly, calling a spade a spade and teaching what they really hold. But our friends here, who hold and teach the same view, try to fool us with lying words and false appearances, giving out that they disagree with the Pelagians, when there is nothing that they are further from doing![86]

Harry McSorley, the Roman Catholic historian and theologian, thinks that Luther may have pressed his dislike for Semi-Pelagianism too far. He feels that Luther, in his legitimate desire to deny the freedom of the sinner to do anything truly good, actually eliminates man's free decision even in the sins which he commits.[87] He claims that Luther "carefully and deliberately avoids explaining sin in terms of man's free will."[88] McSorley goes on to say that it is precisely in terms of man's responsibility for his actions and the origin of evil in God's good creation that each theological rejection of free will must justify itself.[89] In effect, McSorley is saying that Luther, by taking free will away from man makes God the originator of evil.[90] In actuality, however, Luther maintains man's responsibility for his actions and the existence of evil. If one examines Luther's complete theology of man, the answers are forthcoming. Man is in a condition of sin; there is nothing that he can do to remove himself from it. He may choose freely to perform an act of civil righteousness, or he may choose not to do so. But such freedom and such choices are non-spiritual matters. Man's decisions are based on motivations other than God's will. Yet in all of his actions, man is held responsible, for all of these actions are sins in the eyes of God. A life built upon such actions alone leads to eternal damnation. Man, therefore, apart from God, has no choice but to sin,[91] yet he remains responsible for it. McSorley is correct in stating that Luther cannot say that man *freely* chooses sin. But this is hardly a fatal criticism when one takes into account that Paul cannot say it either.

However, Luther would say that the first man, Adam, did have this complete freedom, and freely chose to do that which was evil, or contrary to God's will. This choice resulted in the Fall of man,[92] the enormous consequences of which even McSorley seems unable to grasp. The freedom which Adam misused is no longer ours to enjoy, for we are bound to sinfulness from the time of our origin.[93] Perhaps what McSorley is seeking from Luther is an answer to the question of why Adam chose evil, or why God holds all men accountable for his choice. Here Luther's concept of the "hidden God," the *Deus Absconditus,* is properly employed. Luther says that he simply cannot answer such questions:

> If God does not desire our death, it must be laid to the charge of our own will if we perish;. . . For He desires that all men should be saved, in that He comes to all by the word of salvation, and the fault is in the will which does not receive him;. . . But why the Majesty does not remove or change this fault of will in every man (for it is not in the power of man to do it), or why He lays this fault to the charge of the will, when men cannot avoid it, it is not lawful to ask; and though you should ask much, you would never find out; as Paul says in Rom. 11: "Who art thou that replies against God?"[92]

Perhaps, in this case, Luther is not so much in error for not answering this question as McSorley is for asking it.

Contrary to Erasmus' understanding, Luther does accept the existence of a free will in all matters unrelated to the spiritual. Within this lower sphere, he allows man freedom to do whatever he chooses. He can go out or come in as he pleases, milk the cow or not do so, and generally carry on any way he chooses.[95] But these actions have absolutely no bearing on salvation. Man's freedom of the will ends, for Luther, as soon as one begins to discuss spiritual concerns. Luther is very much to the point in his rejection of a virtuous free will. He quotes Paul, and allows the apostle to cement the case for him:

> "Thus it is written," he says: "there is none righteous, there is none that understandeth, none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are all together become unprofitable, there is none that doeth good, no, not one," etc. (Romans 3:10-12) Here let him that can give me a "convenient explanation", or invent "figures", or contend that the words are ambiguous and obscure! Let him that dares defend "free-will" against these indictments, and I will gladly give way and recant, and be a confessor and assertor of "free-will" myself![96]

In answer to Erasmus' appeal to the exhortations in Scripture as proof of free will, Luther says that they are intended to show man his own weakness and lead him to repentance. The exhortations serve as the tools of the Law. McSorley feels that Luther's explanation is "opposed to common sense and the rules of personal communication."[97] But common sense is highly subjective, and rules of communication, if any truly exist, are certainly vague. Luther's argument accords more with the Church Fathers, and is certainly more consistent with the constant testimony of Scripture. The common sense of Scripture is all that Luther seeks.

With man in a helpless state of sinfulness, Luther relied upon his glorious concept of grace which alone is capable of rescuing

the lost. Packer defines this grace as "the loving action of a sovereign Creator saving guilty sinners who cannot lift a finger to save themselves."[98] There are no scholastic distinctions in Luther, no levels or types of grace. There is simply saving grace, a grace which rules out works, which rules out merit, and which eliminates all talk of free will. For Luther the issue is clear; one is either saved by works, or one is saved by grace. Luther comes down wholeheartedly on the side of the latter.

Finally, on the issue of predestination, Erasmus' denial was without foundation. He claimed to accept the doctrine of justification by faith, but failed to realize that predestination was a logical outgrowth of it. In fairness to Erasmus, he probably recognized the logical difficulty of his position, but chose to stand on the side of the dignity and freedom of man where he had spent all of his life.

After *The Bondage of the Will,* the course of the Reformation became clear. There could no longer be a turning back, for the issues now ran far deeper than spiritual renewal. The *Diatribe,* failing to silence Luther, actually prompted him to an open attack which went to the very core of the doctrinal system of Rome. Erasmus was left a disillusioned and broken man. His views had changed little over the years, yet the world around him had undergone drastic alterations. It was the fate of Erasmus to help pioneer a movement which would eventually leave him far behind. There can be no doubt that his writings were read by the young Luther and influenced him in his early reforming activities. His later attempts to reason with Luther only led to mutual distrust and eventual conflict, which served to broadcast the fundamental split with Rome. Aleander was mistaken when he called Erasmus a Lutheran; but there is no doubt that, in his reforms and later attempts at peaceful settlement, Erasmus was, in a significant way, responsible for the course of Lutheran history. If properly understood, then, the charge that Erasmus laid the egg and Luther hatched it was a substantially accurate one.

FOOTNOTES

1. A. B. Pennington, *The Life and Character of Erasmus* (London, 1875), p. 219.
2. Ernst F. Winter, trans. and ed., *Erasmus and Luther—Discourse on Free Will* (New York, 1961), p.2.
3. R. D. Jones, *Erasmus and Luther* (London, 1968), p.12.
4. Matthew Spinka, ed., *Advocates of Reform* (Philadelphia, 1953), p. 282.
5. A. G. Dickens, *The Counter-Reformation,* (New York, 1969), p. 62.
6. J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston, trans., *Martin Luther on the Bondage of the Will* (Westwood, New Jersey, 1957), p. 17.
7. J. I. Packer, "Luther Against Erasmus," *Concordia Theological Monthly,* 37 (1966), p. 207.

8. Dickens, pp. 10-11.
9. Spinka, p. 375.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 302.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 306.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 321.
13. Pennington, pp. 207-208.
14. Jose Chapiro, *Erasmus and Our Struggle for Peace* (Boston, 1950), p. 19.
15. Craig R. Thompson, ed., *Erasmus: Inquisitio de Fide* (New Haven, 1950), pp. 6-7.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
17. *Ibid.*, p.10.
18. Roland Bainton, *Erasmus of Christendom* (New York, 1969), p. 157.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 160.
20. Packer and Johnston, p. 25.
21. Thompson, pp. 12,13.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
23. *Ibid.*, p.22.
24. Bainton, p. 165.
25. Packer and Johnston, p. 31.
26. Bainton, p. 167.
27. Thompson, p. 17.
28. Bainton, p. 176.
29. Packer and Johnston, p. 34.
30. Bainton, pp. 179, 180.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 182.
32. Packer, p. 209.
33. M. M. Phillips, *Erasmus and the Northern Renaissance* (London, 1949), p. 186.
34. Bainton, p. 178.
35. Thompson, p. 24.
36. Bainton, pp. 183 ff.
37. Thompson, p. 73.
38. Spinka, p. 289.
39. R. B. Drummond, *Erasmus: His Life and Character,* II. (London, 1873), p. 201.
40. Phillips, p. 181.
41. Chapiro, p. 121.
42. Thompson, p. 47.
43. Packer and Johnston, p. 319.
44. Jones, p. 24.
45. S. Zweig, *Erasmus of Rotterdam,* (New York, 1934), p. 139.
46. Phillips, p. 160.
47. Packer, pp. 209, 210.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 210.
49. Bainton, p. 186.
50. Ernest Gordon Rupp, trans, *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation,* (Philadelphia, 1953) p. 36.
51. Bainton, p. 188.
52. Rupp, p. 47.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
54. H. Sasse, "Erasmus, Luther and Modern Christendom," *Reformed Theological Review,* 27 (1968), p. 51.
55. Bainton, p. 188.
56. Phillips, pp. 194, 195.
57. Rupp, p. 80.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
62. Preserved Smith, *Erasmus* (New York, 1923), p. 338.
63. Harry McSorley, *Luther: Right or Wrong?* (New York, 1969), p. 289.
64. Winter, p. 59.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
66. *Ibid.*, p. 78.
67. Bainton, p. 189.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 189.
69. Rupp, p. 97.
70. Phillips, p. 197.
71. Drummond, p. 215.
72. Phillips, p. 198.
73. Zweig, p. 206.
74. J. J. Mangan, *Life, Character and Influence of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam,* II (New York, 1927), p. 246.
75. Packer and Johnston, p. 67.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
78. McSorley, p. 286.
79. Packer and Johnston, pp. 160, 161, and 189.
80. McSorley, p. 367.
81. Bainton, p. 187.
82. Packer, p. 216.
83. Packer and Johnston, p. 318.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 292.
85. *Ibid.*, p. 304.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 293.
87. McSorley, p. 332.
88. *Ibid.*, p. 342.
89. *Ibid.*, p. 343.
90. *Ibid.*, p. 343.
91. Packer and Johnston, p. 275.
92. *Ibid.*, p. 297.
93. *Ibid.*, p. 298.
94. *Ibid.*, p. 171.
95. Smith, p. 339.
96. Packer and Johnston, p. 279.
97. McSorley, p. 331.
98. Packer, p. 219.

Conflicting Models of Ministry—Luther, Karlstadt, and Muentzer

Carter Lindberg
Boston University School of Theology

This discussion of conflicting models of ministry among theologians of the Reformation era will focus on Luther, Karlstadt, and Muntzer as they developed through 1525. The magnitude of this task is such that the author hastens to appropriate the disclaimer of Thomas Carlyle: "Listening from the distance of centuries across the dead chasms and howling kingdoms of decay, it is not easy to catch everything."[1]

Karlstadt and Müntzer were, respectively, Luther's colleague and an early Martinian during the formative years of the Reformation; but their alternative visions of ministry led to open conflict with Luther. The year 1525 is our *terminus ad quem* because by this time Karlstadt had developed his theology of ministry to a level of practice which led to his expulsion from Electoral Saxony. Always more rigorous than Karlstadt, Müntzer suffered execution in 1525. It would be another decade before the "normalization" of ministry through examination and ordination. However, while the problems of the institutionalization of both church and ministry continued to occupy the theologians of the Lutheran Reformation into the first half of the seventeenth century, it is our contention that the major alternative models of ministry were fully present and rejected by Luther by 1525. By this time the educated priests (*sacerdotes litterati*) who had become Luther's followers were being supplemented by men from the younger generation. These men were coming into the ministry via the Wittenberg faculty of theology.[2] Thus by 1525 there is a shift from the problems of conflicting models of ministry to the growing realization of the need to inculcate the understanding of ministry in the older simple priests or lower clergy[3] and to institutionalize the training of younger men aspiring to the ministry.

I. Theory

Our basic presupposition in approaching the concepts of ministry developed by Luther, Karlstadt, and Muntzer is that their models of ministry were theologically determined. Therefore, their conflicting models of ministry were the results of conflicting theological orientations which become explicit

through particular historical occasions. Since time does not allow us the luxury of detailed examination of their theologies, I propose typing their theologies in terms of responses to the fundamental question: Where does fellowship with God occur, on God's level or ours? The goal for all Christians is, of course, fellowship with God. But how is that fellowship, that goal reached? The answer to this question not only delineates alternative theories of salvation but also alternative practices of ministry.

Throughout Luther's reforming career he never departed from his bedrock conviction that the gospel is good news because it is the proclamation that fellowship with God occurs on the human, not the divine level. The famous phrases "sola gratia" and "sola fide" express the divine acceptance of the person on the level of the human, not the divine. Expressed diagrammatically, Luther asserts God's descent to the level of persons against all theologies of ascent—no matter how grace-filled—of the person to the level of the divine.[4] Thus, from his early "Disputation Against Scholastic Theology" (1517) to the end of his life, Luther never tired of the phrase "Let God be God." To "Let God be God" allows the person to become human (i.e., to cease struggling to become what he or she was never intended to be—divine). Righteousness, then, is never an intrinsic capacity or possession of the Christian but a continuous promise and gift. Thus, the Christian ". . . is at the same time both a sinner and a righteous man; a sinner in fact, but a righteous man by the sure imputation and promise of God that He will continue to deliver him from sin until He has completely cured him. And thus he is entirely healthy in hope, but in fact he is still a sinner . . ."[5] Luther thus opposed all forms of ascent to God whether they be ethical, mystical, or sacramental. He was a thoroughgoing incarnationalist.[6] For Luther, then, "true Christian theology" always begins " . . . where Christ began—in the Virgin's womb, in the manger, and at his mother's breast . . . He wanted us to fix the gaze of our hearts upon Himself and thus prevent us from clambering into heaven and speculating about the Divine Majesty."

Church and ministry, then, are continuing incarnations of this living Word of God.[8] Thus, while some psychological interpretations of Luther have referred to him as an anal personality, the theological interpretation of Luther insists that he was thoroughly oral/aural. In his double-fronted war against both the Roman establishment and the "Schwarmer" such as Karlstadt and Müntzer, Luther always proclaimed "the Word, the Word, the Word," for "Even if Christ were given for us and crucified a thousand times, it would all be in vain if the Word of God were

absent and were not distributed and given to me with the bidding, this is for you, take what is yours."

If the Word is the key to Luther's theology and ministry, the Law is the key to Karlstadt's. Three years Luther's senior, Karlstadt was already regarded as a promising Thomistic theologian when Luther arrived at Wittenberg. Karlstadt's theological conversion and collegiality with Luther in the early period of the Reformation is expressed in his manifesto of Augustinian theology, the 151 Theses.[10] The momentousness of Karlstadt's "theological conversion" should not be underrated for it meant not only a major turn in his theology, but also the repudiation of ten years of scholarly labor and publications. The latter would be a stumbling block to a professor in any age!

In contrast to Luther's theology of justification by grace alone through faith alone, Karlstadt developed a theology of regeneration.[11] For Luther the Christian always remained simultaneously sinner and righteous, unable to fulfill the law in himself but rather appropriating Christ's fulfillment *pro me, pro nobis* through faith. In contrast Karlstadt's theology seems to have been more determined by a theological shift from Thomist to Augustinian thought. While this was not without personal religious significance for Karlstadt, his theology did remain within Augustinian motifs such as letter and spirit, good and evil, with an emphasis upon inner renewal and obedience to the Christ *in me, in nobis.* Like Luther He saw forgiveness through Christ's atonement as an integral part of his theology, but unlike Luther he focused on self-mortification and inner regeneration. So Barge referred to Karlstadt as "the champion of lay Christian puritanism."[12]

Luther's dialectic of law and gospel is rejected by Karlstadt in favor of an emphasis upon the law as the revelation of the good to be fulfilled. In terms of our fundamental question, Karlstadt views regeneration of the Christian through life according to the law as the means of an ascent to fellowship with God.

Whereas Luther spoke of the Christian "simul iustus et peccator," Karlstadt already in his 151 Theses used the phrase "simul bonus et malus."[13] And in his early 1522 tract on the abolition of images Karlstadt urged:

> Dear Brothers, God preserve you from these heretical sermons and words; so that you do not say: We do not follow the old law or do not accept it; for that is unchristian, and breaks and diminishes the teaching of Christ. For Christ proves his teaching out of Moses and the prophets, and says that he has come not to break the law but rather to fulfill it.[14]

"In his last work against Luther, he mocked Luther for sup-

posing that his works should remain uncensured provided his doctrine was correct. Genuine faith leads to self-mortification and a new life of righteousness."[15]

Like Luther and Karlstadt, Műntzer was and remained a theologian and preacher.[16] However, Műntzer's work was compressed into the few years between 1521 and 1525. These years were marked by polemical and physical violence culminating in his execution. Thus, the controversial nature of his person and work make him difficult to assess.

Approximately five years younger than Luther, Műntzer was a well educated priest. From 1514 on, he was priest at a small monastery near Halle by the name of Frohse. It is argued that the indulgence controversy initiated by Luther prompted Műntzer to give up this post in the fall of 1518. There is the possibility that Műntzer had the opportunity of spending four or five months in Wittenberg, becoming involved in the "Wittenberg circle." Although Műntzer himself tells us nothing of his personal impression of Luther in these months, Elliger says, "Without doubt, Műntzer now stepped forth with conviction to Luther's side; and yet it must for the time being remain an open question how far he really correctly understood the core Reformation concepts of this man."[17] At any rate, Luther considered him a reliable candidate for the ministry in Zwickau to which he recommended him as a good man "attentive to the work of grace."[18]

During his year in Zwickau (1520), Műntzer's theological divergence from Luther began to emerge. In distinction from Luther's emphasis upon the Word, Müntzer intensified Karlstadt's focus on the Law through a hermeneutic of the Spirit. He does not deny that the Bible is the Word of God, but it is a word of the past which needs actualization through a new word of the Spirit. Műntzer's theology of the Spirit replaces Luther's theology of the Word.

Műntzer's involvement in the civic crises of Zwickau prompted his departure at the very time Luther was before the Diet of Worms (April, 1521). Muntzer now was once more on the road—this time to Bohemia in hopes of a receptive Hussite audience. The first clear expression of Muntzer's break with Luther is his "Prague Manifesto" of 1521. The Bohemians are called not to a human, created theology but rather to a direct, living Word of God from God's own mouth.[19] God's will and law are manifest in the elect through the Spirit. Thus, Spirit, Law, and Word at times appear identical.[20] This theme of the Spirit of the Fear of the Lord remains in Műntzer from the "Prague Manifesto" through to his last tract against Luther.

To return once more to our fundamental question of fellowship with God, we find that the answer of Műntzer bears

formal similarity to that of Karlstadt. There is a "strong ascetic-puritanical ethos"[21] in Műntzer's preaching of inner mortification as the preparation for fellowship with God. Thus, he is fond of the image of the sharp ploughshare preparing the heart as a field for its crop of faith. "No, dear man, you must suffer and know how God roots out of your fruitful land the weeds, thistles, and thorns, that is, out of your heart . . .You must suffer the sharp ploughshare."[22] This will deify and transform us "completely into God, so that earthly life is ruled from heaven."[23]

II. From Theory to Practice

We have argued that the conflicting models of ministry in the early years of the Lutheran Reformation stemmed from conflicting theologies. We have, for the sake of clarity and convenience, typed these conflicting theologies in the shorthand of Word, Law, and Spirit. Luther's theological position consists essentially in the conviction that salvation is not the process or goal of life, but rather its presupposition. The sinner turned in upon the self is freely accepted by the merciful God. This acceptance is so radical that there are no religious or ethical prerequisites to salvation. Since salvation is now the basis for life rather than its goal, Luther's theology stands in stark opposition to that of Karlstadt and Műntzer. This opposition is expressed in Luther's dialectic of Law and Gospel, a distinction which to Luther was the only protection from the aberrations and distortions of life which he saw equally in the Roman establishment and in the *Schwarmer*."[24] We can now turn to cases where these theological conflicts exploded into actual conflicts of ministry. We shall first look at the conflict between Luther and Karlstadt and then at that between Luther and Műntzer.

Luther and Karlstadt

Following the Diet of Worms and the Imperial Ban against Luther, Elector Frederick chose the "better part of valor" and had Luther "captured" and put in protective custody at the Wartburg. The situation in Wittenberg became increasingly volatile. Luther had disappeared and rumors of his death were rampant. There was a groundswell of popular clamor for immediate reform, but Frederick, among others, was concerned about outside intervention if developments in Wittenberg got out of hand. There was the appearance of "outside agitators" from Zwickau, a town already torn by riots, which as already mentioned had led to Műntzer's departure. Known as the

Zwickau prophets, these men seriously disturbed clergy and citizens—including Melanchthon—with their accounts of apocalyptic visions and claims of voices from God. Inside agitators such as Gabriel Zwilling, an Augustinian known as the "second Luther," disrupted the cloister and successfully urged many monks to leave. To add to the Elector's troubles the city schools closed, and his pride and joy, the university, was threatened with collapse. Within a year matriculation dropped by about fifty percent as students, less than pleased with "left-leaning" faculty members and the intrusion of "spiritualism" went elsewhere to get the education for which they were paying.

The leadership gap left by Luther's absence and Melanchthon's vacillation was filled by Karlstadt. In a series of tracts and actions Karlstadt now began to put into practice what Luther had so forcefully propounded in the immediate past. An important point on Karlstadt's agenda was reform of the Mass. In July he argued that "Those who partake of the bread and wine are not Bohemians but true Christians. He who receives only the bread, in my opinion, commits sin."[25] Luther had already spoken his mind against the withholding of the wine, but he could not claim that reception of both kinds was an absolute necessity. Zwilling now attacked the Mass in his sermons. On August 13, the Augustinians under Zwilling's leadership, ceased to celebrate Mass.

The crisis was at hand. Anticlerical violence began. At first Karlstadt counseled caution, but then advocated mandatory reforms. In the next weeks a commission to the Elector submitted a report favoring immediate reform in line with the new theology. In December a petition to the Town Council requested amnesty for the rioters and reforms in liturgy and ethics. The Elector's view was that this was not the time for innovation.

On December 22 Karlstadt announced his intention to innovate at his next Mass, scheduled for January 1. The Elector sent word that he should do no such thing. Karlstadt responded that, in that case, he would do it on Christmas Day. This decision may have been less bull-headedness on Karlstadt's part than an attempt to forestall another riot. Certainly what was most important for Karlstadt was that the mandates of God take precedence over the concerns of persons, including any "false" compassion on the part of the pastor for his congregation's weakness. To Karlstadt grace was "costly," for it meant being in step with Jesus and Scriptural norms rather than with the culture. Christmas Eve was hardly a silent night; gangs roamed the streets, threatened priests, and disrupted services. The next day Karlstadt celebrated communion without vestments. Dressed as a layman, he pronounced the con-

secration in German and distributed communion in both kinds. To say the least, it was a sensation!

The next item on Karlstadt's agenda was the removal of images. He had been preaching that the Old Testament law forbade images, and he kept up the pressure until the council named a day for the removal of images. The result was more violence and disorder. Now he wrote one of his most influential tracts, "On the Abolition of Images." On page after page he contended that images are against the first commandment. There is no excuse in the claim that an image, even the crucifix, points beyond itself to God. Christians are to abolish images just as was done in the Old Testament when the altars were smashed and overturned. For Christ is the continuation of the Old Testament law, and God forbids images no less than murder, robbery, adultery, and the like. Since the priests have perverted God's law and hindered the faithful, the magistrates should follow the example of King Josiah and forcibly reform the church.[26] The Diet of Nurnberg had specifically criticized Saxony for innovation so Frederick was hardly about to follow Karlstadt. Melanchthon was told to silence Zwilling, and Karlstadt was directly requested to stop preaching. The Town Council was forced to compromise, and Melanchthon came down with a bad case of nerves. He appealed now to Luther to return and restore order.

Luther arrived in Wittenberg on Friday, March 6. The following Sunday, Invocavit, he began a series of sermons which lasted the rest of the week. The theme of these sermons is the distinction between an evangelical "may" and a legalistic "must." He began by emphasizing the centrality of the gospel which frees the person from sin and makes him or her a child of God, and then he proceeded to speak of the inseparability of faith and love. This faith, active in love, gives us patience for the neighbor who is not equally strong in faith. His concern, Luther says, is not with the reforms initiated but rather with their haste and compulsion.

> I would not have gone so far as you have done, if I had been here. The cause is good, but there has been too much haste. For there are still brothers and sisters on the other side who belong to us and must still be won.[27]

Luther notes that the sacrifice of order and the consequent offense to the weak resulted from making a "must" out of what is free. Faith is a free gift to which no one can be constrained. Certainly he opposed the papists, but only with God's Word, not with force.

> . . . I will constrain no man by force, for faith must come freely without compulsion. Take myself, for

> example. I opposed indulgences and all the papists, but never with force. I simply taught, preached, and wrote God's Word; otherwise I did nothing. And while I slept, or drank Wittenberg beer with my friends, Philip and Amsdorf, the Word so greatly weakened the papacy that no prince or emperor ever inflicted such losses upon it. I did nothing; the Word did everything. Had I desired to foment trouble, I could have brought great bloodshed upon Germany; indeed I could have started such a game that even the emperor would not have been safe. But what would it have been? Mere fool's play.[28]

Luther argued that forced reform changed the good news into bad news—that is, gospel into law. The history of the church shows, he argued, that one law quickly leads to thousands of laws. Furthermore, rushing about smashing altars and destroying images is counterproductive, for it only sets images more firmly in people's hearts. Only God's Word can capture people's hearts and enlighten their minds. Compulsive zeal not only offends the weak, it creates the suspicion that Christian liberty is being flaunted to prove that one is a better Christian than others.[29]

The sermons differentiated reformation from puritanism. The abolition of the abuse and the forcible institution of reform, no matter how correct the theology, does violence to ignorant and unconvinced consciences. The weak need to be started on pablum and then gradually led to the strong meat of Christian freedom. To do otherwise is to reform only outward things. The effect of these sermons was an almost immediate restoration of order. Innovations ceased for the time being, and so did the violence. Throughout the sermons Luther never mentioned Karlstadt by name.

In the following months Karlstadt experienced increasing frustration over what he saw as Luther's gradualism and delay of reform. Indeed, Luther's counsel to consider the weak only served to radicalize Karlstadt. Thus, when the opportunity arose in 1523, he moved to Orlamunde to become the village pastor.[30] This position provided Karlstadt with the freedom to proceed with the "reform" frustrated in Wittenberg. Images were removed, infant baptism denied, the eucharist interpreted as a memorial, and liturgical changes introduced.[31]

Karlstadt's conviction that Luther's concern for the weak was a form of passive fratricide impelled him to urge that "every community, whether small or large, should see for itself that it acts correctly and well and waits for no one,"[32] regardless of the opinions of the authorities.

> We should take such horrible things (i.e., images) from the weak, and snatch them from their hands, and not

> consider whether they cry, call out or curse because of it. The time will come when they who now curse and damn us will thank us . . . Therefore I ask whether, if I should see that a little innocent child holds a sharp pointed knife in his hand and wants to keep it, I would show him brotherly love if I would allow him to keep the dreadful knife as he desires with the result that he would wound or kill himself, or when I would break his will and take the knife?[33]

The result was Karlstadt's expulsion from Electoral Saxony and Luther's denunciation of him.

Luther and Müntzer

At the very time that Luther was quelling the Wittenberg disturbances with the Invocavit sermons Műntzer was formulating the same criticism of Luther as was Karlstadt: "Our dearest Martin acts ignorantly because he does not want to offend the little ones . . ."[34] Műntzer's concern for an impassioned and experienced faith was now rapidly growing toward its "mature" expression—the call for the Spirit-led cleansing of the godless, not only from the temple, but also from the world. In April 1523 he found a base of operation as pastor of the Johanniskirche of Allstedt, a Thűringian town under the jurisdiction of the Elector of Saxony. By September he had sufficiently alienated the Count of Mansfeld that the latter forbade his people to attend to Műntzer's "heretical mass and preaching."[35] In turn Műntzer now attacked Luther and the Wittenberg "establishment" in his treatises "On Feigned Faith" and "Protestation or Defense of Thomas Műntzer." In these writings and in his "Exposition of Psalm Nineteen" Műntzer made it clear that " 'justification by faith alone'—the center of Wittenberg theology—was an 'invented' doctrine, for Christ had come to fulfill the law." The Holy Spirit converts the sinner into "a willing instrument of God through the 'justification by law.' "[36] The first actual step in this direction was Műntzer's organization of a secret military League of the Elect which on March 24, 1524, destroyed the small Mallerbach chapel outside town.

The subsequent investigation of this incident by Duke John, the Elector's brother, was indecisive. For, while insisting on punishment of the guilty, both Frederick and John also heeded Luther's underestimation of Műntzer's influence.[37] Certainly Luther did not "perceive any particular fruit of the Allstedtian spirit, except that he wants to do violence and destroy wood and stone. Love, peace, patience, goodness, gentleness, have been very little in evidence so far."[38] Yet Luther was still

convinced that this was a battle of the Word, in which the princes were not to intervene until Müntzer resorted to force. Luther was convinced that "the Antichrist shall be vanquished without human hand."[39]

Thus, Duke John decided to visit Allstedt to find out for himself about Muntzer. This is the context for the famous "Sermon to the Princes." Preaching to Duke John and his advisors in the electoral castle near Allstedt, Műntzer used King Nebuchadnezzar just as Karlstadt had used Josiah as a model for the conduct of rulers. As Nebuchadnezzar made Daniel his advisor, so the Saxon rulers should place him, Műntzer, in charge of ushering in the new order. In this appeal to the rulers, Műntzer remains within the classic framework of civil obedience in requesting protection and support. But rather than focusing on the first two verses of the famous Romans 13 passage, he focused on the third and fourth verses, thus presenting the ruler as the servant of God's wrath upon evildoers.[40]

There is no evidence of this sermon's immediate effect upon the princes, but it was not long before Műntzer and others were summoned to Weimar. Within a week of his return, Müntzer fled Allstedt. The support of the princes was not forthcoming. It was clear to him that Luther's "false faith" promoted and supported the tyranny of the princes. Müntzer, the minister, clearly understood his real enemy to be not the princes or class division, but Martin Luther, whose model of ministry as Word-hearing stood opposed to Műntzer's model of ministry as Spirit-heart. To Müntzer, Luther was a preacher of a "honey-sweet Christ" who called only for belief without works. This "cheap grace," according to Műntzer, avoids the "bitter Christ" and the discipleship of the cross.[41]

Müntzer was now in the final stage of his development. His goal of the christianizing of the world had led him to the point of becoming a "reformer without a church."[42] He now fled to Muhlhausen, and from there to Nurnberg and elsewhere, then back again to become involved in the peasants' rebellion. The Peasants' War provided Műntzer with what he saw as the context for the eschatological battle of the Lord. In his famous exhortation to his old disciples at Allstedt, he called on them to join this battle: "It is time to hunt the knaves down like dogs . . . have no mercy . . . Let not your sword grow cold . . . for it is not your battle but the Lord's."[43]

Műntzer's attempt to recreate—albeit more rigorously—the disintegrating Medieval concept of the *corpus christianum* failed because he narrowly concentrated upon the process of salvation. He made this "inner order" the model for reality, the "outer order." He was "not able to break through and overcome the

Medieval conception of the *corpus christianum,*" but rather only intensified it. As such, he was not a prophet of the new but a priest of the old.[44]

III. Conclusions (Theses)

1. The conflicting models of ministry which we have sketched are the result of conflicting theologies. Luther's model of ministry derives from his theology of the Word.[45] Karlstadt's model of ministry, mandating reform of church life and practice, is the result of his theology of regeneration. Műntzer's model of ministry, leading to the coercion of consciences, flows from his theology of the Spirit. Neither Karlstadt nor Műntzer could tolerate the weakness and imperfection allowed by Luther's doctrine of the Christian as *simul iustus et peccator.*[46]

2. Diagrammatically expressed, the theological and therefore ministerial conflicts between these men focus in the question of whether salvation is understood as God's descent to the person or the person's ascent to God. Here Luther opposed Karlstadt and Müntzer on the basis that the conscience may not be bound through human laws and salvation, may not be made dependent upon the fulfillment of these laws.[47]

3. From a formal theological point of view Karlstadt and Műntzer did not differ. Both emphasized a church and ministry known by its fruits. For Karlstadt, the boundary between fleshly and Spiritual Christians is to be clearly visible to human eyes.[48]

4. However, in terms of material ministry, Karlstadt did not progress to the level of Műntzer, although Luther was convinced that Karlstadt's theology implied Műntzer's radicalized ministry.[49]

5. The conflict between Luther and Karlstadt was not primarily one of strategy and tactics but of conflicting theologies.[50]

6. Műntzer's model of ministry with its locus in a "Spirit-heart" nexus, implying the necessity of becoming a religious virtuoso bears a strong resemblance to Donatism and Medieval itinerant anticlericalism.[51]

7. Paradodoxically, Műntzer's model of ministry, which identifies person and office and demands purity as the precondition for belonging to the elect, effectively undercuts social reform for no institutions and structures are capable in their corrupt state of facilitating constructive change. Műntzer presents a model of ministry limited to "prophetic" rejection.[52]

8. While all three of our subjects took their models of ministry quite seriously, Karlstadt and Műntzer were singularly humorless about both themselves and ministry. Luther was free

to laugh at himself as well as his ministry in a way that Karlstadt and Műntzer could not.[53]

9. The reason that Luther could drink his good Wittenberg beer and have a good time with his friends was that he believed the Word would do all. That is, his trust in the transcendent Word provided perspective on humanness.

10. This emphasis upon the Word in Luther's model of ministry also relativized all human structures, thereby freeing them from ideology for service to the neighbor. Thus, the gospel is professed "with hand and mouth."[54] In other words, the Christian is to take seriously the task of world-building with the insight that every culture, every system of justice, and every political structure is only relative and instrumental for the humanization of persons. For Luther, faith alone grants the security to live within the insecurity of relative structures. It is only by faith that persons can avoid the defensive sanctification of past, present, or future goods and values. Faith enables persons to be persons because it lets God be God.

11. Finally Luther contributed to the shape of Protestantism through his "pastoral ecclesiology." The pastor, not the *Landeskirche,* "was the direct ecclesiastical result of the Lutheran Reformation."[55]

12. On this note we once again turn to Carlyle to distinguish Luther's model of ministry from those of Karlstadt and Müntzer. Regarding Luther, Carlyle said: "He had to work an epic poem, not write one."[56]

FOOTNOTES

1. Quoted by L. W. Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1961), p. 547.
2. The first of these was Georg Rőrer, ordained by Luther himself in 1525. Cf. Hellmut Lieberg, *Amt und Ordination bei Luther und Melanchthon.* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 182f. For the formation of Lutheran pastors cf. Bernhard Klaus, "Soziale Herkunft und theologische Bildung lutherischer Pfarrer der Reformatorischen Frűhzeit, " *Zeitschrift fűr Kirchengeschichte* 80 (1969), pp. 22-49.
3. Their perceptions tended to be limited to administration of the sacrament *sub utraque specie* and clerical marriage. The depth of the problem of training these men for ministry is revealed by the response of an early Lutheran parson to the question of whether he was teaching the decalogue; he said, "I don't have the book yet" (Klaus, p. 31).
4. Of the extensive literature see, for example, Steven Ozment, " 'Homo Viator': Luther and Late Medieval Theology," in Ozment, ed., *The Reformation in Medieval Perspective.* (Chicago: Quadrangle), pp. 142-154; Kenneth Hagen, *A Theology of Testament in the Young Luther.* (Leiden: Brill, 1974); Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought,* tr. by R. Wilson. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970).
5. "Lectures on Romans," 1516. LW 25, p.260; WA 56, p.272, 16ff.
6. "Lectures on Galatians," 1535. LW 26, p.30; WA 40, pp. 75-77: "Therefore whenever you are concerned to think and act about your

salvation, you must put away all speculations about the Majesty, all thoughts of works, traditions, and philosophy—indeed, of the Law of God itself. And you must run directly to the manger and the mother's womb, embrace this Infant and Virgin's Child in your arms, and look at Him—born, being nursed, growing up, going about in human society, teaching, dying, rising again, ascending into the heavens, and having authority over all things. In this way you can shake off all terrors and errors, as the sun dispels the clouds."

7. Ibid., p. 29.
8. "The Ministry in Luther's Theological Perspective," Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, *Bulletin 1974*, No. 1, p.18. Eric Gritsch, "The gospel word is the means of God's grace, without which no man can be saved; it is the constitutive element of the church on earth. "Ministry" means to serve this word; and to serve this word means to mediate God's salvation to mankind."
9. "Against the Heavenly Prophets," 1525. LW 40, pp. 212f. Cf. also, Jan Aarts, *Die Lehre Martin Luthers über das Amt in der Kirche.* (Helsinki: Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft, 1972), pp. 290-91.
10. April 1517. Available in a critical edition with commentary by Ernst Kahler, *Karlstadt und Augustin: Der Kommentar des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt zu Augustins Schrift de Spiritu et Litera.* (Niemayer, Halle-Saale): 1952, pp. 8*-37*. In May, Luther wrote to Lang, "Our theology and St. Augustine are progressing well, and with God's help rule at our university." LW 48, pp. 42.
11. Cf. Hermann Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1905; reprint Nieuwkoop, 1968), I, pp. 182-83, 199, 208; H. J. Hillerbrand, "Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt, Prodigal Reformer," *Church History* 35(1966), pp. 379-398; and Ronald J. Sider, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt: The Development of His Thought 1517-1525.* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), pp. 212ff.
12. Barge, op. cit., subtitle to volume 2. Cf. also my essay "Theory and Practice: Reformation Models of Ministry as Resource for the Present," *Lutheran Quarterly* 27 (1975), pp. 30-31; and Eric Gritsch, "Luther und die Schwärmer: Verworfene Anfechtung?" *Luther* 47/3 (1976), p. 116: Karlstadt understands by the gospel the becoming grasped (Erfasstwerden) of the faithful through the internal indwelling of Christ who gives the Christian power to fulfill the old Law. The Spirit of Christ makes possible the fulfillment of the law in the new Covenant."
13. Thesis 138. Kahler, p. 32*.
14. *Von Abtuhung der bylder. . . ,* ed. by Hans Lietzmann. "Kleine Texte," No. 74. (Bonn, 1911), p. 21.
15. Sider, p. 237.
16. "Through my office I seek to proclaim the name of God, to bring comfort to the troubled, and destruction and sickness to the healthy." "Hochverursachte Schutzrede," tr. by H. J. Hillerbrand, "Thomas Muentzer's Last Tract Against Martin Luther," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 38/1 (1964), p. 30. Cf. the critical edition of Műntzer's works by P. Kirn and G. Franz, *Thomas Műntzer, Schriften und Briefe.* (Gutersloh, 1968), p. 332, 5-6 (hereafter cited as Franz by page and line).
17. Walter Elliger, *Thomas Müntzer, Leben und Werk.* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, second ed., 1975), p. 53. Elliger sees Müntzer as a student of Luther, p. 7. Cf. Eric Gritsch's review of this book: ". . . to what extent did Luther influence Műntzer? This reviewer agrees with Elliger's thesis that Műntzer was a disciple of Luther and his attempts at reforming the medieval church rather than a mystic who wanted to realize

the ancient vision of a union between man and God." *Church History* 45/3 (1976), p. 382.

18. WA Br 2, pp. 109-110. Quoted by Eric Gritsch, *Reformer Without A Church: The Life and Thought of Thomas Muentzer.* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), p. 17.
19. "Yet all the days of my life (God knows, I lie not) I have never been able to get out of any monk or parson the true use of faith, about the profitableness of temptation which prepares for faith in the Spirit of the Fear of the Lord, together with the conditions that each elect must have the sevenfold Holy Ghost. I have not learned from any scholar the true Order of God. . .For whoso cannot discern God's Spirit in himself, yea, who has not the assurance of this, is not a member of Christ, but of the devil. . . The children have asked for bread, but there was nobody to break it to them. But there were many then, as there are now today, who have chucked bread at them, that is the letter of the Word, without breaking it to them. . . They have not explained the true Spirit of the Fear of the Lord which would have taught them they are irrevocably God's children." Quoted by Gordon Rupp, *Patterns of Reformation.* (Philadelphia; Fortress, 1969), pp. 175-76; Franz, 491, 7-492,26.
20. Cf., for example, the "Princes' Sermon" in Williams and Mergal, eds. *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers.* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957), pp. 53ff.; Franz, pp. 246ff., and the "Hochverursachte Schutzrede," Franz pp. 226,25-327, 17. "This identity of conceptualizations is typical of the thought of Müntzer. No doubt it has its roots finally in the *unio mystica* and may serve as evidence of the extent to which Müntzer's theological thinking is determined by a mystical experience of reality beyond all conceptualization." Hans-Jürgen Goertz, *Innere und Aussere Ordnung in der Theologie Thomas Müntzers.* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 116.
21. Thomas Nipperdey, "Theologie and Revolution bei Thomas Müntzer," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 54 (1963), p. 172.
22. "Protestation oder Erbietung," 1524. Franz, pp. 233, 29-245, 4; see also p. 277, 7-8, and "Von dem gedichteten Glauben," 1524, Franz, 218, 5-13, 21-28.
23. "Aüsgedrückte Entblössung," Franz, p. 281, 22-31.
24. "As often as God's Word is preached, it creates a joyful, open and assured conscience before God; for it is the word of grace and forgiveness . . .But as often as man's word is preached, it creates a troubled, cramped and fearful conscience, for it is the word of law, of anger, and of sin and shows what we have failed to do and how much we have to do." "Lectures on Galations," 1519. LW 27, p. 164; WA 2, p. 453.
25. "Twenty-four Theses for the Promotion of Christof Hoffman," July 19, 1521. Barge, I, p. 291, note 118: Theses 9 and 10.
26. "Von Abtuhung der Bylder. . . ," 1522. Lietzmann, *passim* but especially pp. 20ff.
27. "Eight Sermons at Wittenberg," 1522. LW 51, p.72.
28. Ibid., p.77.
29. Ibid., p. 91: "For if you desire to be regarded as better Christians than others just because you take the sacrament into your own hands and also receive it in both kinds, you are bad Christians as far as I am concerned."
30. For the legal, financial, and theological considerations involved in this move, see Sider, pp. 181ff.
31. That Karlstadt did not consider himself a revolutionary is clear from his distancing himself from Müntzer, who by now was engaged in revolutionary activity in the Saale valley. See Karlstadt's letter to Müntzer of July 19. 1524, in which he refused to participate in armed revolution and urged Müntzer to trust in God. Franz, pp. 415, 18-416,8.

32. "Ob man gemach faren und des ergernűssen der schwachen verschonen soll. . . ," 1524; Hertzsch, I, p. 85, 26-28. Quotation in Sider, p. 199. Over a half century later the English Puritan Separatist, Robert Browne voiced a similar concern in his ". . .Reformation without Tarying for anie. . ." (1582).
33. Hertzsch, I, p. 88, 34ff. Quoted by Sider, p.199.
34. Letter to Melanchthon, March 27, 1522. Franz p. 381, 20f. Cf. Steven Ozment, *Mysticism and Dissent.* (New Haven: Yale, 1973), p. 71.
35. Ozment, p. 74.
36. Gritsch, p. 90.
37. Cf. Gritsch, pp. 91-100.
38. Letter to the Princes of Saxony, July 1524. LW 40, p.56.
39. Ibid., pp. 57-58.
40. "Princes' Sermon," in Williams and Mergal, eds., *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers.* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957), pp. 66-68; Franz, p. 259-61: "Now if you want to be true governors, you must begin government at the roots, and, as Christ commanded, drive his enemies from the elect. For you are the means to this end. Beloved, don't give us any old jokes about how the power of God should do it without your application of the sword. Otherwise may it rust away for you in its scabbard. . .For the godless person has no right to live when he is in the way of the pious . . . The sword of the rulers . . . is bestowed on them for the retribution of the wicked as protection for the pious (Rom. 13:4)."
41. "Protestation. . .," paragraphs 5 and 13. Franz, pp. 228, 9; 234f. "Von dem gedichteten Glauben," Franz, pp. 222f.
42. Such is the insightful title of Gritsch's study of Műntzer.
43. "Műntzer an die Allstedter," 1525. Franz, pp. 454f.
44. Goertz, pp. 148-49. Cf. also Thomas Nipperdey, "Theologie and Revolution bei Thomas Műntzer," *Archiv fur Reformationsgeschichte* 54 (1963), pp. 145-181; Ozment, p. 91; A Friesen, "Thomas Műntzer and the Old Testament," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 47 (1973), pp. 5-19; Gott fried Maron, "Thomas Műntzer als Theologe des Gerichts," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 83 (1972), pp. 193-225.
45. Cf. B. A. Gerrish, "Priesthood and Ministry in the Theology of Luther," *Church History* 34 (1965) pp. 404-22, especially 409f.
46. Cf. Joyce Irwin, *The Theological and Social Dimensions of Thomas Műntzer's Liturgical Reform.* (unpublished Ph. D., Yale, 1972), pp. 147-148: "Paradoxically, the main reason he seems in conflict with tradition may be that he took it too seriously. . .With single-minded idealism he strove to overturn this only superficially Christian structure and set up a new theocracy where only the morally strong faithful would be allowed to survive." *Re* Műntzer, Gritsch ("Luther und die Schwărmer") says: "The new law creates not only a 'puritan church-fellowship' (*'puritanische Kirchengemeinschaft'*), but also a theocratic world rulership, which for Műntzer is the pre-stage of the parousia," p.118.
47. ". . .You now see that Dr. Karlstadt and his spirits replace the highest with the lowest, the best with the least, the first with the last. Yet he would be considered the greatest spirit of all, he who has devoured the Holy Spirit feathers and all." "Against the Heavenly Prophets," 1525. LW 40, p.83. Cf. also LW 40, pp. 68f.
48. "Anzeig etlicher Hauptartickeln Christlicher leere," 1525. Hertzsch, II, p. 102, 21ff.
49. LW 40, pp. 89 and 109, especially 105f.
50. Cf. Sider, pp. 197-201, especially 201: "But one cannot explain the break between Luther and Karlstadt solely, and perhaps not even primarily, in terms of theological differences."

51. "Letter to the Princes of Saxony," 1524. LW 40, p. 57: "It is not a fruit of the Spirit to criticize a doctrine by the imperfect life of the teacher. For the Holy Spirit criticizes false doctrine while bearing with those who are weak in faith and life. . ." Cf. also *Table Talk,* LW 54, p. 47: Luther criticizes Müntzer for identifying person and office. Karlstadt "denounced Luther for tolerating 'poor, miserable, lousy, sinful, unbelieving pastors,' " Sider, p. 288.
52. Müntzer realized this after the defeat at Frankenhausen. The people had "not rightly understood him, but looked to their own self-interest, thus causing the downfall of the divine truth." Letter to his followers at Muhlhaus, May 17, 1525. Franz p. 473, 9-10. Cf. also Maron, p. 223.
53. Luther spoke of the theologian as God's "court jester." "To the Christian Nobility," 1520. LW 44, pp. 123f. Cf. Luther's criticism of Müntzer's self-repression in "Lectures on Genesis," 1544. LW 7, p. 261.
54. "The German Mass," 1526. LW 53 P. 64.
55. M. Rade, "Der Sprung in Luthers Kirchenbegriff und die Entstehung der Landeskirche," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 24 (1914), pp. 259-260. Quoted by Scott Hendrix in a paper delivered at the Sixteenth Century Studies Conference, St. Louis, 1967, "The Pastoral Ecclesiology of the Later Luther." Hendrix goes on to argue that Luther's "pastoral motivation allowed the *Landeskirche* to become the ecclesiatical framework in which the most important structural element, the pastor, could find a foothold in those early years."
56. *Heroes, Hero Worship, and the Heroic in History.* (A. L. Burt, n.d.), p. 164.

Proclaiming Freedom in Church and State

Henry J. Eggold

"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," said our now exalted King of kings and Lord of lords. God exercises His sovereign power on earth in two kingdoms. The one is the kingdom of power, the kingdom of His left hand, the civil government, commonly called the state. The other is His kingdom of grace, the church, ruled by His Word. The kingdom of power is concerned chiefly to promote the temporal welfare of men; the kingdom of grace is concerned chiefly with the spiritual and eternal welfare of men. Church and state exist side by side and are to be mutually supportive, though distinct in nature and objectives. Recently church-state relationships have been described as that of institutional separation and functional interaction. The Augsburg Confession (XXVIII, 18) states: "Thus our teachers distinguish the two authorities and the functions of the two powers, directing that both be held in honor as the highest gifts of God on earth." In this essay, we want to summarize briefly the nature and function of state and church trying to demonstrate that they are to be mutually supportive, but not intermingled, so that the one arrogates to itself the right of the other.

Let us first consider the nature and function of the state. Our guide will be Romans 13:1–7. Notice first that Paul simply refers to higher powers. The Scriptures do not advocate any specific form of governmental organization. When Paul wrote these words, Nero was on the throne. A more pagan, more wicked, and more unjust government is hardly on record. Yet Paul says, "Be subject. . .for the powers that be are ordained of God." Even a scoundrel like Nero is called a minister of God, a servant of God. Luther says, "God sometimes permits much good to come to a people through a tyrant or scoundrel" (Smalcald Articles, II, iv, 3).

Paul continues by reminding us that government is "a minister of God to thee for good." The function of government is to establish moral order and to prevent anarchy. Emil Brunner says that the state is organized selfishness. The Apology (VII, 50) says that "lawful governments are ordinances of God and are preserved and defended by God against the devil."

Moreover, government exists for the protection of life, reputation, and property of the citizen, Luther remarks: "it would therefore be fitting if the coat-of-arms of every upright

prince were emblazoned with a loaf of bread. . .to remind both princes and subject that through the office of the princes we enjoy protection and peace, and without these we could not have the steady blessing of daily bread" (Large Catechism, I, 150). The framers of the Declaration of Independence assumed this truth when they wrote: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect safety and happiness." Similarly, the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States declares: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

We look to our government to preserve to us and our children those freedoms and rights granted us in the Bill of Rights: freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of petition to the government for a redress of grievances; freedom from unreasonable search and seizure, from excessive bails and fines, and from cruel and unusual punishment; the right to bear arms, to life, liberty, and property, to just compensation for private property, and to a fair trial.

To accomplish these purposes governments enact laws. Wrote Jefferson, "In questions of power, let no more be heard of confidence in man, and bind him down from mischief with the claims of the Constitution"[1]. These laws are based upon reason, natural law, and expendiency. To enact and carry out these laws, the government in our country maintains legislative, judicial, and executive branches, with proper checks and balances. Furthermore, taxes are levied to enable the government to protect our inalienable rights.

Government, according to Romans 13, exists not only to safeguard our freedoms, but also to punish evil-doers. "He beareth not the sword in vain, for He is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Christians are not to engage in private revenge, but are to seek justice in the courts. So states the Apology (XVI, 7): "The Gospel forbids private revenge, and Christ stresses this so often lest

the apostles think that they should usurp the government from those who hold it, as in the Jewish dream of the Messianic kingdom; instead, he would have them know their duty to teach that the spiritual kingdom does not change the civil government. Thus private revenge is forbidden not as an evangelical counsel but as a command (Matt. 5:39): Rom. 12:19). Public redress through a judge is not forbidden but expressly commanded, and it is a work of God according to Paul (Rom. 13:1ff). Now the various kinds of public redress are court decisions, punishments, wars, military service."

The state seeks to preserve the nation from anarchy by the use of power. In the Little Rock school desegregation episode, President Eisenhower called in paratroopers. The government levels punishment in the form of fines and imprisonment. It has the right to take human life in cases which it considers to be of such gravity as to call for that extreme punishment. In his Large Catechism, Luther says that the government's "right to take human life is not abrogated" (I, 180). In Genesis 9:6 God says: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man."

Governments exist also to use the sword to protect the citizens against enemies from without. The Augsburg Confession (XVI) says: "That Christians may without sin. . .engage in just wars, serve as soldiers. . ." The Apology (XVI, 8) adds that by a just war vengeance "is done as God's work."

God rules not only in the kingdom of power but also in the kingdom of grace. In both its nature and purpose, it differs radically from the kingdom of this world. Jesus confessed before Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered into the hands of the Jews, but now is my kingdom not from hence . . . . To this end was I born and for this purpose came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice" (John 18:36-37). Christ's kingdom is the kingdom of the truth of the Gospel of God's grace revealed in Him who is the truth. Everyone who confesses this truth is a member of Christ's spiritual, worldwide, and everlasting kingdom.

In an effort to describe the kingdom of grace, article 5 of the Augsburg Confession says: "To obtain such faith, God instituted the office of the ministry, that is, provided the Gospel and the sacraments. Through these, as through means, he gives the Holy Spirit, who works faith when and where he pleases, in those who hear the Gospel. And this Gospel teaches that we have a gracious God, not by our own merits but by the merit of Christ, when we believe this." So the great blessing which the

church mediates is saving faith; the means that it uses are the Gospel and the sacraments through which the Holy Spirit brings men to faith. This, then, is the peculiar church power which Christ has given to His church on earth, to forgive the sins of penitent sinners unto them and to retain the sins of the impenitent as long as they do not repent.

The Church exercises its power publicly through the called and ordained servants of the Word. Pastors are ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God who in Christ's name and in the name of the congregation which has called them preach the Word, administer the sacraments, and forgive and retain sins. And we firmly believe that when the called ministers of Christ deal with us by His divine command, especially when they absolve those who repent of their sins and are willing to amend, this is as valid and certain in heaven also as if Christ, our dear Lord, dealt with us himself.

By way of summary, we can make the following contrasts between the kingdom of power represented by the state and the kingdom of grace represented by the church: The state is composed of citizens; the church of Christians. The state is ruled by laws derived from reason; the church is guided by the Word of God. The state is a temporal kingdom; the church is a spiritual and an eternal kingdom. The blessing the state gives is protection; the blessing the church mediates is the forgiveness of sins. The state is concerned with the body; the church, primarily with the soul. The state aims at outward obedience; the church at faith active in love. The state uses force to maintain order; the church uses the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.

The Christian in the world finds himself a citizen of both kingdoms at the same time, with responsibilities toward both. Jesus said: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." As a citizen in Christ's kingdom, the Christian is to nourish his own soul by diligently hearing and reading the Bible. "Blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it," says Christ. Moreover, he is to support the work of the church by Word and deed. "Go and make disciples" is Christ's command. "Ye shall be witnesses unto me" is a word for every Christian. The Christian is to show forth the praises of Him who has called Him out of darkness into His marvelous light. The Christian is to support the work of the church. On the first day of the week he is to lay by him in store as the Lord has prospered him. In addition, he is to endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. He is to honor the office of the public ministry. St. Paul exhorts: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of

double honor; especially they who labor in the Word of doctrine" (I Tim. 5:17).

Pastors, too, as guides of their flocks, have their responsibilities, "It is required in stewards that a man be found faithful" is the over-arching demand. Moreover, pastors are not to be lords over God's heritage but are to be examples to the flock (I Peter 5:3). They are to labor as those who must give an account. (Hebrew 13:17).

And pastor and people have God-given responsibilities as citizens. Paul says: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." Again "wherefore we must need be to subject not only for wrath but also for conscience sake." Not only the fear of the government's wrath, but the promptings of Christian conscience ought to urge us to obedience. St. Peter says: "Submit yourself to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake" (I Peter 2:15). Luther affirms (Large Catechism, I, 150 f.): "The same may be said of obedience to the civil government, which, as we have said, is to be classed with the estate of fatherhood, the most comprehensive of all relations. In this case a man is father not of a single family, but of as many people as he has inhabitants, citizens, or subjects. Through civil rulers, as through our own parents, God gives us food, house and home, protection and security. Therefore, since they bear his name and title with all honor as their chief glory, it is our duty to honor and to magnify them as the most precious treasure and jewel on earth." Rulers, too, are obliged to submit to the law of the land, as the Watergate case reminded us all.

The Augsburg Confession says (XVI, 6f): "Christians are obliged to be subject to civil authority and obey its commands and laws in all that can be done without sin. But when commands of the civil government cannot be obeyed without sin, we must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). When Peter and John were commanded to cease preaching, Peter replied: "We ought to obey God rather than man." However, before any Christian engages in civil disobedience, he should make quite sure that the government's demand is contrary to the Word of God. Furthermore, he should be willing to take the consequence for his action. As Gardner writes, "Whenever the citizens believes a law to be unjust, he has a duty to do what he can to change it by participation in the normal and legal processes whereby laws are made, amended, and repealed. In those countries where citizens have an opportunity to participate in the processes of government, obedience to God is not the same thing as mere submission to those who are in authority at a particular time. Rather, it involves the responsibility to assist those in authority in performing their appointed tasks by giving them support, by keeping their

actions under continuous criticism, and by preparing to replace the governing authorities themselves when this seems necessary in the interest of better government."[2] The CTCR document, *Civil Obedience and Disobedience,* says that "when a Christian disobeys a law which he considers to be in conflict with the higher law of God, he should:

1. be quite sure that all legal means of changing the law have been exhausted;
2. consult with men of good conscience to test the validity of his judgment;
3. carry out his act of disobedience in a nonviolent manner;
4. direct his act of disobedience as precisely as possible against the specific law or practice which violates his conscience;
5. exercise restraint in the use of this privilege because of the danger of lawlessness."[3]

Furthermore, the Scriptures tell us to give honor to whom honor is due (Romans 13:7). Speaking of rulers, Luther says: "If you regard their persons with reference to their noses etc. . . . they look no different from Turks or heathen . . . But because of the commandment, "You shall honor father and mother," I see another man adorned with the majesty and glory of God" (LC, IV, 20).

Again, Christians are to pray for government. Jeremiah tells the Babylonian captives: "Seek the peace of the city whereunto I have caused you to be carried away captive and pray into the Lord for it. For in the peace thereof shall ye have peace" (Jer. 29:1–7). St. Paul exhorts: "I exhort, therefore, the first of all, supplications, prayers, and intercessions be made for all men, for kings and for all authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceful life in all godliness and honesty" (I Tim. 2:1–3). In our General Prayer we pray: "Bestow Thy grace upon all nations of the earth. Especially do we entreat Thee to bless our land and all its inhabitants and all who are in authority. Cause Thy glory to dwell among us and let mercy and truth, righteousness, and peace everywhere prevail."

Another responsibility we have is to pay the taxes necessary for running our government. Jesus himself paid the temple tax. And Paul urges us: "Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor" (Romans 13:7).

In addition, Christians have the responsibility in our democratic society of participating in government by running for public office, by knowing the candidates for election so as to vote intelligently, by performing jury duty, and by affiliating with local community groups designed to improve the quality of life of our citizenry and to promote good government. Gardner

writes: "From the standpoint of responsible citizenship, what is needed to clean up politics is not cynicism and self-righteous withdrawal from the political process but more concern and participation in it by those Christians and others who deplore the existing corruption. This participation can take place at many levels, and it does not demand that everyone run for office. All the citizens share the responsibility for government. . . ."[4] John Bennett suggests that in a democratic society the words *responsibility* and *participation* must be placed alongside the demand for obedience to government.[5] When Christian people create a void by their inactivity in the process of good government, we can be sure that the devil will rush in to fill it.

While I have contended in this paper thus far that church and state should be mutually supportive, I want to state now that the two should remain separate and not be intermingled. For mingling produces tyranny. And tyranny unmasked is the work of the devil. The Augsburg Confession (XXVIII, 11f.) says: "Temporal authority is concerned with matters altogether different from the Gospel. Temporal power does not protect the soul, but with the sword and physical penalties it protects body and goods from the power of others. Therefore, the two authorities, the spiritual and the temporal are not to be intermingled or confused."

If the history of the Christian Church teaches us anything at all, it is that a mingling of the two powers produces tyranny. The Roman emperor was the *pontifex maximus*, the great high priest, and those who worshipped any other as God were fed to waiting lions in the coliseum. In 330 Constantine in the Edict of Milan declared Christianity to be a permitted religion. But soon the Christian Church became a compulsory institution of the state. In 800 the pope crowned Charlemagne as head of the Holy Roman Empire. Pope Boniface VIII in his bull *Unam Sanctam* declared that the church has two swords, the temporal and the spiritual. The Middle Ages are consequently one long bloody struggle between church and state for power. John Calvin felt that every offense was a transgression of the Ten Commandments and called upon the state to enforce church laws and to punish all offenders. Our spiritual forebears, the Saxons, came to this country to escape the harassment of the State Church in Germany which demanded that they use rationalistic textbooks in their schools. As late as 1665 the British Parliament, in an effort to compel all persons to attend the established Church, passed the Conventicle Act, making everyone over sixteen years who attended a conventicle subject to imprisonment and, for the third offense, to transportation beyond the seas. This was followed by the Test Act requiring

oaths in support of the established religion. And dissenters flocked to our shores.

Theodore Hoyer says, "Not until the United States of America was established did the world see a land in which this right and natural and scriptural relationship between church and state exists - separation."[6] The government has nothing to do with the church as church, nor the church as church with the State.[7] This principle is violated when either church or state usurps or interferes with the powers, rights, and duties of the other.[8]

Accordingly, the Augsburg Confession (XVIII, 12-14) says to the church: "The power of the church has its own commission to teach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments. Let it not break into the office of another; let it not transfer the kingdoms of this world; let it not abrogate the laws of civil rulers concerning the form of the Commonwealth." The church should not strive for temporal power. Nor should it resort to the sword as was done at the time of the Crusades and the Inquistion.

At the same time, the domain of the state does not include conscience and religion. Says Luther, "When civil government gives laws to the soul, it interferes with God's order and only seduces and destroys souls."[9] Hence, civil government oversteps its authority when it names one religion as a religion of the state. Says Luther, "No ruler ought to prevent anyone from teaching or believing what he pleases, whether Gospel or lies. It is enough if he prevents the teaching of sedition and rebellion."[10] Nor is it a function of the state to designate church festivals or pass blue laws or to settle doctrinal disputes.

The one area in which church and state have come into conflict most seriously is in the area of education. Now we grant to the state the right to insist that for the good of the nation children receive an education. However, when the state attempts to ban parochial schools, we have always insisted that to do so would constitute an abridgment of the First Amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion nor permitting the free exercise thereof." In a democratic society, it should be the perogative of the parents to decide on the education of their children. At the same time, we cherish the privilege of giving our children a Christian education and must strive to conform to reasonable standards of education set by the state.

A second area of debate involves the teaching of religion, whether Bible reading or prayers, in the public school. Ardent supporters of the separation principle want to eliminate God altogether from public education. Opponents of this position

argue that if God is eliminated, then secularism, a view of life which operates as if God did not exist, is taught. And secularism, too, is a religion. Harold Brown has written: "The doctrine of the separation of church and state, if it refers to institutions and organizations, is salutary and acceptable. If it is interpreted to mean the systematic exclusion of all religious attitudes, insights and values from every aspect of life and every square feet of space where the state exercises a measure of involvement or regulation, then it is illegitimate and represents nothing less than a long-range program for the suppression of religion, and specifically, of the most widely represented and active religion in America, Christianity."[11] Many Christians argue that the case for creationism ought to be taught alongside of evolutionism, for example. On July 21, 1925, John Thomas Scopes was convicted of teaching the theory of evolution in a public school. At that time, Clarence Darrow, his attorney, declared: "It's bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins."[12]

A third area of debate concerns services provided by the state for its children, like bus service, the hot lunch program, health services, etc. A case in point is the Supreme Court ruling in the case of Meek vs. Pittinger. The ruling states that the state may lend textbooks to children to nonpublic schools but may not lend instructional materials or equipment to nonpublic schools. The ruling also prevents public school personnel from providing auxiliary services (testing, speech therapy, special education for the handicapped, etc) to nonpublic school children on nonpublic school property.

Commenting on the decision Dr. Al Senske said: "It is impossible to understand why providing a secular textbook is constitutional and a secular filmstrip is not . . . . It does not make sense to believe that a public school teacher providing speech therapy on church property will be promoting religion while that same teacher will not be guilty of such an act while providing that same therapy off the church property . . . This present decision reaffirms our continuing position that the church and individuals committed to Lutheran elementary and secondary schools must be willing to be responsible for the basic support." Some argue that the children attending our parochial schools are as much entitled to such services as any others because the services come from tax dollars. After all, they say, we are already receiving federal funds because of our tax-exempt status. Others argue that state funds are for public education and should not be directed to assist private education. Even some of those in favor of parochial education argue against the acceptance of state aid on the theory that power follows purse. Sooner or later, they say, the strings of

the purse of state aid will strangle parochial education. I happen to be on the side of those who argue that we should pay our way in parochial education. The little we could receive in state aid is not worth the risk of state domination. Parochial education has been and always will be expensive. But in terms of training up children in the way they should go, it is well worth it.

As God's children, then, let us continue to proclaim liberty throughout the land by rendering unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God, the things which are God's.

FOOTNOTES

1. Thomas James Norton, *The Constitution of the United States* (New York: America's Future, 1943), preface IX.
2. Edward Clinton Gardner, *Biblical Faith and Social Ethics* (New York: Harper, 1960), p. 315.
3. Commission on Theology and Church Relations, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, *Civil Obedience and Disobedience* (St. Louis: CTCR, 1967), p.5.
4. Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 332.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 314.
6. Theodore Hoyer, *Church and State,* in Theodore Laetsch, ed., *The Abiding Word, II* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1947), p. 590.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*, p. 591.
9. Quoted in Hoyer, *op. cit.*, p. 595.
10. Quoted in Hoyer, *op., cit.*, p. 595.
11. Harold Brown, "The Passivity of American Christians," *Christianity Today, XX* (January 16, 1976), p. 10.
12. *Bible-Science Newsletter,* October 1974, p.4.

The Crisis on Biblical Authority: A Historical Analysis

STEVEN HEIN
Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Illinois

I. Erosion of Confidence in Biblical Reliability

Michael Reu in his excellent monograph, *Luther and the Scriptures,* has impressively shown that Luther's understanding of the nature and authority of Scripture was similar to the Occamist theological tradition in which he was schooled. As William of Occam regarded Scripture from the standpoint of plenary inspiration holding that all of its teachings are divine and hence without error, so also did Luther.[1] Thus, Luther could assert, "The Scriptures have never erred."[2] "It is impossible that Scripture should contradict itself; it only appears so to senseless and obstinate hypocrites."[3] Such a position Luther could and did assert from his earliest writings on, without raising the least bit of protest from Rome. This was only possible because his own views on the divine origin and authority of Scripture were the same as those of his Roman Catholic contemporaries. Even Paul Althaus, although critical of Luther on this point, is forced to admit that Luther

> . . . followed the tradition of his time and basically accepted it [Scripture] as an essentially infallible book, inspired in its entire content by the Holy Spirit. It is therefore "the Word of God," not only when it speaks to us in Law and Gospel . . . but also—and this is a matter of principle—in everything else that it says.[4]

Althaus goes on to assert that "seen as a totality, its historical accounts, its world-view, and all the miracle stories are 'God's Word' given by the Holy Spirit; they are therefore all unquestionable truth, to be 'believed' precisely because they are contained in the book."[5]

The Reformation issue that Luther raised, and which has since divided Protestantism from Rome, was not the fully divine character and authority of Holy Scripture; it was the issue of the *sole* authority of Scripture. It was Luther's insistence that Scripture is to be "the *sole* rule and norm of all doctrine, and that no human being's writings dare be put on a par with it."[6] This meant, *contra* Rome, that even the doctrines of popes, councils, and revered church fathers must be judged and declared right or wrong on the sole basis of the teachings of Scripture. It was their stand on Scripture *alone,* not their stand

on Scripture as inspired and infallible that separated the reformers from Rome.

The current-day struggle in Lutheranism, then, concerning the nature and extent of Biblical authority does not stem from a lack of clarity on this issue from Luther and his fellow reformers. There can be no question but that they regarded the totality of Holy Scripture to be the inspired and inerrant Word of God. Therefore whatever Scripture teaches they regarded as what the Holy Spirit teaches and hence what faithful believers were to embrace. Such a position carried with it the dual recognition that Scripture is both God's authoritative revelation to us *and* a fully reliable historical witness to God's actions and words in human history. To acknowledge this fact is to acknowledge that our present controversy stems not from some vacuum in the Reformation, but rather from challenges to that position which have been raised since the sixteenth century.

It was the famous German theologian, Ernst Troeltsch, who, at the turn of the century, asserted that modern day Protestantism stemmed primarily from the Enlightenment instead of from the Reformation.[7] Although Troeltsch's observation was directed primarily at the European theological scene just prior to World War I, his judgment nevertheless has application to the present controversy in American Lutheranism concerning Biblical authority. It serves to emphasize that the crisis in Biblical authority, and the shift away from a Reformational understanding has its roots primarily in the eighteenth century, an age characterized in history as the Enlightenment. Prior to the Enlightenment, western Christendom had a fundamental concensus concerning the nature and extent of Biblical authority. The matter of *sola Scriptura* divided Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, and doctrinal issues involving Biblical interpretation (as, for example, concerning the Sacraments) separated Lutheranism from Calvinist church bodies. All confessional grouping, however, agreed that the scriptures were inspired, the infallible Word of God, and were fully reliable on all matters which they taught. Despite this consensus which existed up to the end of the seventeenth century, the next hundred years were to deal a series of blows to the full authority of the Bible from which western Christendom has yet to recover.

In order to understand the nature and severity of this challenge, we will focus our attention especially on four prominent thinkers in this period. The first of these four is the famous English scientist, Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727), whose *Principia Mathematica,* published in 1687, betokened the dawn of a new age. A new cosmology was set forth by Newton that simply could not be reconciled with the Bible's understanding of

the ongoing relationship between God and His creation. Working from the data of human experience, Newton set forth by way of mathematical formulas, the notion that the universe was controlled by certain "Laws of Nature" or principles which are built right into the fabric of the universe and by which almost all activity in the universe could be explained in terms of cause and effect. Newton's cosmology viewed the universe as a closed-system: something like a perfect clockwork mechanism which, once created by God, was then able to exist on its own quite independently from God's direct involvement. God was still viewed as Creator, but the Biblical view that God is the causal agent who sustains the orderly functioning of the world was ruled out. For Newton, God was still present to see all and know all, but it was considered quite impossible to say that He shaped any particular event.

Said Newton, "We are to admit no more causes of natural things than such as are both true and sufficient to explain their appearances."[8] And for Newton, only natural causes were the "true and sufficient" ones. Such an understanding is in absolute contradiction to the Biblical picture of God as an ongoing causal agent whose continual involvement in His creation is necessary to preserve the created order. Listen to the Psalmist:

> Sing to the Lord with thanksgiving,
> make melody to our God upon the lyre!
> He covers the heavens with clouds,
> He prepares rain for the earth,
> He makes grass grow upon the hills.
> He gives to the beasts their food, . . .[9]

Who is right? The Biblical writers or Newton? Most of the intellectual world up until the 1920's went along with Newton. The Biblical world-view rested on the authority of an inspired book which promised a subjective certainty concerning its claims worked in the heart by the Holy Spirit. Newton offered objective mathematical certitude for his views, and for that reason Newton won and the Bible lost.

Now, to be sure, Newton himself understood that there were gaps in his closed-system view. There were phenomena which his laws of nature could not explain. To these areas, he was more than eager to attribute to God certain housekeeping functions which were necessary to keep the universe in good order. Nevertheless, his findings had a profound effect upon philosophers, theologians, and scientists who were optimistic that these gaps would soon be closed by the discovery of yet unknown, but very real, laws of nature. To his followers, Newton had uncovered the mechanistic inner workings of the universe, and all that was left was to work out some of the finer details.

One of the results of Newton's findings was a general attitude of great awe and admiration for God the Creator who had made such a magnificent creation. If Biblical writers held God in awe for a creation with which they believed He must be continually involved to preserve it, how much greater awe and wonder must be directed to a Creator God whose creation is so perfect that it can sustain itself without God's constant involvement! Yet, if God the Creator was magnified, so also was His creature man, who, now coming of age, had developed his reasoning capacities to such a degree that he had discovered the very mysteries which God built into the created order to keep it functioning. How great is God and His creative wisdom! But also how great is man and his reasoning potential! Armed with natural law (and science to back it up), together with a new-found optimism concerning man's powers of critical reasoning, theologians and philosophers began to exert pressure on the notion of a divinely inerrant Holy Scripture. The Biblical writers had quite erroneously understood God as a constant causal agent in the world. This was only natural, however, because they lived in a pre-scientific age where things like laws of nature were unknown. Their errors were understandable, but nevertheless they *were* errors and ones which modern man had now been able to perceive clearly. One simply could not be intellectual and hold to an inerrantly inspired Bible. The enlightened theologian must use his God-given reason to reinterpret the Scriptures for modern man, minus the pre-scientific supernatural world-view of its human authors.

Orthodoxy's reaction to this serious challenge to the Bible's authority was one of retreat to a position that it hoped would be an adequate defense. Apologists for orthodoxy asserted that science had *not proven* that God was no longer a causal agent in the world. As Newton admitted, they argued, there are gaps where God continuously works in His ongoing activity of preservation, areas which really are more crucial than science suspects. The Bible was not in error. Moreover, they asserted, the Biblical accounts of God's miraculous interventions into the affairs of His creation were proof positive that God continues to be active in the affairs of the world.[10] And natural law had not ruled out the miraculous—not yet anyway.

These defenses, although somewhat persuasive for a time, were soon overrun as gaps began to be closed through the discovery and formulation of new laws of nature. Following the lead of philosophers like Spinoza, theologians in the eighteenth century began to equate God's will with the laws of nature. Biblical accounts describing miraculous interventions by God into the affairs of nature were soon suspected of the same kind of pre-scientific distortion as were biblical accounts which gave

God a primary role in directing the ordinary affairs of the world. Such a skeptical attitude about the accuracy of Biblical reports of miracles was given tremendous impetus by the British philosopher, David Hume (1711-1776).

In his work, *An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding,* Hume launched a devasting attack against orthodoxy's belief in Biblical miracles. He argued that proper historical reasoning must proceed on the basis of two rules: "conformity with the observed course of nature and determination of the reliability of witnesses."[11] Since miracles are a violation of the laws of nature, they certainly are not in conformity with the observed course of nature which operates on the basis of natural law. Hence, Hume concluded, because the laws of nature have been established on the basis of "firm and unalterable experience," uniform experience weighs against any alleged violation. Thus, miracles are intrinsically the least probable of all possible events. Historically speaking, the evidence is always against them, and thus testimony to their occurrence is either a deception or the product of naive delusion. Whereas Newton theoretically removed God from the role of ultimate causal agent in the ordinary affairs of the world, Hume removed Him in a practical way from the role of supernatural intervener in the created order. Enlightened reason marched on toward further conquests, and the amount of sheer "faith" needed to sustain an enlightened conviction in a fully authoritative inspired Bible produced a rising level of tension.

Another thinker of the eighteenth century who was to add to this tension was Gotthold Lessing (1729-1781). "Lessing argued that an historical truth was not capable of logical demonstration and, since miracles are historical truths, the truth of Christianity could not be demonstrated by them."[12] All historical knowledge, reasoned Lessing, is based upon evidence about which there is never certainty of its reliability. It is always possible that more reliable evidence might turn up in the future, thus altering our historical judgments. Christian truth demands certitude, which, although reason may supply, history cannot. "Accidental truths of history can never become the proof of a necessary truth of reason." Hence to argue, for example, from the historical event of the resurrection (an accidental truth of history), to the deity of Christ (a necessary truth) was to shift categories *and* to attempt to render a kind of result from history that history is incapable of rendering. If Hume had shown that it was pointless to hold historically to miraculous events as reported in the Bible, Lessing took the matter one step further by arguing that all alleged historical events, by their very nature, are insufficient vehicles for mediating divine truth which demands certitude. Not only was

it now considered impossible historically to regard such events (for example, Christ's resurrection) as factual historical events, but it was considered equally impossible to make *any* alleged historical events the basis for certain knowledge of God and matters of religious truth.

Perhaps in the light of this background it is easier for us to understand why the former faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, could assert in 1972 that we "ought to focus on the central meaning of the miracle accounts for us rather than dwell on the authenticity of isolated miraculous details."[13] Or perhaps more to the point is the further observation by the faculty that "if we keep asking 'Did Jesus really rise,' we will never hear the promise."[1] Let us understand clearly at this point that, like the moderate theologians in our Synod, not one of the influential thinkers we have discussed thus far intimated that God cannot work miracles or that miracles are theoretically impossible. They were simply skeptical about the Biblical reports to their occurrence and our intellectual ability to defend their occurrence and relevance to the Christian faith. Miracles could occur; but they could not be known objectively or serve as the basis of an authoritative knowledge of God.

The last major eighteenth century thinker whom we will consider is Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). In his *Critique on Pure Reason,* Kant attacked the use of reason as a legitimate avenue for gaining certain knowledge of God and His divine wisdom. He argued with great effectiveness that all thinking must be checked by the data of experience for its validity to be established. With great expertise he launched a convincing attack upon both the classical arguments for the existence of God and the metaphysical rationalism of his day. The existence or the non-existence of something (even God) cannot be determined by thought alone; it depends entirely upon experience. Reason is competent to unify or systematize the phenomena of human experience but cannot reach beyond to the unseen part of reality. What is important about Kant for our discussion is his division of reality into two separate realms or "stories." The lower story consisted of the realm of the phenomenal or natural world of human experience. On this level lay all observable experience, such as historical facts and the laws of nature. In the upper story, which Kant called the noumenal realm, there existed God, ultimate purposes, values, and all absolutes. All divine or religious truths were placed in this unverifiable, objectively unknowable "upper story." The effect of this dualistic view of reality was to remove God from that realm of human history and experience by which He could objectively reveal Himself—a realm in which the Bible had God operating (in a seemingly objective fashion) all the time.

Epistemologically, Kant's dualism forced theologians to conclude that God revealed Himself in such a way that the Biblical writers merely perceived His working and action in a subjective manner, not in such a way that He was objectively manifest.

We recall from the beginning of our discussion that, for Luther and the post-Reformation fathers, the Bible was regarded as God's fully authoritative revelation to us, mediating a fully reliable history of God's dealings with man. This course of events culminated in the entry into human history of God's Son, whose miracles, fulfilment of prophecy, and bodily resurrection offered mankind powerful signs that God had visited His people and died on a cross to redeem them from their sins. The reformers, as numerous church fathers before them, tied together the accuracy of Biblical history and an inspired and infallible Word of God. Hence Luther can, on the one hand, say: "My neighbor and I—in short, all men—may err and deceive, but God's Word cannot err."[15] (And here Luther is upholding both the divine authorship *and* the inerrancy of Holy Writ.) And on the other hand, with consistency he can argue in the following manner:

> Christ says, "If my preaching does not make you willing to believe that God dwells and is in me and that I dwell and am in Him, then believe this because of the works you see before your eyes. These works as no one can deny, are not human; they are divine. They prove and attest powerfully enough that he speaks and works in me and through me." These are the works and miracles which he performed publicly before all the world—giving sight to the blind and hearing to the deaf—solely by the Word. These are not only divine works, but they are also witnesses of God the Father. Therefore he who sees and hears these, sees and hears the Father in them.[16]

Listen again to Luther's reasoning:

> Therefore when Christ says: "In three days I will raise it up," He proclaims that the death of His body lies within His power, that He can lay down His life and take it again at will (John 10:18). Therefore He cannot be only man but must also be God. The fact that He is to be destroyed and die is proof of His humanity. But that He will rise again, that He will raise Himself from death, bears witness to His divinity and to His divine power to quicken the dead, for this is not the work of a human being. In this way Christ reveals His true divinity and humanity to the Jews.[17]

Because the Scriptures are the inerrant Word of God, they are also, argues Luther, a fully reliable account of God's super-

natural intervention into human history. Their witness to Christ's miracles and resurrection provides a solid basis to assert Christ's divinity, oneness with the Father, and power over life and death. These signs provide powerful and convincing reasons for the Jews to accept Christ as the Messiah and the Son of God who has come to redeem the world from its sin.

Now, if you take away the reliable historical witness, you take away *both* objective access to Christ and a fully inspired and authoritative Bible. And this, as we have seen, is exactly what much of the intellectual world in Christendom believed men such as Newton, Hume, Lessing, and Kant had done. The issue was not problems with parallel Biblical accounts of the same events. The issue was not problems with genealogies, numbers, or chronology. These problems had been known and faced since the time of the early church fathers. The key issue which the Enlightenment raised was the validity of viewing God as a causal agent in the affairs of nature and human history. The issue was whether or not a modern enlightened Christianity could continue to accept the Biblical picture of God's direct, objective, and immanent involvement in His created order. Orthodoxy tried to maintain a yes, others tried to work out a compromise, and liberalism said no.

It was not until the close of the nineteenth century that the overall impact of the Enlightenment became firmy embedded in the new science of history. Probably no one came to grips more effectively with what historical criticism had done to challenge Biblical authority than the famous German theologian, Ernst Troeltsch. In his work *Historismus und Seine Probleme,* Troeltsch expounds with great clarity the objectives of historical criticism and the central principles which undergird its endeavor. The critical scholar must attempt to recover the past through an objective scientific analysis of the evidence. Events must be analyzed, evaluated, and understood in terms of the origins or antecedent causes with the objective of getting behind the evidence so as to reconstruct what truly happened, what caused it, and what was its effect. To carry out this task, the critical scholar must observe three principles which undergird the critical task. The first principle Troeltsch calls the *Principle of Criticism.* This principle states that the Scriptures (or any alleged historical writing for that matter) must be subjected to a critical analysis whereby "our judgements about the past cannot simply be classified as true or false but must be seen as claiming only a greater or lesser degree of probability."[18] Here in Troeltsch's Principle of Criticism we see the shadow of Gotthold Lessing, who maintained that historical truth cannot provide objective certitude.

Troeltsch's second principle, known as the *Principle of Analogy,* asserts that in making historical judgments of probability, the critical scholar must presuppose that our own present experience of reality is not radically different from the experience of past ages. Troeltsch elaborates:

> The analogy of what we actually see happen before our eyes and what goes on within ourselves is the key to criticism. The deceptions, shifts, creation of myths, frauds and factions which we see before us are the means whereby we recognize the same things in the material that has come down to us. Agreement with the normal, usual or at least frequently attested manner of events or conditions which are familiar to us is the hallmark of probability for events which criticism can accept or allow really to have happened.[19]

Here we see enunciated as a formal historical principle both Newton's closed-system world-view and David Hume's dictum that current uniform experience is to be the basis for judging the plausibility of alleged unique miraculous events in the past. Since supernatural interruptions of the course of nature are not observed to occur in the present, the historian is incapable of dealing seriously with alleged claims to their occurrence in the past.

Troeltsch's third principle he calls the *Principle of Correlation.* This principle asserts that the phenomena of man's historical life are so related (in terms of cause and effect) and interdependent, that no radical change can take place at any one point in the historical nexus without effecting a change in all that immediately surrounds it. What Troeltsch is saying here is that the causes and effects of historical events must be sought within the immediate context of historically conditioned space and time. Explanations, therefore, which would attempt to explain causes or effect of historical events in terms of ultimate divine causality or eternal effects are not admissible because they would force the scholar to leave his proper domain, which is space-time history, not the unseen realm of eternity. Here, of course, we see the influence of Immanuel Kant, who maintained that reason may properly analyze and understand the data of human experience in the phenomenal realm, but in providing understanding may not cross over into the noumenal "upper story" realm for final causes or ultimate meaning.

With these underlying principles, the task of the critical scholar is to carry out an objective, independent investigation of the Biblical text using all available resources and evidence for the purpose of determinining the credibility of the Biblical writers in terms of reconstructing as well as possible what

really happened. A concomitant task is to seek to understand why the Biblical writer composed his document and arranged his materials in the fashion we have received them in the resultant text. Appropriate to this task are the following presuppositions:

1. Rather than revealed truths from God, the Biblical documents represent first and foremost the personal faith and beliefs of their human authors and secondarily the faith and beliefs of part or all of the writer's contemporary religious community. Hence as Norman Perrin has written in *What is Redaction Criticism,*

> We must take as our starting point the assumption that the Gospels offer us directly information about the theology of the early church and not about the teaching of the historical Jesus, and that any information we may derive from them about Jesus can only come as a result of the stringent application of very carefully contrived criteria for authenticity.[20]

2. Due to the human origin of the Biblical documents, the exegete is not surprised to find contradictions, inaccuracies, and errors within them. However the Spirit's activity is understood in relation to the writing of Scripture, it does not preclude the possibility of such contradictions, errors, and inaccuracies. The competent twentieth-century Biblical scholar is in a position to point many of them out. To this effect Walter E. Rast in his *Tradition History and the Old Testament* has asserted that

> the historicality of the Bible, that is, the conditioned character of its contents, a conditionedness which makes them dependent upon all kinds of human limitations and situations in precisely the same way as the legacies of all sorts of historical traditions, is an assumption of modern criticism throughout. That assumption makes it modern.[21]

This is the same assumption that the former faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, maintained in *Faithful to Our Calling.* That document asserts that, because the Biblical writers operated with dissimilar standards of history and accuracy together with limitations imposed by their culture and language, the reliability of Scriptures cannot be determined by twentieth-century standards of factuality.[22]

3. Because of these built-in limitations of language and cultural conditionedness, the *verba* of the text never in themselves constitute God's revelation in the sense that the thoughts expressed by the words and God's thoughts are one and the same.

4. It can never be stated *for certain* that the events recorded in Scripture occurred as reported, but probabilities can be

assessed on the basis of several factors, among which are the alleged event's uniqueness and the amount of time that exists between the event's occurrence and the written record. (A.) As a general rule, the greater the time span between an event's alleged occurrence and its recording, the greater the likelihood that the recorded details of the event are inaccurate, conflated and distorted, usually by heightening the degree of supernatural involvement. (B.) Moreover, the more numerous the parallels that exist between a given supernatural event recorded in Scripture and supernatural events recorded in contemporary pagan literature of the same area, the greater the probability that the Biblical event did not actually occur but rather was probably a common legend or myth that numerous religions used for didactic purposes.

Gene Tucker reflects these general presuppositions in his *Form Criticism of the Old Testament* where he observes:

> Sagas usually tell us more about the life and time of the period in which they were circulated and written down than they do about the events they mean to describe. A careful form critical and traditio-historical analysis, however, can help the historian to distinguish between the old and the new and the historically reliable and the unreliable in those sagas. It also helps us to separate older traditions from newer interpretations.[23]

Or as William A. Beardslee has put it in his *Literary Criticism of the New Testament:*

> The recognition that the New Testament does belong extensively to folk literature has gradually opened the possibility of a new understanding of formal analysis of the New Testament. The first major application of this new approach has been "form criticism" . . . The new turn has shown that the most useful date for comparison come not from familiar literature of the West, but from folk materials, myths, legends, cultic materials and from phenomenological studies of religion generally.[24]

5. Prophetic discourse has a direct application to the immediate situation in which the utterance was made, regardless of whether or not Scripture at some point interprets the passage as applying to a later time and circumstance. In harmony with this assumption, the former faculty in St. Louis maintained that "The Old Testament—on its own terms—does not explicitly bear witness to Jesus Christ, but it proclaims the words and deeds of God for Israel."[25] Hence, the faculty asserts in the *Faithful* document that "many 'Messiahs' like David ruled over Israel," "Solomon was the first fulfilment of the messianic

promise to David," and "a young woman in Isaiah's day gave birth to a child named Immanuel."[26]

It is evident, then, that historical criticism is not a neutral method of Biblical interpretation. Its presuppositions come right out of the Enlightenment and are antithetical to a Reformational understanding of the intrinsically divine character of Holy Scripture. As Gerhard Ebeling has so clearly argued,

> It leads only to obsuring the nature of the problem when the critical historical method is held to be a purely formal scientific technique, entirely free of presuppositions, whose application to the historical objects in the theological realm provokes no conflicts and does no hurt to the dogmatic structure . . . . For historical criticism is more than lively historical interest.[27]

Such is the case because, as Robert Funk summarizes,

> Historical criticism exposes the word of God as a fully human word by exposing the human situation into which it is received as radically human. This procedure may be termed "unmasking" . . . and involves calling in question all human claims to access to the divine. It is important to grasp the connection of this formulation with Bultmann's repeated emphasis on history as a closed causal continuum *as the presupposition of the historical method* (italics supplied) . . . .The historian cannot presuppose supernatural intervention in the casual nexus as the basis for his work . . . .[28]

II. Erosion in the Objective Foundation for Faith

Despite these principles which lie behind the historical-critical method and rejection of full Biblical authority, it is apparent that many historical critics do not base the content of their faith upon the results of a consistent application of this method. Few apply these presuppositions with the rigor of a Rudolph Bultmann or Heinrich Ott. To understand why and how this is so, it is necessary to look at some of the changes which have taken place since the Reformation in the understanding of the nature and role of faith.

Following Melanchthon's lead, classical Lutheranism understood saving faith to be composed of three elements: *knowledge* of the key events by which our Lord effected our redemption, *assent* to the facticity of these events, and *trust* or *confidence* that the Redeemer, the Risen Christ will be gracious to forgive *my* sins and grant *me* eternal life. Orthodox Lutheranism was convinced that, since the Scriptures were fully authoritative and therefore mediated a reliable history of God's redemptive work which culminated in Christ's death and

resurrection, even the unbeliever could be brought to an intellectual knowledge of and assent to these truths apart from the subjective inner working of the Holy Spirit in conversion. This kind of faith they called historical faith (*fides historica*) or human faith (*fides humana*), as distinguished from saving faith (*fides divina*), which included a Spirit-wrought trust in the promise of forgiveness. Saving faith rested on an objective *extra nos* incarnation, redemptive death, and resurrection in space-time history. Therefore, for Orthodoxy, history was an objective point of contact between the believer and the unbeliever. The Christian faith was anything but an irrational leap of faith into a free-floating religious commitment.

This understanding of faith and its relationship to the events recorded in Scripture was to change, however, under the influence of Martin Kahler. In his own day Kahler was an obscure Lutheran theologian. He was a contemporary of Ernst Troeltsch and in 1892 published a small monograph entitled *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ.* In this work Kahler struggled with the nature of faith, the Christ of the church's historic profession, and the effects of higher criticism upon the Bible. Kahler was caught in the middle. On the one hand, he agreed with Lutheran Orthodoxy in its understanding of Christ and the substance of the Gospel as the Biblical writers witnessed to it. But, on the other hand, he sided with liberalism—in its pessimistic appraisal of the reliability of the Scriptures as historical documents. Kahler brought these two seemingly antithetical viewpoints together in one unified theological position. The product was neither "orthodoxy" nor "liberalism" in the traditional sense of these words. From one standpoint, there is the Jesus of history (*Historie*) who emerges from a scientific, historical-critical examination of the New Testament. This is the Jesus who can be objectively known through critical scholarship as it carries out its task of attempting to reconstruct what really happened back there on the basis of a critical examination and evaluation of the evidence. From another standpoint, however, there is the Christ of faith whom we meet in the proclamation of the text of the Biblical witness. For Kahler, this portrait was the *real* historic Christ who lived on earth, died, and rose again for our sins. The important point, however, is that for Kahler, this real historic (*geschichtlich*) Christ can be known only subjectively, through the preaching of the Gospel by the power of the Holy Spirit. The true historic Risen Christ can be known and encountered only in the believer's contemporary experience of faith. He cannot be known objectively through some inspired Bible which guarantees in advance our knowledge of Christ, nor can He be known from an objective historical inquiry.

True Christian faith, for Kahler, is rooted in a personal encounter with the living, historic Christ in the contemporary situation. Faith must be content with the *viva vox* of Christ which we confront today in the ongoing preaching of the church. It is Christ Himself who will validate the truthfulness of the biblical proclamation in the heart of the believer "without the midwifery of historical research" and without some prior guarantees by an inspired text.[29] The authority of Scripture, for Kahler, is not grounded in its juridical or divine nature but rather in its *creative* authority that is instrumental in authoring faith in the historic Christ. Key salvation-events, such as the resurrection of Christ, were affirmed by Kahler to be *historic* (*geschichtlich*) events which, though true, could not be seen as such on the basis of an objective historical examination of the Biblical records. It was Karl Barth and the later twentieth-century school of neo-orthodoxy which was to appropriate Kahler's understanding of the solely dynamic authority of the Biblical proclamation together with the distinction between objective *Historie* and the faith realm of *Geschichte.*

Both Luther and the later Lutheran dogmaticians were convinced that the Scriptures were God's inspired Word and that their history was reliable beyond question. Because these men regarded the Scriptures as historically reliable, they appealed to them as primary historical sources for the life and work of Christ. For them, the historical Jesus (Jesus of *Historie*) *was* the historic Biblical Christ (Christ of faith, *Geschichtliche* Christ), and the historic Biblical Christ was the historical Jesus. These men made no dichotomies between historic events and historical events, nor between faith and history.

Now, Kahler's chief concern was to defend the Biblical picture and witness of Christ from the destructive and anti-supernatural hands of nineteenth-century historical methodology. There were two avenues that he could have taken to achieve this end. The first would have been to demonstrate the errors in the methodology employed by the historian. The second was to remove the Biblical witness from the historian's domain of work. Kahler, as we have seen, took this latter road. By setting up a distinction between *Historie* and *Geschichte,* Kahler divorced the "Biblical Christ" from the "Historical Jesus" and, in doing so, removed the Church's proclamation of Christ from its objective foundation.

By making this distinction between historically verifiable *Historie* and non-historically verifiable *Geschichte,* Kahler has indeed accomplished his objective of removing the Biblical Christ from historical criticism. His victory, however, comes at a great price. Because Kahler's Biblical Christ lies in the supra-

historical realm of unverifiable *Geschichte,* the Church's proclamation of the Gospel loses its objective, historical ground. Both believer and unbeliever are cut off from any objective contact with Christ. He can be encountered only by faith through the dynamic of the New Testament proclamation, in contemporary experience. The post-Reformation Lutheran fathers grounded the *fiducia* of faith in a *notitia* of fact. Kahler has inverted the order, so that the trust-relationship is first established by a divine encounter with the present living Christ in the contemporary situation. This encounter then serves to ground the content of the Biblical proclamation. The veracity of the Christian truth-claim can be seen only from within the circle of subjective faith.

We see these very same kind of efforts being made among many American Lutheran theologians who are trying to protect the central aspects of the Biblical Gospel from the destructive effects of higher criticism. This is accomplished, first of all, by doing what Kahler has done, by shifting all aspects of the Bible's unique authority into a dynamic power which operates subjectively on the hearts of those who are called through the proclamation of the Gospel. This we see in the former St. Louis faculty's assertion that "inspiration of the written word pertains to the effective power of the Scriptures to being men and women to salvation through the Gospel."[30] Inerrancy is likewise given the same dynamically subjective kind of reinterpretation. In this regard the faculty asserted that in *discussing* the whole truth about what God was doing in Jesus Christ, God does not err.[31] Here, as with Kahler and the later school of neo-orthodoxy, Biblical authority is described only in terms of what the proclamation of the Gospel accomplishes dynamically in terms of a Spirit-wrought subjective faith. No divine authority or influence is attributed to Scripture itself. It is one's subjective encounter with the Spirit in the proclamation of the Gospel that grounds all true knowledge of Christ and the content of saving faith. In reacting against any objective grounding of the Gospel, the former faculty declared that "any approach to the Scriptures which focuses on the need for historical factuality rather than on the primary need for Christ leads us away from Christ rather than to him."[32]

The authoritative thing here is God's dynamic proclamation of Law and Gospel. Events such as the resurrection are affirmed "for the sake of the Gospel," not because reports to such a resurrection are mediated to us objectively through a historically accurate, inspired New Testament witness. The former faculty stated: "Any tendency to make the doctrine of the inspiration or inerrancy of Scripture a prior truth of the

Gospel or give support to our faith is sectarian."[33] "The Gospel gives the Scriptures their normative character, not visa versa."[34] Thus, we see an understanding of faith and the Biblical witness which pulls together facets of an Enlightenment-inspired historical-critical methodology and an inverted interpretation of a Reformational understanding of faith. The proclamation of the Gospel becomes a medium of a subjective appropriation of Christ which validates by theological necessity certain key facets of salvation-history which have been placed out of the reach of the potentially destructive critical method. The trick is to try to hold on to two antitheses, without either one invalidating the other.

There can be no cooperation, however, between authentic Lutheranism and historical criticism. Instead, we must recapture a truly Reformational and Confessional understanding of Scripture and faith in order to make a strong Gospel proclamation to our contemporary world, which needs a clear voice. It needs a clear voice concerning the real Son of God who truly entered human history, manifesting His identity by many signs and wonders; a clear voice concerning a historical resurrection—occurring in real space and time—which validates a truly redeeming death on Calvary's cross; a clear voice concerning a fully reliable and divine testimony concerning all that our gracious God has done for us.

FOOTNOTES

1. J. Michael Reu, *Luther and the Scriptures* (Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Publishing House, 1944), reprinted in the *Concordia Seminary Monograph Series* (Springfield, Illinois, 1960).
2. WA 15, 1481.
3. WA 9, 356.
4. Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther,* trans. by Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 50-51.
5. Ibid., p. 51.
6. See Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, Rule and Norm, 9.
7. See especially Benjamin A. Reist's comments in his survey of Troeltsch's thought in his *Toward a Theology of Involvement* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 20-25.
8. Sir Isaac Newton, *Mathematical Principles,* trans. by Andrew Mott, revised by Florian Cajori (University of California Press, 1960), p. 389.
9. Psalm 147: 7-9a (RSV).
10. Donald G. Dawe, *No Orthodoxy But the Truth* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 71.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
12. Daniel P. Fuller, *Easter Faith and History* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing House, 1965), p. 34.
13. *Faithful to Our Calling, Faithful to Our Lord: Affirmations and Discussions,*
14. 1972, p. 19.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
16. Large Catechism, IV, 57.

17. WA 45, 527; LW 24, 73.
WA 46, 538-789; LW 22, 247.
18. As cited in Van A. Harvey, *The Historian and the Believer* (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1966), p. 14.
19. Ernst Treltsch, *Gesammelte Schriften, II,* p. 732, as cited in Ernest and Marie-Louise Keller's *Miracles in Dispute,* translated by Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 204.
20. Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 69.
21. Walter E. Rast, *Tradition History and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), p. ix.
22. Faithful, p. 37.
23. Gene M. Tucker, *Form Criticism and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), p. 20.
24. William A. Beardslee, *Literary Criticism of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), p. 5.
25. *Response of the St. Louis Seminary Faculty to the Report of the Synodical President* (Spring, 1973), p. 32.
26. *Faithful,* pp. 28-29.
27. Gerhard Ebeling, *Word and Faith,* translated by James W. Leitch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963), p. 42.
28. Robert W. Funk, "The Hermeneutical Problem and Historical Criticism," *New Frontiers in Theology, II,* ed. by James M. Robinson and John B. Cobb, Jr. (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964), p. 185.
29. Martin Kahler, *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ,* trans. and ed. by Carl E. Braaten (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 121.
30. *Faithful,* p. 36.
31. *Ibid.,* p. 37.
32. *Ibid.,* p. 23.
33. *Ibid.,* p. 21.
34. *Ibid.*

Theological Observer

LCUSA

The Division of Theological Studies of the Lutheran Council in the U. S. A. sponsored a conference on May 3-5 of this year to examine the "problem" of the historical-critical method of Biblical interpretation. Six papers were assigned: two theoretical assessments of historical criticism by exegetes, two such assessments by systematicians, and two actual exegetical treatments of parables to put theory into practice. One LC-MS clergyman was chosen for each type of presentation, and each Missourian contribution was counterbalanced by an offering from the LCA or ALC.

What transpired was fascinating. First of all, it was readily observable that all three Missouri Synod papers were of a totally different nature than their counterparts. Each Missourian assessment or exegesis was intensely theological, pertinent to the topic under discussion, and pointed in its treatment of that topic. The papers from the LCA and ALC, by contrast, tended to be "personal", almost testimonial in nature; did not, at times, deal with the issue (one was a superb exposition of the so-called New Hermeneutic, but nothing more); and often were vague and generalized.

Secondly, a different attitude toward the importance of doctrine in Christian faith and life on the part of both LCA and ALC participants was observable, an attitude which, it became increasingly clear, was crucial to their understanding of the requirements for fellowship. One of the most engaging and gracious scholars at the conference (ALC) illustrated this in his closing remarks. He said he felt that some of the participants on "his side" had not been entirely fair and forthright in their assessments of the LCA-ALC and LC-MS attitudes toward the historical critical method. A goodly number had contended that *no difference* existed between the the two sides at all (a most incredible assertion and one worthy of separate and extensive treatment), and this, he said, was manifestly not so. There were real and deep differences in the doctrine of Holy Scripture, in methods of interpretation, and in attitudes toward the Confessions. But, he went on to say, *these differences are not significant.* Finally, they make no difference. And therefore, they should not be devisive of fellowship but should be treated as "open questions," for which contradictory opinions are perfectly permissible and acceptable.

Thirdly, each side at this conference had a different attitude toward the nature of truth. For LCA and ALC theologians, truth was subjective and experiential. Something is true "for me," many said, or "from our perspective today." A correspondence theory of truth was specifically repudiated by several of the participants. This, in turn, led to a complete emasculation, nay perversion, of the English language. In the final devotion, the Bible was described as "both errant and inerrant," with the enlightening explanation that such a formulation preserved the paradoxical nature of Christianity and of God's revelation. It is interesting to note that Dr. David Preus, President of the ALC, has succumbed to something similar, for he has said (*Reporter*, 1 August 1977, p. 2):

> We are even willing to affirm 'the inerrancy of Scripture'....But when we are told that we must believe that inerrancy means just exactly what some Missouri Synod theologians say it means...that smacks to us of ecclesiastical pride and tyranny.

In both of these cases a technical term has lost its cognitive content and has become a mere totem or "rabbit's foot" (to use Kurt Marquart's phrase) which creates oneness and true fellowship regardless of its meaning.

James W. Voelz

Homiletical Studies

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT: MATTHEW 24:37-44

In citing the example of Noah (v 37), the Lord refers to the fact that the warning then given was not heeded (Gn 6:3). The antediluvians had more than a century's warning of the coming flood, but recklessly pursued their pleasures (v. 38). So the parousia of Christ will fall on a heedless world. The word for "eating" iplies gluttony, and the entire expression denotes a habitude. The same lack of comprehension of the coming judgment, or refusal to take it seriously, will be found at Christ's coming. People will be intoxicated by wickedness and will persist in unbelief (v. 39). Christ's coming will profoundly affect individuals. Two will be working together at their ordinary occupations with nothing outwardly to distinguish one from the other (v. 40). The taking implies separation from companions. Those "taken" are caught away to meet the Lord and his saints (1 Th 4:17; Jn 14:3), while others are "left" for judgement (2 Th 1:7-9). Because the end will be sudden and the final separation will then be completed, we are to be prepared. Christians have to watch against their own evil heart and temptation, but most of all they are to watch for the Lord's coming. We simply do no know when He will come (v. 42). The unexpectedness of His coming Christ sets out in parabolic form, comparing it to that of a thief coming stealthily in the night (v. 43). It is momentously important to live each day in faith in Christ and not grow careless about our spiritual life (v. 44). The day of our death marks for us the coming of Christ. As death finds us, so judgment will find us.

The central thought of the text is the reality of Christ's Second Coming. The problem is that Christians sometimes are oblivious to the facts which point to that reality. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers would seriously and continually face the facts connected with Christ's Second Coming. Introductory thought: It is sometimes difficult to face the fact of illness, loss of job, or death. It is even more difficult to face the fact of Christ's coming again. Many who call themselves Christians do not believe in a visible Second Coming of Christ that will signal the end of the world as we know it. Advent stresses the truth of Christ's Second Coming. The test is a call to

Face Up To The Reality of Christ's Second Coming

I. Face the fact of the world's indifference to the Second Coming.
   A. People in Noah's time were indifferent to their coming end.
      1. They blindly continued in their sensual ways (v. 38).
      2. For 120 years they paid no heed to Noah's warnings until they were swept away (v. 39).
   B. Similarly most people today are indifferent to threats of disaster to the world.
      1. They are weary of prophets of doom who warn of energy crises, cigarette tars, or final judgment.
      2. They want to continue as they are and to dismiss also any thought of Christ's coming (v. 39b).
      3. Their wickedness lies in their refusal to repent.

Christ will come, even though the world ignores and scorns that reality. The world's attitude is itself a sign of His coming. As we face the fact of the world's indifference, we are pointed to the reality of Christ's coming.

Let the world think what it will; all people will be profoundly affected by Christ's coming.

II. Face the fact that people's similar circumstances do not guarantee similar fates.

A. People may be engaged in the same work. Yet how different their fates! One will taken to be with Christ in eternal blessedness, one left to the awful judgment. We cannot judge a person's eternal future by his present position. Association in life does not secure association after death (vs. 40-41).

B. Those taken correspond to Noah and his family, who were taken into the ark, while those left correspond to the ones shut out of the ark.

C. The day of Christ's coming will make strange revelations and eternal separation between godly and ungodly.

Let us face the fact that though people often seem alike, God knows the heart. He will separate the believers from the unbelievers on the day Christ comes.

Do we need to know exactly when Christ will come so we can make sure we are among the believers? No.

III. Face the fact that Christ's coming will be unexpected (v. 44).

A. It will be like that of a thief in the night (v. 43) 1 Th 5:2; 2 Pe 3:10; Re 3:3). Just when we think He is not coming, He will come.

B. It is impossible to predict the exact day or hour (vs. 42, 36).

C. "Watch therefore." We must be always ready for His coming by daily repentance - confessing our sins and looking to Jesus as our Savior and Friend. What is needed is a spiritual alertness - faith sustained by Word and Sacrament.

Concluding thought: We can face up to the reality of Christ's Second Coming, not with fear and foreboding, but with joyous anticipation and sure hope of better things to come.

GA

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT: MATTHEW 3:1-12

The kernel of John's message was "repent" (v. 2). There was a dearth of fruits of repentance in Israel; people were lost in dead formality and in the letter of the law. The words of Is 40:3 were a direct prophecy regarding John, who was the forerunner of the Messiah. His appearance (v. 4) was a reminder of Elijah, in whose spirit he went forth. John's preaching at first made a profound impression (v. 6). "Brood of vipers" (v. 7) gives a picture of Jewish leaders as evil-minded, unloving men - the spiritual vermin of Israel. They had not of their own accord come to be baptized. Yet John's baptism was not a mere outward ceremony, but a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. True repentacne, renewal of mind, must produce fruits, a new moral code. It is no use to boast of outward descent from Abraham; God would rather raise up children to Abraham out of the stones than to admit impenitents into His kingdom. God will cut down the impenitent, who are like unfruitful trees. The judgment is at hand (v. 10). Jesus will baptize "with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (v. 11). The contrast is not between the baptism of John and the baptism of Jesus, but between the person of John and of Jesus. John's baptism was an effective sacrament which mediated regeneration. But the Holy Spirit was sent by Christ, not by John. The reference in Ac 1:5 and 11:16 to these words of John does not mention "fire." For a clear connection between vs. 11 and 12, it is best to see Jesus bringing the Spirit who creates new life, but also bringing the fire of judgment, the very opposite of salvation. The fire of Gehenna will be poured out upon every impenitent soul, just as the penitent sinner will receive a share in the Spirit poured out on Pentecost. Our God is a consuming fire to those who resist Him (He 12:29). Christ is ready to purge His floor. The fan is the judgment word of Jesus, the wheat the true membership of the church, the chaff the false members or hypocrites, the garner the kingdom of glory.

The central thought of the text is that repentance is an absolute necessity in the kingdom of God. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers would repent daily. The problem is spiritual complacency. The means to the goal is the empowerment of Christ through His Spirit. Introductory thought: The keynote of the preaching of John the Baptist and of Jesus (Mk 1:14) was repentance. A characteristic of much modern preaching is the lack of any reference to repentance. Thus many church members have not repented. For many, repentance has negative connotations. Yet Christian preaching still proclaims: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." But why?

Why Repent?

I. Because without repentance there is judgment.
II. Because with repentance there is salvation.

I.

A. What are the indicators of a lack of repentance?
   1. Absence of fruit (v. 8).
      a. No humble confession of sin (v. 5b).
      b. No self-giving love.
   2. Spiritual blindness (v. 9).
      a. Equating outward connections with God's favor (v. 9).
      b. Satanic thought and action (v. 7).

B. What is the judgment that will result?
   1. Divine separation by the judgment word of Jesus (v. 12a).
   2. Eternal punishemnt (vs. 10b, 12b, He 12:29).

Why repent? Without it there can be only judgment, now and forever.

II.

A. What does one do to repent?
   1. One has sorrow over his sins, but, above all, relies on Christ for forgiveness.
   2. Such faith in Christ, as well as its prerequisite, contrition, is a gift of the Holy Spirit whom Christ poured out fully on Pentecost (v. 11b) and whom all Christians share.
   3. The gift of repentance is imparted through the Word and Sacraments.
      a. Through the words of a messenger like John the Baptist, who was a voice for God (v. 2) speaking both Law and Gospel.
      b. Through Baptism and Holy Communion.
   4. Repentance is to be a daily occurrence because we need daily to let sin die, to cling to Jesus for forgiveness, and to bring forth fruit in holy living.

B. What is the salvation that results?
   1. Being a good tree that brings forth good fruit (v. 10).
   2. Being wheat rather than chaff (v. 12).
   3. Being gathered into the granary of heaven (v. 12).

Concluding thought: Why repent? It results in salvation. In road-construction areas there are sometimes signs picturing a closed hand with a forefinger pointing at the individual driver and saying: "YOU Slow Down." The message of the test is: *YOU* Repent. It is absolutely necessary. Do you see why?

GA

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT: MATTHEW 11:2-11

That it was John who heard in the prison of Machaerus, east of the Dead Sea, about the deeds of the Christ, that it was John who by his disciples put the question to Jesus (v. 2), and that it was to John that Jesus sent His

answer show that John, at the very least, must have had concerns about the relationship between Jesus' activity and His Messianic office. Perhaps he who had put so much stress on the judging activity of the Messiah (Mt. 3:10, 12) wondered why Jesus was showing so much love and compassion. That John had not lost his faith in Jesus is obvious from vs. 7-9, 11. Jesus, in his answer (vs. 4-5), makes clear that the very works John might have been faulting were the works that belonged to the Messiah (Is 35:4; 61:2). At the same time, John's concern for his own disciples need not be ruled out. It must have been a source of disappointment to the forerunner that he who was sent by God to prepare the way for Jesus was not able to accomplish this even in his own disciples, who appear to have made common cause with the Pharisees against Jesus himself (Mt 9:14). Possibly John wanted to give his disciples an opportunity to talk to Jesus personally without interference from the Pharisees so they could hear Jesus' own testimony about himself Although John might have been questioning Christ's activity, so that Christ's words (v. 6) could be taken as a warning to him, these words apply still more strongly to John's disciples. They had discovered nothing extraordinary in Jesus but had found more in their own master to remind them of the prophets of old.

Christ's purpose in vs. 7-11 appears to be twofold: to correct any possible wrong notions in the multitude regarding John's attitude toward Him as the Messiah, and to admonish the Jews regarding their failure to accept John's testimony. Christ gives a glowing testimony to John and his work. Yet "he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he" (v. 11). The Christian who stands lower than John in position and spiritual gifts is nevertheless greater because he lives in the era of fulfillment in which he has a fuller understanding of Jesus, of His suffereing, death, and resurrection, than did John.

The central thought of the text is that Christ will not disappoint the expectations of his followers. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers would expect great things from Jesus. The problem is cynicism, which causes Christians to expect nothing of consequence to happen that will change the world or their lives for the better. The Gospel-means is that Jesus supplies us with all we need through His good Gospel Word. Introductory thought: As we grow older, the sense of wonder which we had as children tends to disappear. We do not expect results from our efforts, let alone wonders. This may be the reason why we do not get any. But expectancy is important. Without it we receive little; with it great things are possible. In the text it seems that Jesus had disappointed John, as well as John's disciples, at the point of their highest expectations. Yet they and we are to learn that we can

Expect Great Things From Jesus

I. Expect Him to deal understandingly with our problems.
   A. Jesus did not upbraid John for asking the question he did (v. 2).
      1. Perhaps John was bothered in prison when he heard nothing about Christ destroying fruitless trees (Mt. 3:10).
      2. John surely believed in Jesus, as Jesus' tribute to John showed, and yet Jesus' warning (v. 7) indicates that doubts are not to be taken lightly.
   B. Jesus understands that for us, too, believing sometimes involves struggle.
      1. We may question God's ways in the world and in our own lives and wonder how Jesus is the answer.
      2. We can and should go to Jesus with our questions and not let them fester and finally destroy our faith.
      3. Do we expect Jesus to deal understandingly with us? Or do we expect Him to condemn us, saying, "Shame on you for thinking that way?" We can expect better things than that from Jesus.

II. Expect Him to do for us what needs to be done.
A. Jesus offered John evidence.
1. The deeds Christ performed, which were foretold in the Old Testament, were evidence that He was the One who has to come.
2. Also the news of God's love that Christ proclaimed was evidence of His Messiahship.
B. Christ does not argue with us but gives us the evidence we need to strengthen our faith.
1. His miracles, recorded in the Scriptures, are evidence that He is the Savior.
2. Evidence too is the good news of the Gospel and what it does in our lives.
3. We need the declaration of God's love and forgiveness. That declaration we can expect from Jesus. Really extraordinary events are taking place right now. We poor sinners are being lifted up each day.
III. Expect Him to regard us as great in the Kingdom.
A. When we think of our lack of conviction and our love of comfort and popularity, we can hardly expect Jesus to say of us what He said of John (vs. 7-9).
B. But we can expect Him to say of us that we are greater than John.
1. Because we are in the era of the fulfillment of which John was on the threshold.
2. Because we know more fully than did John the meaning of Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection.
C. Why then, with such privileges, should we not expect Jesus to make us great also in character and behavior, as He made John?

Concluding thought: He can, and He will, if we expect Him to. Let us never expect too little from Jesus.

GA

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT: MATTHEW 1:18-25

"Of the Holy Spirit" (v. 18) asserts the divine origin of Jesus Christ, that He was conceived of God in contrast to man. The Third Person of the Trinity prepared Mary for the incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity. Joseph, being a just man who tried to conform to the Jewish law, planned to adopt the most private form of legal divorce, handing the letter to Mary in the presence of only two witnesses to whom he need not give his reasons. Here was delicate thoughtfulness for her whom he loved and to whom he was bound by the Jewish betrothal as if in marriage (v. 19). The angel reminded Joseph of the greatness of his ancestry (v. 20) to assure him that his resolution was right insofar as Joseph knew the circumstances, for the line was to be kept pure, but also to urge him to take Mary so that the promise would be carried out in his family and no other. Joseph would formally give the child the name Jesus. Jesus, in His own person, by virtue of what He is shall save (v. 21). "From their sins" emphasizes that salvation from sin through Christ had to precede the restoration of Israel which Joseph and all true Jews desired. The angel stresses "virgin" on the basis of Is 7:14. God's past utterance is looked at as necessitating the present action (v. 22). The child was to be called not only Jesus, but also Emmanuel, the manifestation of God in our midst (v. 23). Joseph's faith is seen in his immediate obedience to the commands received (v. 24).

The central thought of the text is the immanence of the transcendent God. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers would live in the awarenss of

God's closeness to them in Jesus Christ. The problem is that they often live as if God were far removed from them and not a God who partook of their humanity. The Gospel-means is that God condescended to us in limitless love. Intoductory thought: These words appeared on a church bulletin board: "If God is far away, who is left?" We often live our lives with little awareness of how close God really is to us. It may be only the weekly worship service, or a tragedy in our lives, that sensitizes us to God's nearness, or to the need for Him to be near. The test reiterates a reality of our Christian existence:

God Is With Us
I. In our humanity
II. With His salvation

I.

A. He who is with us is true God.
   1. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost in a virgin (vs. 18, 20b).
   2. He is without sin (He 4:15).
   3. He is nor merely godly but acutally and fully God (v. 23b, Col 2:9).
   4. He was, is, and remains God (He 13:8).

B. He who is with us is true man.
   1. He was born of a woman (v. 25).
   2. He assumed a human body, wants, and feelings.
   3. He lived in the real world experiencing joy and sorrow, acceptance and rejection.
   4. Jesus, the God-man, is with us still (Mt. 28:20). Since He assumed our human nature, He will never cease being a man.

C. We believe the incarnation as Joseph did (v. 24).
   1. Though we cannot fathom the mystery of it.
   2. Because God says so (vs. 22-23).

II.

A. He came to save from sin (v. 21).
   1. Sin is a terrible reality.
      a. Corrupts.
      b. Separates from God.
      c. Condemns.
   2. Only God and Mary's son could save us (Ac 4:12).
      a. As man keeping the law and dying in our stead.
      b. As God able to bear the suffering and to rise from the dead.

B. Let Him be your Savior.
   1. Do not make prayer, or faith, or piety your Savior.
   2. Jesus alone saves from the guilt, punishment, and power of sin.

C. His salvation is a daily reality (Ps 85:9; 27:1).

Concluding thought: The Advent message is that God has come to be with us in our humanity and with His salvation. How close God is to us!

GA

CHRISTMAS DAY: LUKE 2:8-20

The shepherds were keeping watch to guard the flock against thieves and marauders (v. 8). It was night when Jesus was born, also in the spiritual worlds. Into the night of the world He came as the true light. A symbol of this truth was the heavenly light (v. 9). The shepherds were afraid in the face of divine glory and holiness. But they had no need to fear (v. 9), because the angel's message was not one of judgment but of salvation, not only to the shepherds but to all people (v. 10b). The shepherds were representatives of all lost sinners to whom was born a Savior from spiritual enemies. The Savior was both the promised Messiah and Lord without peer (v. 11). The "sign" (v. 12) was

a reference to the Is 9:6. The song of the angelic host was a triumphant declaration that God is glorified in heaven where angels see the realization of His counsel of love. On earth peace is established between God and Man, and God is reconciled with the world (v. 14). The shepherds believed without seeing, accepting the message as from the Lord (v. 15). They became witnesses of the truth without leaving their daily vocations (v. 20).

The central thought of the text is that doxological worship involves the whole person. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers would worship God with their whole being. The problem is that Christians fail to grasp the essentials of worship and so do it mechanically. The means to achieve the goal is that God has met our need and renewed us to worship Him.

Introductory thought: There are Christmas customs and forms of worship. Christmas services are usually beautiful and appealing. Not only this service but every Christian worship service can take its cue from the first Christmas service.

The First Christmas Service Is A Model For Christian Worship

I. In its message.
II. In its praise.
III. In its worshipers.

I.

A. Declared by a unique messenger (v. 9).
   1. Angels were often privileged to bring a message from the Lord (Mt 1:20; Lk 1:26).
   2. Preachers of God's word are also unique - they are called angels (Re 1:20; Ga 4:14).

B. Directed to the hearers.
   1. Not speculative, abstract, or unrelated to people, but concrete and applicable ("to all people," "to you," vs. 10-11).
   2. Meeting the hearers at their point of need.
      a. A savior from sin.
      b. No need to fear (v. 10).

Christian worship contains the message of the everlasting Gospel delivered by messengers whom God has sent (Re 14:6).

II.

A. Praise to God for what He is.
   1. He is the highest One (v. 14), in whom we live (Ac 7:28), and whom we cannot fully comprehend (Ro 11:33-36).
   2. He is worthy to be adored by the hosts of heaven and also by men on earth.

B. Praise to God for what He has done.
   1. He made peace between Himself and men (v. 14; Ro 5:1, 10; 2 Cor 5:19).
   2. In Christ, He made us objects of His good will.

Christian worship contains praise to God in the form of hymns, prayers, and other responses. It is God-centered activity.

III.

A. They were attentive.
   1. They really listened.
   2. They regarded what they head as God's word ("the Lord has made known . . . " v.15).

B. They believed.
   1. They would go to Bethlehem (v. 15).
   2. They went with haste (v. 16).

C. They confessed.
1. Shared with others what they had heard and seen while continuing in their occupation (v. 17).
2. Honored God in what they said and did (v. 20).

Christian worship involves people who listen attentively, respond in faith, and confess that faith by word and deed.
Concluding thought: Let this Christmas service and all our worship be modeled after the first Christmas Service.

GA

THE SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS: MATTHEW 2:13-15, 19-23

There are occasions when one is tempted to call the heavenly host of Christmas Eve a bunch of celestial liars. Hardly has the echoes of their shout of "peace on earth" faded away, hardly has the beams of Bethlehem's star dimmed, and the gifts of the Magi been offered, than we hear Rachel weeping for her children. The rage of a jealous Herod brings down a cloud of gloom and doubt that calls into question the song and light of Christmas. Where is the Lord who "reigneth," who is "clothed with strength" (Introit), when His incarnate Son must flee for His life? He is there in the midst of sinful, human history active and working out His gracious purposes. This is what our pericope tells us and it speaks to our doubts and concerns when we are faced with the injustices and ambiguities of life.

Textual Notes: 1) "Fulfill" - Matthew tells us that some things happened to fulfill a previous word of God. Many of the OT words, men, and events were like hollow molds waiting to be filled up and completed. God shaped the molds and also the events that filled them; He is Lord of history. 2) "Out of Egypt . . . " - Israel, as God's "son" was once called from Egypt for its mission. That event was itself a prophecy of God's Son, Jesus, who must likewise sojourn in Egypt. In spite of Herod, God accomplishes His purposes. 3) "He shall be called a Nazarene" - Nazareth was an insignificant place from which no one expected anything. That Jesus should be called a "Nazarene" points to the obscurity and reproach which God had prophesied for the Messiah. God did not operate in His Messiah as men might expect.

Introductory thought: I know that God is loving and kind. Yet I experience heartache, injustice, and suffering. I doubt and sometimes wonder who really does call the shots in my life.

God Calls The Shots

I. God does govern and guide history: He calls the shots.
A. Prophecy and fulfillment point to a God who is Lord of history.
B. The Lord of history is in charge of my life.

II. Although God works from within the framework of sinful history, He accomplishes His gracious purposes; He calls the shots to save me.
A. God called Israel out of Egypt to be His servant people.
B. God called Jesus, as the goal of Israel's history, out of Egypt to be the world's Saviour.
C. In the midst of heartache and trouble this same God is working out His gracious purposes for me.

III. Yet God does not operate in His Messiah as men might expect: He calls the shots in a surprisingly simple and obscure way.
A. God's saving action in history was in Jesus, an obscure and rejected Nazarene.
1. Jesus experienced the worst that sinful history could offer.
2. Yet He was victorious and reversed the course of history.

B. This same Jesus comes to me with His saving power in ways that, to the world at least, appear simple and obscure: Word and Sacrament.

1. He comforts and strengthens me.

2. He points me forward to God's ultimate goal for His people. "God will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying" (Rev. 21:4).

RH

Book Reviews

I. Biblical Studies

THINKING THROUGH THE BIBLE. By John McNicol. Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, 1976. 319 pages. Cloth. $9.95.

Thinking Through the Bible is a reprint of what originally appeared as a four-volume work, later issued in one volume. It contains the distillation of a half century of teaching at the Toronto Bible College, Ontario, Canada. The approach is mainly exegetical, but at times devotional. Dr. McNicol leads his readers straight through the Bible, book by book.

McNicol looks upon the Bible as the Word of the living God. For him the most important thing in the study of Holy Scripture is to find and ascertain the mind of God as expressed in God's inscripturated revelation. When the former teacher at the Toronto Bible College wrote his Old and New Testament volumes various types of higher criticism were developing with the result that much in the Word of God was being challenged, rejected, or explained away. In contrast to such "scientific Biblical interpretation," McNicol insists that the Bible be allowed to stand on its own, to speak for itself, and wherever possible, to be its own interpreter. As a result, the Bible, McNicol contends, exhibits unity and a self-authenticating witness. It reveals itself as the Word of the living God. In this unabridged book, McNicol leads the student step by step down what he calls the three highways: the highway of promise and prophecy, the highway of sacrifice and worship, the highway of fulfillment—Jesus Christ Himself.

Since the author is an exponent of "historical premillennialism," the Lutheran pastor and teacher will need to beware of this theological bias and use this book with discrimination. Despite this deficiency, however, the volume can be helpful.

Raymond F. Surburg

A THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By John L. McKenzie, Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York. 1974. 336 pages. Cloth. $7.95.

The publishers on their paper cover describe this volume as a definitive study, in which Dr. John McKenzie, a prominent Roman Catholic critical scholar, investigates every aspect of Old Testament theology. As a critical Old Testament scholar, McKenzie begins with the assumption that the conclusions of the historical-critical method are valid and he utilizes them in his so-called synthesis. In endeavoring to produce a synthesis of the total theological statement of the Old Testament, McKenzie divides his investigation into categories, which when taken together supposedly provide a picture of the God of Israel far more complete than that produced by any individual category. This theology of the Old Testament deals with the following topics: cult, revelation, history, nature, wisdom, political and social institutions, the future of Israel. These seven categories are preceded by a chapter setting forth the author's principles, methods, and structure (pp. 15-29) and another chapter entitled "The Israelitish Experience of Yahweh."

McKenzie claims that he has read with care and close attention most theologies published since G. F. Oehler. "One must read most of them; but it is a very peculiar form of study the major fruit of which is to know what you are not going to do" (p. 10). The author has, indeed, read widely in Old

Testament critical literature; the findings of earlier critics are discussed in the various parts of his Old Testament theology and many of these are woven into his presentation.

While he has a section on revelation, McKenzie's understanding does not agree with the New Testament's assessment of what revelation is in the Old Testament. According to St. Paul the entire Old Testament is *theopneustos,* i.e., God-breathed. Large parts of the Old Testament are treated by McKenzie, on the other hand, under the category of a record of experience. Thus he writes about Israel's experience: "It is obvious that the record of a religious experience, especially as an experience which covers a period so long and so remote and which occurs in a culture so different, presents problems of its own" (p. 32). He subscribes to the view that revelation is primarily found in the acts of God in history (p. 32). Revelation is to be found in God's encounters with men.

One position taken by McKenzie will surprise, yes, even shock most Christians, whether they be Roman Catholics or Protestants, and that is his repudiation of the necessity of finding any prophecy of the Messiah in the Old Testament Scriptures. Thus he writes: "I have been convinced for years that messianism is a Christian interest and a Christian theme; that it is a Christian response to the Old Testament and should be treated as such; that in a theology of the Old Testament, as I have described it thus far, messianism would appear neither in the chapter headings nor in the index. It is not only not a dominant theme, but in the proper sense of the word it is doubtfully a theme of the Old Testament at all. This theme is imposed upon the theologian by theological factors foreign to his area of study. He should be free to make his own selection and to make his own errors of judgment" (pp. 23-24). Conservative Roman Catholic scholars and conservative evangelical scholars will disagree with this presentation of Old Testament theology in its basic assumptions and most of its consequent conclusions.

Raymond F. Surburg

DICTIONARY OF OLD TESTAMENT WORDS FOR ENGLISH READERS. By Aaron Pick. Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, 1977. 589 pages. Cloth. $12.95.

This is a twentieth-century reprint of a nineteenth-century book of the same title that was published by Hamilton, Adams, and Company, London, in 1845. The compiler of this dictionary was Aaron Pick, Professor of Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, and German at the University of Prague. To accomplish the task, Pick had the assistance of two English scholars. The object of this philogical work is to enable the English-speaking person who does not know Hebrew or Aramaic to ascertain what word is found in the Hebrew of the Old Testament or in the Aramaic protions of Daniel and Ezra. In offering this volume to the public, the publishers hope to make the study of the Old Testament easier and more delightful.

In English translations of the Old Testament the same English word is often used for different Hebrew words. The original words, of course, express varying shades of meaning which the translation cannot indicate. In this *Dictionary* every English word in the Old Testament is arranged alphabetically, and under the English word is given every Hebrew word so translated along with its literal English meaning, plus every Bible reference where the word is used. The complier of this informative volume wished to enrich the understanding of English readers ignorant of Hebrew language by sharing with them the nuances of meaning indicated by the various Hebrew words employed in the Old Testament. Students of Scripture will find this a useful book for the study of the synonyms of the Old Testament.

Raymond F. Surburg

HANDBOOK OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM. By Richard N. Soulen. John Knox Press, 1976. 191 pages. Paper. $7.95.

Students of Biblical criticism, which in the twentieth century has come to include a very complex set of disciplines, will welcome this book by Dr. Richard N. Soulen, Associate Professor of New Testament at the School of Theology, Virginia Union Seminary, Richmond, Virginia. This aid includes over five hundred terms, phrases, and names. It gives explanations of common abbreviations employed by the scholarly fraternity. Soulen has incorporated notes on major methodologies and exegetical basics. Biographical sketches of sixty-plus key figures in the history of Biblical research history are also provided. In addition, Soulen has given us outlines of fundamental critical problems and systems of Hebrew transliteration. This *Handbook of Biblical Criticism* is a unique and valuable reference work.

Raymond F. Surburg

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON CREATION—EVOLUTION. By John N. Moore. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 110 pages. Paper. $2.95.

Dr. John N. Moore, Professor of Natural Science at Michigan State University, a scientist and prpular teacher, presents and answers questions most often raised about origins. It is Moore's contention that the current debate between evolutionists and creationists is no longer just an issue of science versus fundamentalistic religion. Today there are reputable scientists who support creationism. Creation scientists are gathering and producing more and more evidence from the fields of genetics, biology, physics, and geology which support creation by design. Moore's book will help Christian parents, Sunday school teachers, high school and college students who are challenged by unbelieving scientists endeavoring to support materialistic and humanistic interpretations of scientific data. The book, which is popularly written, is comprehensive and so is a good book to place in the church library.

Raymond F. Surburg

NOAH'S ARK PITCHED AND PARKED. By Nathan M. Meyer. BMH Books, Winona Lake, Indiana. 112 pages. Paper. $3.00.

This book by a former professor of Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana, is divided into two parts: (I) "The Story of the Flood," and (II) "The Story of the Search for Noah's Ark." While many scholars are skeptical about the occurrence of a worldwide flood, Meyer believes there is overwhelming evidence for a worldwide flood from tradition, archaeology, history, and, of course, from the Bible. In contradistinction to many Biblical scholars, Meyer believes that the Bible treats Noah as an historical person (I Chron. 1:4; Is. 54:9; Ezek. 14:14, 20; Heb. 11:7; I Peter 3:20; II Peter 2:5; II Peter 3:5-6) and that Christ believed in Noah, the Ark, and the Flood (Matt. 24:37-39 and Luke 17:26-27). On the basis of the Biblical data, Meyer concludes: "Thus the Biblical record is clearly presented with no room for doubt, except on the part of those who doubt or deny the Bible itself. And anyone who does that, it seems to me, exposes his ignorance of the Bible. Who but a fool would dare to line himself up against such a formidable array of witnesses as we have presented, ranging all the way from Moses to Jesus?" (p. 22)

In Part I Meyer has clearly and succintly dealt with some of the problems that are associated with a worldwide flood. Materials collected from Rehwinkel in *The Flood* (Concordia), Whitcomb in *The Genesis Flood, The Early Earth,* and *The World That Perished,* and Pattern in *The Biblical Flood and the Ice*

Age are utilized and clearly presented. Part II is based on materials contained in the following books: Montgomery, *The Quest of Noah's Ark;* Navarra, *Noah's Ark, I Touched It;* Cummings, *Noah's Ark: Fact or Fable?;* La Haye and Morris, *The Ark on Ararat.*

The author believes that the fact that since 1856 some 186 different people on seventeen different expeditions have claimed to have seen the ark is evidence that cannot easily be brushed aside. On pages 77–83 Meyer has listed twenty-nine important witnesses to the existence of the Ark, beginning with Berossus' reference in 275 B.C. and continuing up to the expedition of Search Foundation in 1969.

It is Meyer's belief that someday the Ark will be discovered in the Ahora Gorge. Unfortunately Meyer is a millennialist, and his speculation about the Ark being found when Christ comes to establish His earthly reign has to be rejected by those who do not believe that Christ will ever found a kingdom in which all Jews will recognize Him as their Lord and King.

Raymond F. Surburg

LOVE SONG. THE SONG OF SOLOMON COMES ALIVE FOR TODAY. By Clarence E. Mason, Jr. Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 96 pages. $1.95.

There are not many books written on the Song of Songs. Mason claims this book has been neglected, except for a few devotional works which treat certain phrases and verses. Christians often fail to read and study Canticles because they are pressured by the unbelievers about them to live a faster pace and have no time to "get quiet in their souls and enjoy the Lord" (p. 7). Still another reason for the neglect of this Biblical book is the sad fact that it has been distorted. "This has been largely due to the fact that even fundamentalists have generally accepted the erroneous and Christ-dishonoring plot of the redaction critic Ewald, who takes a pure book and makes it questionable, if now lewd."

Dr. Mason explores two basic plot theories, then uses the one he believes to be correct as the basis for his study. In the process he finds many New Testament foreshadowings in the Song of Songs. Mason has more or less followed the interpretation of H. A. Ironside. The Song of Songs has not incorrectly been called "the Holy of Holies" of the Old Testament. The interpretation presented here is opposed to the thoughts of most commentators on Canticles in this century.

Raymond F. Surburg

A SONG FOR LOVERS. By S. Craig Glickman, Inter-Varsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1976. 188 pages. Paper. $3.95.

Glickman, an instructor at Dallas Theological Seminary, believes he can offer a sound and defensible interpretation of an Old Testament book that has experienced at least seven different kinds of interpretation in the last two thousand years of Jewish and Christian history. In this book the author has included both a new paraphrase and a new translation of the Song of Solomon. The title *A Song for Lovers* indicates the author's approach to the Song of Songs. Glackman has joined in the recent move of a number of conservative scholars to set forth what Kline has called the "natural method" of interpretation. It is the thesis of this volume that the song is the only book of the Scriptures which treats entirely of love, sex, and marriage. Glickman believes that here the reader will find excellent instruction about ethical positions which are challenged and rejected by a world gone mad, which no longer holds marriagle sacred and has made sex a selfish enjoyment.

St. Paul states in 2 Timothy 3:15-17 that the purpose of the Old Testament is to make men wise unto salvation. And if that is the primary purpose of the Song, then the Jewish synagogue and the Christian Church had a good reason for adopting the allegorical and typical methods of interpretation, because the Old Testament Scriptures in various places depict the relation between Yahweh and Israel under the form of a marriage covenant. Psalm 45 does the same thing. The influences of Solomon's Song of Songs may be seen in the prophetic literature in Jer. 22:24; Haggai 2:24; Hosea 1-3; 14:6-8. The representation of Christ as the Bridegroom and the church as the Bride is also employed in the New Testament, in Matthew 9:15; John 3:29; and Ephesians 5:25-29.

Raymond F. Surburg

A TIME TO MOURN AND A TIME TO DANCE. By Derek Kidner. Inter-Varsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois 1977. 110 pages. Paper. $2.50.

Derek Kidner, Warden of Tyndale House, Cambridge, author of a number of commentaries on Genesis, Psalms, and Proverbs, has written this study on the Book of Ecclesiastes in a new series, *The Bible Speaks Today*, edited by J. A. Motyer and J. R. W. Stott. This brief study has three parts: (I) What is this book doing in the Bible?—a reconnaissance. (II) What is the book saying? (pp. 21-108). (III) What are we saying to this?—an epilogue.

In Part I Kidner states what he believes is the purpose of this unique book in the Old Testament canon, known in the Hebrew Bible as Qoheleth. The author is a wise man "who teaches us to use our eyes as well as our ears to learn the ways of God and man" (p. 13). With Archer, Kidner believes that King Solomon was "the Preacher, the Son of David, in Jerusalem (1:1)." There is no book in the Old Testament Scriptures that "speaks in quite his tone of voice" (p. 13). Solomon is an explorer. "His concern is with the boundaries of life, and especially with the question that most of us would hesitate to push too far." Because of his intensive and deep probing, the preacher might be considered to be a skeptic or pessimist and because his repeated cry of "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." But that, according to Kidner, would be misunderstanding this wisdom book, in which one can find the axiom of all wise men of the Bible, that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Kidner believes that the Preacher has, as a humanist or secularist, probed the big issues of life and endeavored to go as far as possible apart from the aid furnished by divine revelation.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE TRIUMPH OF FAITH IN HABAKKUK. By Donald E. Gowan. John Knox Press, Atlantic, 1976. 94 pages. Cloth. $5.95.

Donald Gowan, Associate Professor of Old Testament at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, an ordained minister in the United Presbyterian Church, has written a useful study of a little known book. The author believes that the prophet Habakkuk has given Old Testament readers the earliest treatment of the problem of suffering. This conclusion rests, of course, on higher critical views about the development of Old Testament theology and the dating of Old Testament books and literature. Psalms 37 and 73 are older than the seventh century B.C. Book of Habakkuk. The Book of Job surely is older also.

Many pastors and laymen ignore this "small obscure book tucked away in the middle of the minor Prophets." After an introductory chapter, the author examines each of Habakkuk's three sections. Gowan offers his own translation of the text, applying a critical approach, and provides a commentary. Gowan has adopted most of the findings of critical scholarship. He holds that

Habakkuk belonged to a clan of prophets associated with the temple, for which there is no proof in the book. He also ascribes some of its material to the "w e men" and classifies this material as belonging to the wisdom genre of the Old Testament. The author is correct when he shows how a man who begins his book doubting God's justice ends up by being completely satisfied with God's dealings with mankind.

Raymond F. Surburg

DIE JOHANNESAPOKALYPSE. By Otto Boecher. Ertrage der Forschung, Band 41. Wissenshaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1975. XVII 154 pages.

The Revelation of St. John is notoriously difficult to interpret, and, what is worse, it is notoriously prone to abuse and misinterpretation. No portion of Scripture has given rise to more questionable doctrines or been the mainstay of more theological quacks than has the book of Revelation. All the more reason why serious theological reflection ought be given this writing. And, indeed, throughout the ages competent Biblical scholars have directed their attention to this fascinating book which so begrudingly gives forth its secrets.

However, even the best of Biblical scholars are divided on the significance of this prophetic book. *Die Johannesapokalypse* by Otto Boecher takes not of these divergences and attempts to give a summary of the present situation in the scholarly study of Revelation. For this purpose Boecher, who is Professor of New Testament at the University of Mainz, has divided the book into three sections. The first section provides a resume of the history of interpretation from 1700. In short, descriptive paragraphs Boecher reviews the various methodological perspectives from which Revelation has been interpreted and the principal proponents of each perspective. In the second section Boecher shows how some especially difficult problems in the interpretation of Revelation have been handled by twentieth-century commentators. The twelve problems considered include authorship; Christ as the Lamb; the 144,000; the number 666; the 1000-year rule; and the heavenly Jerusalem. As examples of twentieth-century treatment of these problems Boecher has chosen the commentaries of Wilhelm Bousset (1906), R. H. Charles (1920), Ernst Lohmeyer (1926), Wilhelm Hadorn (1928), Joseph Sickenberger (1942), Alfred Wilkenhauser (1959), and Heinrich Kraft (1974). For a brief overview is not a bad choice of commentaries. Both Protestant and Catholic exegetes are included, although, as is so often the case, the choice indicates a Teutonic bias. The French Catholic Ernest-Bernard Allo ought have been included. For each problem Boecher also states his own viewpoint. For the ongoing study of Revelation the third section is the most beneficial. It is an extensive bibliography (with five hundred listing entries) the major books and articles which have been published on Revelation from the during the years 1700–1974.

Of course, books which deal exclusively with secondary sources do not replace direct confrontation with the Biblical text. Nevertheless, the *opinio communis* is perhaps more welcome for the study of Revelation than for the study of any other book of Scripture. In that regard this book is a distinct help.

William C. Weinrich

THE GENESIS RECORD. A SCIENTIFIC AND DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF BEGINNINGS. By Henry M. Morris. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 716 pages. Cloth. $12.95.

New commentaries on Genesis are periodically appearing; there are at least twenty commentaries on Genesis on the market tody. But *The Genesis Record*

is unique in that it is the only commentary in print which was written by a creationist scientist. Dr. Morris is now Director of the Institute for Creation Research and Professor of Apologetics at Christian Heritage College in San Diego. Prior to joining the faculty of Christian Heritage College he was for twenty-eight years on the faculties of major universities, including thirteen years as chairman of the Civil Engineering Department of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The commentary takes the form of a narrative exposition rather than a critical verse-by-verse analysis. However, Morris has woven into his presentation discussions on all important historical and scientific problems. The book has been written with both the clergyman laymen in mind.

In opposition to liberal and neo-orthodox scholars, Morris rejects the Documentary Hypothesis; one's attitude toward this theory will determine how a commentator interprets the fifty chapters of the Bible's first book. Under no circumstances does the author consider the conclusions of the various types of the historical-critical method as viable. In opposition to twentieth-century form criticism (which began with Herman Gunkel) he accepts the first eleven chapters of Genesis as truly historical, as also the remaining thirty-nine. According to Dr. Arnold Ehlers "this conclusion is not based simply on faith, but on many years of study of the scientific aspects of the Genesis records and of the interchange of ideas with many other scientists, both creationists and evolutionists. Since he and many of his colleagues are convinced that the earth and the universe are young, rather than billions of years old, he advocates a tight chronology in expounding Genesis" (p. v, in the foreword). In dealing with the Flood, Morris takes the same stance as he did in his earlier book, co-authored with John Whitcomb, *The Genesis Flood*—namely, that the Biblical Flood was a universal Flood and not just a local one, as theistic evolutionists argue.

The King James translation of each section discussed has been inserted for easy reference. Appropriate changes are indicated in the commentary whenever necessary. References to other books of the Bible are made throughout the commentary, and all passages are indexed at the end of the book. Morris has woven into his commentary much interesting and helpful material. Archaeological discoveries bearing on events and personalities are not neglected (there are references to at least ten different discoveries). The two-volume Lutheran commentary on Genesis by Leupold is mentioned as an exposition which Morris has found extremely helpful.

The experience of having taught Genesis eight different times in the course of more than thirty years of Bible class teaching has alerted Morris to problems that both pastors and lay people have in their study of this book. While conservative students of the Bible may not agree with all the assumptions and conclusions of Morris, yet they will find *The Genesis Record* an informative and rather sound commentary on one of the Bible's key books.

Raymond F. Surburg

INDEX TO BROWN, DRIVER AND BRIGGS HEBREW LEXICON. Compiled by Bruce Einspahr. Foreword by Bruce K. Waltke and Kenneth Barker. Moody Press, Chicago, 1976. 452 pages. $19.95.

Here is a great new aid for students who wish to expound the Old Testament on the basis of the Hebrew. One of the great lexica produced by Old Testament Biblical scholarship was *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* by Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs (hereafter deferred to BDB). Dr. Barker states in his foreword stated:

> To appreciate BDB, one must first understand the nature of a lexicon in contrast to the ordinary dictionary. Dictionaries

> generally list only the meanings of words, whereas a thorough lexicon relates the various meanings to specific passages in literature—the Old Testament in the case of BDB. Obviously, then a lexicon's value is judged by the author's skill both as philologist and interpreter.

Despite certain weaknesses which Barker has pointed out on page v, he still contends that BDB "remains unsurpassed in its philological depth and scope—reflected, for example, in its etymological studies and its sensitivity to the nuances of words within various contexts." Another strength of BDB is that it lists cognates of a given Hebrew root as they exist in other Semitic languages.

The *Index* is not in any way meant to supplant the use of BDB; it was compiled to enable the translator to get into the lexicon more easily. It lists in consonantal form (by book, chapter and verse) every Hebrew word in BDB, listing its general English meaning and the page and section in the Lexicon where the word is discussed—a total of over 139,000 entries.

The inspiration for the compilation of the *Index* was the index to the Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich Greek lexicon by John R. Alsop, published by Zondervan Publishing House. Many beginning students find translation so difficult that they wonder if it is the time expended in view of the existence of a plethora of good Bible translations. Students who have devoted many hours to the study of the Hebrew language are diasppointed with results in relation to the time consumed. Einspahr recognized this situation as a very common one and believed that "an index to a popular and reliable Hebrew lexicon would encourage the Hebrew student by directing him quickly to the appropriate entries in the lexicon. He would therefore enjoy greater results in a shorter period of time, regardless of his skill in the language" (p. vii).

It took ten months and the resources of seven men to produce this remarkable interpretative Biblical aid. Seven students of Dallas Theological Seminary were assigned a section of the Lexicon; from his section each man recorded every entry. Then the entries were put into the computer and programmed for a printout in verse-by-verse order. Thereafter the printout from the computer was compared with the Lexicon and corrections made. Four times this was done, so that the numbers of errors might be kept to a minimum. Einspahr describes the production of the *Index* as follows:

> The original information was recorded on 7,947 sheets of paper, and was then transferred to 832 pounds of computer paper. The computer took 45 minutes to sort the information and four hours to print it. The final computer printout contained 139,924 references on 2,596 pages of computer paper weighing 46 pounds. Finally, the data was recorded on computer tape in biblical sequence and readied for typesetting by additional programming.

No doubt, the *Index* is one of the finest linguistic tools published in the last three decades. For newer students the *Index* will solve the vexing problem of the identification of Hebrew roots. It will also serve as a handy vocabulary list for the beginning student as well as a frequency list for more advanced students and as a source for various statistical word studies. With a better knowledge of the vocabulary and syntax of the Hebrew language, the serious student of God's Word will be able to fathom more fully the depths of God's revelation of Himself and His will.

Raymond F. Surburg

PSALMS. By Charles Haddon Spurgeon. Edited by David Otis Fuller. Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, 1976. 703 pages. Cloth. $14.95.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon (1834-1892), famous nineteenth-century Baptist preacher and author, whose sermons fill forty-nine volumes in *The Metropolitan Pulpit,* was for years the pastor and preacher of the well-known Metropolitan Tabernacle whose seating capacity was six thousand. Although he died when he was only fifty-seven years old, he left a considerable religious literary legacy. Spurgeon's most famous effort was his seven-volume *The Treasury of David,* consisting the three thousand pages and nearly two million words. This work contains comments on every verse of the one hundred and fifty psalms of the Psalter. Often there are pages of discussion on the phrases or words of individual verses of a psalm. Spurgeon, "the Prince of Preachers," spent twenty years of his life in writing this *magnus opum.*

The well-known nineteenth-century Union Seminary (New York) professor, Dr. Philip Schaff, said of Spurgeon's *Treasury* that it reveals Spurgeon at his best. "Specially valuable for quotations from early writers. Commended alike for soul and service." "The most important and practical work of the ages on the Psalter is THE TREASURY OF DAVID by Charles H. Spurgeon. It is full of the force of the genius of this celebrated preacher and rich in selections from the entire realm of literature."

David Otis Fuller has condensed the seven volumes into two, and the latter condensation has now been issued as one volume by Kregel Publications, which in recent years has been reprinting some of the older theological classics. Fuller has endeavored to preserve all the jewels from Spurgeon's great devotional classic, which Fuller describes as "a theological anthology of the whole realism of Christian truth. All other doctrines of God's Word are dealt with by the master minds of nearly every age since the first coming of Christ. Some of the 720 different expositors are Augustine, Chrysostem, Athanaius, Calvin, Bunyan, Matthew Henry, and, of course, Mr. Spurgeon himself. Here is a great thesaurus of golden truth that will endure through the ages." The busy pastor who does not wish to invest the money necessary to buy the unabridged edition and still would like to become acquainted with this classic of psalm interpretation will find many sermonic helps in this seven-hundred-page abridgment.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION. By Ferrell Jenkins. Foreword by Homer Bailey. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. Paperback. $3.95.

For many Christians the Book of Revelation is a mystery book. Inasmuch as many Christians cannot understand the strange imagery of the New Testament's last book, they ignore it in their personal devotions and in Bible study. Jenkins, Associate Editor of Cogdill Foundation and editor of the *Truth in Life* series of Bible class literature, wrote this book with the purpose of helping puzzled Christians understand the use of Old Testament symbols that are found throughout Revelation.

Jenkins specifically aims to (1) determine the extent to which the Old Testament is employed in the Apocalypse, and (2) to determine the way an understanding of Old Testament images contribute to a sound exegesis of the message of Revelation. In chapter one the Old Testament background of the Book of Revelation is presented. Jenkins lists the Old Testament references; then takes up the matter of the kind of text utilized in the Old Testament allusions. In chapter two the place of Revelation in apocalyptic literature is evaluated. Chapter three contains an examination of the Old Testament books most frequently referred to in Revelation. They are Daniel, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Zechariah, Psalms, and Exodus. Chapter four takes up the unique description of Christ in the first chapter of the Apocalypse. In chapter five

such titles as Creator, the Almighty, the God of Heaven, Lion of the Tribe of Judah, the Root of David, the Lamb, the Bright Morning Star, the Holy One, the Key of David, the Beginning of God's Creation, all titles of deity from the Old Testament, are discussed and their usage in Revelation analysed. The last chapter acquaints the reader with Old Testament imagery used in the Apocalypse.

After reading this book the reader will be convinced, if he was not already when he took it up, that the Old Testament provided many symbols and allusions and images for the Book of Revelation. Jenkins' study shows that there are at least 348 Old Testament references in the Apocalypse. However, of these there is not one single direct quotation, and the majority of the allusions come from seven books.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Leon J. Wood. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 160 pages. Paper. $3.95.

Since the eruption of the Neopentecostal movement the Holy Spirit has assumed a new prominence in churchly circles. The author who is professor of Old Testament studies and dean of the faculty at the Grand Rapids Baptist Bible Seminary has written an interesting and useful study, one which conservative students of Scripture will welcome, whether or not they agree with all of Wood's interpretations. Since the true God has been the Triune God from all eternity, it would be logical that the various persons of the Godhead should not only be referred to in the Old Testament but their activities in regard to men described. The author is correct when he begins his work with this assertion: "Although many books have been written about the Holy Spirit, they have considered the subject almost exclusively a New Testament presentation. If the Old Testament is mentioned at all, it is only in passing or in the form of a comparative remark. Some writers have doubted that the Old Testament contains any sure references to the Holy Spirit and that certainly people of the time had little, if any, conception of this Third Person of the Trinity. No books to my knowledge treat of the subject of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament as such."

The Old Testament contains more than veiled references to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of Yahweh is portrayed as creator, the renewer of life in man in redemption, as the Person through whom the prophets were inspired and through whom men and women received the gift for wisdom and leadership. Woods further presents evidence for the fact that the Holy Spirit regenerated, dwelt in, sealed, filled, and empowered the saints who lived prior to Christ's coming and the miraculous outpouring the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament* is one of the volumes in Baker's series, *Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives.*

Raymond F. Surburg

NEW TESTAMENT JUDEAN AND AUTHORIZED VERSION. Judean Publishing House, Jerusalem, 1972. 592 pages. Cloth. $5.00.

The publishers state in an introduction to this version: "This Judean and Authorized Version may be described as "The New Testament without Anti-semitism." Amendments herein of the 1611 translation can all be established from the sources. They have been adopted with one aim: "to eliminate, as far as truth will allow, those unfortunate renderings which tend to sow emnity between Christians and Jews. The authentic involves love (not murderous hate). Thus, this Judean version claims to be a truly Christian translation. In all other respects, the text remains as in 1611."

At the foot of each page the publishers have amplified every instance of departure of the Judean version from the King James or Authorized Version. It is claimed that this translation is long overdue—a reapproachement between Christendom and Jewry. The Judean Revised Authorized Version has 350 places where the text has been changed to bring the New Testament into line with the presupposition that the Jews were in no sense involved in the crucifixion and death of Jesus. Those passages in the Greek New Testament that reflect unfavorably on first-century Judaism, its proponents and representatives have been toned down or changed.

The King James Version claims that it is a translation made from the original languages, the Hebrew and Aramaic as far as the Old Testament is concerned, and the Greek (according to the Textus Receptus) for the New Testament. To justify changing a translation which faithfully translated the Greek text of the twenty-seven books that comprise the New Testament, it would be necessary to produce manuscript evidence which was in harmony with the changes made by the Judean Publishing House of Jerusalem.

To rewrite history the way one claims its should have occurred is quite different from translating documents which claim to record what actually transpired. The New Testament, with the exception of two books—the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts—were written by Jewish people. Jesus of Nazareth was a descendant of Abraham and a descendant of David. The twelve Apostles, chosen by Jesus of Nazareth at the beginning of His Galilean ministry, were Jews. When Matthias was chosen to replace Judas, another Jew took the son of perdition's place. Paul, at first a persecutor of Jesus and of those who accepted Jesus Christ as the promised Messiah, was a Jew of the Diaspora and a member of the sect of the Pharisees. Peter, the author of I and II Peter, and John the writer of the Gospel, the three Epistles, and Revelation, were Hebrews. James and Jude were probably penned by two of the brothers of Jesus of Nazareth. The Epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul or Timothy or some other Jewish author. There are over a thousand quotations, references, and allusions to the Old Testament in the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. All this makes the New Testament a Jewish collection of writings.

Like the people of Qumran, so the Gospels show that there was a general expectation regarding the coming of the Messiah. The leaders of first-century Judaism rejected Jesus of Nazareth as the fulfiller of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament. Therefore, as the Gospels portray the evidence, the Scribes and Pharisees were opposed to Jesus and finally decided that He would need to be removed. This is the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter (in Acts), and Paul.

It might be instructive to consider the changes of this Judean "Christian" Version. Whenever the word "law" occurs, this version substitutes "Bible." According to *The American Heritage Dictionary* the word "Bible" refers either to the entire Bible of Christians, including the Old and New Testaments; or it may refer to the Hebrew Old Testament. Changing "law" to "Bible" does not change the meaning. So why tamper with the A. V. text? Whenever the word "Pharisees" occurs, the Judean Version renders it "the Separates." The New English Bible still uses the word "Pharisees," as do all modern speech translations. This reviewer does not see what is gained by the new translation in the Judean Version. In the Passion Narratives the attempt is made to give the impression and Jews had nothing to do with the delivering of Jesus of Nazareth to the Roman authorities, requesting the death penalty for Jesus. In Matthew 21:45 where the Greek text reads: "And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spoke of them, but when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet," the Judean Version translated: "And when the ministers and Separates had heard his parables," etc. What is the reader to

understand by "the ministers and Separates"? *The New English Bible* translates: "When the chief priests and Pharisees heard his parables," etc.

Another change made in this Judean Version is to substitute "Judean" for the word "Jew." Judeans are people who lived in Judea, which by contrast with Samaria, Perea, and the Decapolis was nearly totally Jewish. What is gained by the substitution of "Judeans" for "Jews," the latter being the correct translation of the Greek *Ioudaioi*? Caiaphas, before whom Jesus is brought is called "chief minister" instead of high priest. The Sanhederin is composed of "all the ministers, lawyers of the people, headed by the chief minister Caiaphas who took counsel to condemn him," instead of the text's "crucify him." Wherever the word "crucify" occurs the Judean Version substitutes "condemn" or "kill." The crucifixion is blamed on Pontius Pilate.

This *New Testament Judean and Authorized Version* must be labelled as an attempt to take the onus away from Jews, who, according to the New Testament Greek text, rejected Christ as the promised Messiah and asked Pontius Pilate to crucify the Lord of Glory.

Raymond F. Surburg

AN INTRODUCTION TO NEW TESTAMENT GREEK. By R. A. Martin. Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, 1926. Paper. $5.95.

Anyone who teaches Greek these days knows that students often want nothing but a crash course so they can get on with their theological studies. What was customarily done in two semesters must now be done in one quarter. Here is a book that claims it can be done in half a quarter. The opening paragraph of the preface reads thus: "The 66 lessons are intended to be covered in a 5 week intensive course of 85 class periods (17 class periods each week), allowing periods for review, tests and reading in the Greek New Testament." Whether or not a student can actually cover all of basic Greek grammar in five weeks remains to be seen. But this new grammar could well be used for a course to be covered in one quarter (10 weeks). In addition to all the required paradigms, a vocabulary of 650 words, careful syntactical explanations, and good exercises both from Greek to English and vice versa, the book contains twelve reading selections, after lesson fourteen, from the New Testament and the Didache. A total of twenty non-Biblical quotations from Classical and Koine authors are found at the head of individual lessons.

It is good for any teacher of Greek to change textbooks occasionally. Here is a book that allows for a good change. The grammar ($5.95) and the vocabulary—principal parts cards ($1.50) can be obtained from the Wartburg Seminary Bookstore, 333 Wartburg Place, Dubuque, Iowa 52001.

H. Buls

II. Theological-Historical Studies

THE MEANING OF THE MILLENNIUM: FOUR VIEWS. Edited by Robert G. Clouse with contributions by George Elden Ladd, Herman A. Hoyt, Lorraine Boettner, Anthony Koekema. Inter-Varsity Press, Downers Grove, 1977. 223 pages. Paper. $4.25.

Dr. Robert G. Clouse, professor of history at Indiana State University, has edited a volume giving four different views about the Second Coming of Christ. While Christians ever since the first century have believed that Christ will come again, there nevertheless have been significant disagreements about the manner of Christ's return and the time of His return. What kind of a kingdom will Christ establish? How is Revelation 20:1-10 to be understood?

Each of the four views presented in this volume has a long history. George Ladd of Fuller Theological Seminary presents historic premillennialism; Lorraine Boettner, retired author and theologian, discusses the postmillennial view; Herman A. Hoyt of Grace Theological Seminary writes on dispensational premillennialism. The amillennial stance is set forth by Anthony Hoekema of Calvin Theological Seminary. After each major essay, the three other writers respond from their respective points of view. Historic Lutheranism, of course, as reflected by the Augsburg Confession, is opposed to chiliasm. Lutheran literature dealing with the millennium, however, is either unknown by Hoekema or ignored. Unfortunately dispensationalism and millennialism have implications for many parts of Holy Scripture. Old Testament prophecy, parable interpretation, the understanding of the Gospels, and the locus of eschatology are especially affected by dispensational millennialism.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE CHURCH. Studies in Dogmatics. By G.C. Berkouwer. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1976. 438 pages. $9.95.

Berkouwer's work in dogmatics stands as one of the monumental achievements in twentieth-century theology. This volume on the church is number 14 in the series (number 19 in the Dutch original, where some of the topics are divided into more than one volume) and represents the master dogmatician at his maturest. Prof. Berkouwer, now in retirement after more than thirty years of teaching at the Free University of Amsterdam, has been, after Kuyper and Bavinck, the Dutch Free Church's leading theologian.

His introductory chapter defines *credo ecclesiam*, especially what "I believe in the Church" means in a world cluttered with so many options. "We do not mean" hereby, states Berkouwer, "to blur the outlines of the *ecclesia*, but rather to testify to her reality," as "made up of concrete, living men" (p. 9). He notes, too, the need to distinguish carefully between the attributes of the church - *una, sancta, catholica, apostolica* - and the marks of the church. While Lutherans recognize Word and Sacraments as the only marks of the church, as Berkouwer rightly notes, the Reformed tend to expand these by the addition of church discipline or to telescope the whole bundle into the somewhat nebulous principle of "preaching the Word," a thing which "comes to expression in various ways and is directed to conformity with the gospel" (p. 15). Undoubtedly this explains in part how Reformed theologians - conservative, neo-orthodox (Barth), and liberal - have been comfortable with the somewhat elastic possibilities of the "Word" as the determinative principle. Confessional Lutheran theology, on the contrary, remains much more straight-laced and single-minded on the nature and objectivity of the Word and Sacraments as God's given means of grace and the true marks of the church, whatever the circumstances or efforts at expressing them.

The main body of Berkouwer's treatment is divided according to the church's four chief attributes. Under the church's unity he duly notes the invisible nature of the *ecclesia* under the one Shepherd, and "that the division of the Church has its origin in human sin" (p. 33), a condition which "has penetrated into the visible, but not into the invisible, Church" (p. 38). This broken condition of the empirical church, as might be expected, "gives the world *cause* for joy and derision" (p. 46) and "is one of the deepest 'ecclesiological' problems," states Berkouwer (p. 46). Of course, the pluriformity of the church does not rise from Biblical origins but from a wrongful spirit of divisions and unfaithfulness. Berkouwer tends towards vagueness anent the whole Biblical injunction to purity of doctrine as a given of God and the church's obligation therein. This ambiguity surfaces again in the discussion on the proper basis for church fellowship, where Berkouwer's emphasis seems to come down more on love than on purity of teaching, instead of on both evenly.

Pretension to catholicity on the part of bodies like Rome, Berkouwer tabs immediately as phony ecumenicity. True ecumenicity ought to stand "in the light of gift (*Gabe*) and task (*Aufgabe*)" (p. 121). The empirical church, Berkouwer argues, has always had difficulty with this important concept, either by "particularistic narrowness" or unrestricted and syncretistic latitude. There are God-given boundaries, boundaries which are connected with God's promised salvation in Christ, and it is this latter which "is connected to the unity of the Church - her confession of the one hope (Eph. 4:4) - and, thus, also to the catholicity of the Church" (p. 197).

Berkouwer's third main section takes up the question of the Church's apostolicity, correctly tying it to its unique "apostolic past" (p. 201) and the fact that Christ's church bears an unmistakeable, indefectible, empowering dependence upon and relation to human apostles, through whom "the authority of the messenger is the authority of the Sender" (a theme borrowed from K. Rengstorf). Berkouwer has no difficulty stating that apostolic truth is tied to a succession of doctrine from God's appointed apostolic personages, but the linking of this truth to the inspired and inscripturated Word, Holy Writ, is not so clearly stated.

The attribute *sancta* shapes the fourth section of the book. The church "possesses her unassailable holiness in Christ," a holiness which is to show itself in vibrant, concrete sanctification, states Berkouwer. Though always *simul justus et peccator*, the individual members of Christ's church strive against sin and weakness, against error and heresy, and for proclamation and mission, seeking always, in the words of John Mott, "to evangelize the world in this generation."

E.F. Klug

DIETRICH BONHOEFFER. By Dallas M. Roark. Word Books, Waco, Texas, 1972. Cloth. $4.95.

This volume is a contribution to the series, *Makers of the Modern Theological Mind*, edited by Bob E. Patterson of Baylor University. The series intends to provide a reliable guide to the ideas of men whose thinking has significantly influenced twentieth century theological discussion. Other volumes in the series discuss Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, Charles Hartshorne, and Wolfhart Pannenberg. Each theologian is to be examined critically concerning his theological method, his central ideas, his conceptual weaknesses, and his contributions to the present theological context.

Dallas Roark approaches Bonhoeffer with the requisite deference and humility for such a task. Bonhoeffer is notoriously difficult to interpret. Some of his best work was never completed (his Christology and his ethics); the work which shapes the popular view of Bonhoeffer, *Letters and Papers from Prison*, contains quotable and radical comments which have served as mottos for all kinds of chic theologies. "God of the gaps," "world come of age," and other catch phrases have provided fodder for many a speculative mind to run amuck under the aegis of a respectable name. Following Bonhoeffer's close compatriot, Eberhard Bethge, Roark chooses to interpret Bonhoeffer in the light of all his writings, in the light of the "whole" or "complete" Bonhoeffer. Such study usually concentrates on certain motifs within Bonhoeffer. Roark chooses the motif of "Church". It is a good choice, for not only were Bonhoeffer's most serious and complete works concerning the Church (*The Communion of Saints, Act and Being, The Cost of Discipleship*), but the matrix for much of Bonhoeffer's thinking was a question raised by the emerging totalitarianism of Hitler, "What is incumbant upon the Christian, and upon the Church, in a social-political context which has become evil?"

The book is divided into chapters, each discussing a work of Bonhoeffer

from the perspective of its ecclesiological implications. At the end of each chapter is a critical comment by the author. While the book may well be helpful to the layman who is eager to learn of Bonhoeffer without spending much time in the process, it is doubtful the book fulfils the goal of the series of which it is a part, "to give assurance to a Ph.D. student in theology preparing for his preliminiary exams." The chapters consist of summarizations of works by Bonhoeffer; that is, little, if any, analysis is given. It would be vastly superior to read Bonhoeffer himself, who is every bit as readable as this book. Exceptions to this may be (for the layman most probably would be) chapters 2 and 3, which discuss Bonhoeffer's two most technical works, *The Communion of Saints* and *Act and Being*. The critical comments of the author could easily have been omitted. They are supremely superficial, adding nothing to an appreciation of the issues raised by Bonhoeffer. The criticisms are trite (against Bonhoeffer's dislike of singing hymns in harmony, pp. 73f.), ridiculous (ought Bonhoeffer really answered such questions as "How many children shall I have?" or "Whom shall I marry?"), and strongly biased toward the Reformed viewpoint. This latter is especially noticeable in Roark's attitude toward the importance Bonhoeffer repeatedly placed on infant baptism. Roark shows little appreciation for the function infant baptism plays in Bonhoeffer's thinking, no doubt because he does not understand the Lutheran teaching concerning infant baptism ("Bonhoeffer follows a Lutheran position on infant baptism, in which faith is located by proxy in the congregation rather than the infant", p. 35).

William C. Weinrich

MARTIN BUBER. By Stephen M. Panko. Edited by Bob E. Patterson. Word Book Publishers, Waco, Texas, 1976. 135 pages. Cloth. $5.95.

This is one of the volumes in *Makers of the Modern Theological Mind*, a series edited by Bob E. Patterson. The following makers of the modern theological mind have thus far appeared: Karl Barth, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Rudolf Bultmann, Charles Hartshorne, Wolfart Pannenberg, Teilhard du Chardin, Emil Brunner, Soeren Kiekegaard, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Martin Buber. These are the men which Patterson believes have shaped twentieth-century Christian theology. The books dealing with these theologians and philosophers are not intended as a substitute for reading their writings. However, the editor assures the readers of these ten books that each major theologian has been carefully and critically examined. In each case, "his life, his theological method, his most germinal ideas, his weaknesses as a thinker, his place in the theological spectrum, and his chief contribution to the climate of theology today" are evaluated. *The Makers of the Modern Theological Mind* are meant for laymen and at the same time, because they are supposedly carefully done, they are also to help the Ph.D. student prepare for his preliminary examinations. Some may question whether both goals have been attained in these volumes.

Stephen Panko, Director of Continuing Education and Associate Dean of University College, Loyola University, Chicago, has given insights into the life and work of Buber. His helpful and interesting introductory overview of Buber's life aids in a better understanding of the activites and literary productions of Buber. Major topics included in this book are a discussion of *I-THOU* and the philosophy of dialogue, Buber's distinctive concept of God, "the eternal Thou," his interest with the Hasidim, his translation of the Old Testament, Buber's views on Judaism and Zionism, and Buber's impact on the understanding of the Christian faith.

Panko claims that the following Christian theologians were somehow influenced by the thinking and teachings of Buber: John Baille, Karl Barth, Emil

Brunner, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Paul Tillich. If this is true, it certainly would be worthwhile to see what these so-called Christian theologians borrowed from Buber or at least to determine how the flow of their thought was directed by some of Buber's ideas.

Buber's concept of God, whom he calls the "Eternal Thou" is not the God of the Old Testament, much less of the New Testament. His God is the construct of a philosopher; he creates his own version of what he imagines God to be. This always differs radically from the revelation the Biblical God has given of Himself, as may be inferred from a study of the various names of God, from specific descriptive statements about His essence and nature, from a description of God's attributes and from His dealings with individuals and nations as set forth in the Bible.

Panko in his discussion of Buber's famous book, *I and Thou*, claims that "truth comes for Buber as a result of experiencing life and not from any intellectual solution to problems. There is a great risk when a person becomes involved in political, religious and social questions, because there is no guarantee that the position that is taken is the truth" (p. 55). "He cannot take any absolute standards of truth and falsity, or right or wrong. Anyone who attempts to establish such absolute standards, whether it be within the church, or a political party, or in a social organization, is involved in a worthless endeavor" (p. 55).

Buber's philosophy of uncertainty may appeal to certain individuals but it is inadequate for building a satisfying philosophy of life. This is especially true when it comes to dealing with life's ultimate question: Where do I spend my eternity? That Buber with his philosophy could not appreciate or agree with the distinctive claims of Biblical New Testament Christianity comes as no surprise. That a number of so-called Christian theologians were influenced by Buber testifies to the fact that men like Barth, Baillie, Brunner, Gogarten, R. Niebuhr, Oldham and Tillich also would not abide or accept the clear teachings of the New Testament, because the hermeneutics with which they approach the Old Testament and New Testament is not consistent with the Bible's claims about itself and the teachings set forth in them. Panko has included a selected bibliography, listing Buber's own writings and fifteen books which discuss the teachings and philosophy of Buber.

Raymond F. Surburg

PREUS OF MISSOURI AND THE GREAT LUTHERAN CIVIL WAR. By James E. Adams. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1977. 422 pages. Cloth. $10.00.

This fourteen-chapter book deals with the life of Dr. J.A.O. Preus from infancy to 1977; it also endeavors to set forth the part played by Preus in the "great Lutheran civil war" which broke out in all earnestness with Preus' election to the presidency of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod (LCMS) at the Denver Convention in 1969. Adams' literary effort does not claim to be a definitive biography; because such an attempt, the author believes, is impossible while Preus remains active and while "too many lips are sealed for fear of influencing the outcome of the deadly struggle in the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod" (p. x).

Adams, a working journalist for the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, admits that his book represents impressionistic reportage. Adams feels that Preus has grabbed more than his share of headlines. In alerting his readers as to what they might expect in his treatment of the subject of his book, Adams informs his readers that his volume contains more than a mere inventory of facts. He does claim that he presents the facts accurately and fairly, but at the same time he writes from a certain point of view.

After reading Adams' biography of President Preus, people both within and

outside the LCMS will know more about the latter's life than about most religious leaders in the world of Protestantism. They will learn many interesting facts about his childhood, his youth, his seminary days, his pastoral efforts in a number of Lutheran congregations, his university days, his marriage, his efforts as seminary president, and especially his first two terms as synodical president. The part played in the LCMS by his brother Dr. Robert Preus is also discussed.

It appears that Adams wishes to be fair to President Preus and all the people whom he describes. While he takes both sides to task in "the great Lutheran civil war," it does not take too long to discover with whom his heart is and which side he would like to see win. Since the war in Missouri is a theological war—one, namely, about the nature of the Bible and its correct interpretation—Adams is influenced in his evaluation by his own personal prejudices. From the page of acknowledgements it would appear that it is a Roman Catholic writer who is interpreting Missouri's civil war and passing judgments on the motives and action of the contesting parties. The following are listed as individuals and institutions that shaped the religious and moral views of Adams: "his parents; the Catholic Church; Subiaco Academy and Abbey, Subiaco, Arkansas; the University of Dayton, Theology Department, Dayton, Ohio; McGill University Divinity School, Montreal." Scripture quotations are from the Jerusalem Bible. It is a well known fact that most Roman Catholic seminaries and divinity schools have adopted the historical-critical method together with its interpretative implications in the study of the Bible. In Roman Catholic circles a development has occurred which parallels that in the Missouri Synod, except that in Roman Catholicism it began a few decades earlier. Understandably, then, Adams at times editorializes instead of reporting.

Harper and Row are advertising *Preus of Missouri and the Great Lutheran Civil War* in the following manner: "hard hitting, colorful, psychologically fascinating, *Preus of Missouri* becomes more than a study of ecclesiastical power politics: it is an in-the-field report of a new battle for the Bible and a revealing portrayal of a man willing to risk his church in the cause of orthodoxy." Again, the advertising blurb on the jacket tells the reader that the thirty-six year old religion editor of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* endeavored to present in his book "a sense of the daring and idealistic, but fault-ridden and tragedy-prong, humans who shape churches and are shaped by them." That he may have overdone his characterization of the LCMS's president is hinted at by Adams himself; in the conclusion to his preface, he states: "And if I have told the story too bluntly, if I have created an immoderate revelation, perhaps, in view of the subjects, I can be forgiven and if not forgiven, then at least tolerated as one of those outsiders who gasps on the pure air of that Missouri mountaintop."

Preus was chosen as the subject for a book by Adams because of the part which Preus has played in the reversal of the direction of the LCMS from that which it had been taking for nearly a decade. Stopping this trend away from Missouri's historic position and directing it back again to the path of orthodoxy was the beginning of "the great Lutheran civil war" in all its earnestness. In chapter two, entitled "The Missouri Waltz," Adams has attempted to give a succinct history of the LCMS's doctrinal position, in which he also proceeds to attack the Synod's stance on the Bible as inerrant and historically trustworthy. Adams' book clearly shows who was responsible for starting "the great Lutheran civil war." There are two parties at war—those faithful to the LCMS's historical doctrinal position and those determined to depart from it and change the character of traditional Missouri. The latter are called by Adams "the revisionists." Although he ultimately favors the stance of the "liberal moderates," Adams reports that these "liberal moderates" planned to change the course of the LCMS in the second half of the twentieth century.

The last twenty years have seen doctrinal developments which never would have been possible had all members of the LCMS chosen to abide by the Synodical constitution and its by-laws. When the LCMS celebrated its centennial in 1947, the essays published in the first two volumes of *The Abiding Word* showed that the doctrine and practice of the Synod had not changed in a hundred years, although there had been rumblings of discontent in the *Statement of the Forty-Four* and *Speaking the Truth in Love.*

However, the late fifties and early sixties saw changes occurring in the LCMS that were planned by a group of people who were convinced that the historic doctrinal position of the Synod was not correct and who decided to change the course of history for the LCMS. To bring one of the most orthodox Lutheran churches in the world into the mainstream of American religious life would take some doing. The plan called for securing control of the thought-influencing agencies of the synod, such as the following: the two seminaries, the two teachers colleges, the junior colleges, the senior college, the Board of Higher Education, the Synodical Board of Directors, the Boards of Home and Foreign Missions, the Board for Parish Education, *The Lutheran Witness,* the Walther League, the Lutheran Layman's League, the Lutheran Woman's Missionary League, and *Advance Magazine.* In fact, all administrative positions were to be taken over by individuals sympathetic to the new program. The idea was to control the direction of the Synod in every way possible. Many members of the Council of Presidents were won over to the concept of "a new Missouri." Between 1955 and 1969 many of the revisionist goals were realized and gradually the character of old Missouri was being changed. Between 1962 and 1969 Synodical conventions were passing resolutions implementing the new program. In 1965 the LCMS joined the Lutheran Council in the USA (LCUSA), and in 1969 altar-and-pulpit fellowship were established with the American Lutheran Church. The group responsible for the changes in the LCMS was committed to world-wide Christian ecumenism. It was the aim of this group to have the LCMS not only join the Lutheran World Federation, but also affiliate itself with the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches. Such memberships were impossible for those who understood the true nature of Lutheranism and who supported the Synodical Constitution. At the St. Louis Seminary the historical-critical method was introduced with resulting attacks on the inerrancy and historical reliability of the Bible and with the repudiation or questioning of many miracles of the Bible.

This new program was promoted surreptitiously until its adherents felt that it was safe enough to come out boldly. Adams admits that the "moderates" (a term he does not believe fits these men) did attempt to bring the LCMS out of its self-chosen isolationism and that they did not set forth their program honestly. The picture they endeavored to paint was that what they were doing was in accord with the tradition the Synod had known for at least a century. In order to hide what their goals were, they tried to soothe grassroots concern by claiming that no changes were involved, that what was being done was to present the old truths unchanged in language more meaningful to the American public. In the judgment of Adams "this seek-no-change, hear-no-change, speak-no-change was ecclesiastical disaster." Father John Jay Hughes in his April 3, 1977, review of Adams' book made this remark about the moderates' policy: "For an intellectual elite to work for change while denying that any change was taking place seemed to many to come close to confidence artists fleecing a crowd of yokels in a shell game."

Adams cannot appreciate Missouri's traditional emphasis upon pure doctrine. He seems to believe that the teachings of a church body should be relevant and subject to change. The Roman Catholic Church in which he was nourished from time to time develops new doctrine as the Holy Spirit supposedly guides the teaching magisterium of the church. While he faults Preus

and Missouri for having substituted the Bible for the Pope and insisting on the sole authority of the Bible as ultimate religious authority, he should realize that there must be an ultimate source to which people may appeal for certainty as to their religious beliefs and practices. For Roman Catholics it is the Pope and the teaching magisterium of the Roman Church; for liberal Protestants it is feeling, science, psychology, philosophy, human reason. For historic Lutherans it is *sola Scriptura.* Preus wants the LCMS to remain totally faithful to the Bible and not just when the Bible proclaims the Gospel.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE REAL SATAN. By James Kallas. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, 1975. 111 pages. Paper. $2.95.

James Kallas, professor of religion at a Christian college in Thousand Oakes, California, is the author of *God and Satan in the Apocalypse* and *The Story of Paul.* The scope of this study is announced as being "from Biblical times to the present." This book takes Satan as a person to be reckoned. It is the contention of Kallas that many Christians do not take Satan seriously enough if they believe that the Devil only manifests himself in the forms he is described as assuming in the New Testament. It is true, as the author claims, that there are twentieth-century manifestations of Satan which are evident in drug abuse, in atheistic ideas, and in devil worship. Yet Kallas claims that Satan can be taken too seriously when he is depicted as superior in power to Jesus. The Bible assures Christians that Jesus Christ was victorious over the Satan and all his evil hosts.

The title of this book claims to portray the *real* Satan, the Satan of the Old and New Testaments, the Satan who fought Jesus but whom Jesus conquered. Chapter one deals with the teaching of the Old Testament regarding the Devil. The conclusions given in the opening chapter present a view of Satan which is contrary to what the Christian Church has held about the great enemy of mankind. On page 25 Kallas has summarized his study of Satan in the Old Testament as follows:

> That brings us back to where we started the chapter. The whole of the Old Testament doctrine of Satan can be summed up in two words–insignificant, and a servant. Mentioned only three times, only once at length, and in that one lengthy passage, a loyal servant. That is *all* that the Old Testament has to say about Satan! Any more than that is untrue to the Old Testament.

But when the reader comes to the New Testament there is a dramatic reversal, according to Kallas. In the New Testament the Devil is no longer insignificant but central (p. 25). At Jesus' time Satan is no longer a servant but "the enemy."

To comprehend this change Kallas claims we need to understand the development of thought in the intertestamental period and he obliges with a discussion of "Satan in the Intertestamental Period" (pp. 27–48). The change in the concept of Satan as a helper to an enemy is attributed to the Essene sect, as may be seen from one of their Dead Sea Scrolls: "The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness." The concept of the Devil as an opponent was then followed in the New Testament writings, so that two diametrically opposite understandings are reflected in the two Testaments.

This raises an important theological question. Is Satan a reality? Is Satan a good angel who was once led a revolt against God or is he a creation of the mind of the intertestamental period? Traditional Lutheranism believes that it was the Devil that tempted Eve and Adam in the garden of Eden, that it was Satan who was responsible for bringing various disasters on Job, that it was the Devil who tempted David to number Israel, and that the same demonic

personality tempted Jesus in the wilderness. While Kallas wants to present the *real* Devil, he actually has painted him "as an angel of light" and misrepresented the theological teachings of the Old Testament on the personality and work of Satan.

Raymond F. Surburg

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE EARLY CHURCH. By Harry R. Boer. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1976. Pages xiv + 184. Paper. $2.95.

This book offers a succinct, clearly written, easily comprehended survey of the history of the early Church. Laymen who wish to become acquainted with the people and events which formed the first centuries of their Church's history will not go wrong by beginning with this book. The author presents as balanced a treatment of the doctrinal conflicts, the rise of Church institutions, and of the confrontation with Graeco-Roman culture as is possible within the scope of this book. All the highpoints are touched. There is good discussion concerning the persecutions, and the discussion concerning the Christological controversies rightly extends, not only to Chalcedon, but to the Seventh Ecumenical Council. Each chapter concludes with a series of study questions which make the book useful as a study guide. Certainly anyone who could answer all the study questions could claim a fundamental knowledge of the Church's first five centuries.

One could quibble about details. Montanus was most probably not a converted priest from the cult of Cybele in Phrygia, as is asserted (p. 63). The importance given to Irenaeus' role in the growth of episcopal authority is overdrawn (p. 69–70), and Irenaeus had no intention of ascribing to the bishop of Rome any special authority not held by other bishops as well (p. 70). "The most important, most universally accepted, and most enduring of the creeds" in not the Apostles' Creed (p. 77). This honor must certainly go to the Nicene Creed, which is accepted by both East and West (the Apostles' Creed is not). It would have been desirable for the author to have given a slightly fuller treatment of the religious-cultural environment of the Roman Empire into which Christianity was born. One error which must be corrected in any subsequent revision is the statement on page 115 that Alexander (bishop of Alexandria) "wanted a statement that could possibly be read in an Arian way." It should read that Alexander "wanted a statement that could *not* possibly be read in an Arian way." All in all, however, the book admirably fulfills its primary intent, to serve as a primer for the study of early Church history. It is recommended for the Church library.

William C. Weinrich

JONATHAN EDWARDS THE YOUNGER, 1745-1801, A COLONIAL PASTOR. By Robert L. Ferm. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids. 214 pages. Cloth. $7.95.

A Professor of Religion at Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont, Dr. Robert L. Ferm has revised his doctoral dissertation presented at Yale University in order to provide us with this biography of the son of Jonathan Edwards, Senior, the grandfather of Timothy Dwight – the almost forgotten Jonathan Edwards the Younger. This concise yet complete study of a man who lived in transitional times (America changed from a monarchy to a republic, from part of the British Empire to an independent nation, from a series of rival colonies to a federal union, from a seaboard society facing the Atlantic to a continental state expanding from the Appalachians to the Pacific) properly focuses on Edwards' efforts to cope with the theological alterations of his era.

As another historian aptly phrased it, America was moving from its Calvinist Epoch into its Methodist Age on its way toward its current Pragmatic Period. This created no little perplexity to a loyal son of the Geneva tradition such as Jonathan Edwards Junior. This readable volume casts new light on how the American Reformed Community sought to cope with such new influences as Deism, Revivalism, the Frontier, Nationalism, Republicanism, Unitarianism, and Practical Secularism. As a Connecticut pastor and New York college president active in both the Congregationalist and Presbyterian Churches, Jonathan Edwards Junior offers us a human focus for a re-evaluation of the major men and movements of this formative period in American religion and letters. Professor Ferm is to be commended for mastering both biography (said to be the most difficult form of history) and Reformed theology (in an era of crisis) and for sharing his insights with the general reader in such succinct and pleasant form.

C. George Fry

INTRODUCTION TO PURITAN THEOLOGY. Edited by Edward Hindson. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1976. 282 pages. Cloth. $8.95.

The well-known British evangelical scholar J.I. Packer states in the forward that the Puritanism which flourished during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has bequeathed its inheritance to the contemporary evangelical movement. Hindson, who serves as a religion professor at the Baptist college, has collected essays from British and American Puritan divines on twelve topics: natural theology, Scripture, God, etc. Puritanism was not one denomination but a movement which had adherents among the Anglicans, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Congregationalists. The theologians chosen for this anthology represent this diversified background. An alliance, though casual, has existed between Missouri Synod Lutherans and conservative Protestants, known as evangelicals. This alliance derives from a common aversion to Barthianism, destructive theories of Biblical study, and what may generally be called liberal theology. Lutherans and evangelicals may agree in certain conclusions and share an aversion to many forms of contemporary theology, but each group starts off from different points. This collection of essays on Puritanism will provide the reader with knowledge about the origins of evangelicalism. Robert Preus, Fred Kramer, J.A.O. Preus, and Eugene Klug have provided the same type of historical service in making the writings of the sixteenth and seventeenth century Lutheran theologians available to our generation. Hindson's collection of Puritan theologians will make a comparison of the origins easier. Evangelical conservatives will always have an easier task to making available their Puritanical history than the Lutherans will. All the Puritans wrote in English. Our men have to plough through the Latin and German in every case. All the essays chosen are good theological reading. Some of the more famous names chosen include John Jewel, John Bunyan, and Jonathan Edwards.

dps

BIBLICAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT. By Georgia Harkness and Charles F. Kraft. Abingdon, Nashville, 1976. 208 pages. Cloth. $7.95.

Professor Georgia Harkness, author of thirty books, showed a great interest in the people of the Middle East. As tour leader she conducted numerous tours to Bible lands, during which she endeavored to provide the participants with the background which would enable them to understand the "depth and sweep

of the culture of the Semitic people." The publisher's foreword informs the reader that Dr. Harkness "set out to help others understand the past as 'prologue' to the present and the future. . ." However, before Professor Harkness could complete her book she became ill and died. In this ten-chapter book, chapters one to six were written by Dr. Harkness and the last three chapters by Dr. Charles F. Kraft, her one-time colleague at Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary.

In the portion of the book authored by Dr. Harkness the focus is upon the Biblical history of Palestine, both social and political. Dr. Kraft presents an account of the chief events which transpired in Palestine during the last seventy-five years: the rise of Arab nationalism, the advance of Zionism, the increase in Jewish immigration, and the four Arab-Israeli wars.

The authors have attempted to create sympathy for both major parties in today's Near Eastern dispute. "It is their claim that this sympathy for both sides can best come through a knowledge of the backgrounds, both recent and in the remote past, that have produced the conflicts." While the book contends that it is not its intent to provide answers, but to furnish background information for enlightened individual and group decisions about the crucial and highly explosive issues in the Middle East, yet it seems to state that Christians should become involved and that Christians should "bring Christian thought to bear on present day Middle East conflicts." Indeed, the volume contains the following suggestions, as expressed by Rosemary Ruether, who in September, 1976, became Georgia Harkness Professor at Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary:

> A new start must be based on an unequivocal concession from the Arab side of the right of Israel to exist, and Israel too must come to see that it cannot survive by military counter-attack forever. . . Concerned Christians. . .must start by affirming the principle of the interdependency of . . .two causes (the development of new conditions for the Palestinians' existence and a committment to Israel's survival) . . .
>
> In the prophetic tradition divine donation cannot simply be translated into a secular land claim. Israel can be called the Zion of God only by those willing to accept the implication of this faith: Israel is not called to be a nation like other nations but must strive for the higher ethic of love and justice that will make it a beacon light of redeemed human relations for *all nations*. Therefore, a secular Zionism that appeals to the religious traditions of the Promised Land to make a secular land claim for the right of a state to exist "like other nations" turns biblical language into idolatry.

Here we have a mixing of two kingdoms and a wrong view about the resons for the selection of Abraham and his descendants in pre-Christian times. While the reviewer would not agree with all judgments in this book, it does furnish historical materials useful in understanding the present conflict and tensions in the Near East.

Raymond F. Surburg

HISTORY OF GREECE. By Cyril E. Robinson. Apollo Editions, Thomas Y. Crowell, New York. Paper. $2.75.

This is a reprint of an old classic, first published in 1929. It covers the classic history of Greece and her people from prehistoric times through the age of Pericles to the Hellenistic Age. Apollo Editions has also reprinted two more classics by Robinson, namely, *History of the Roman Republic* and *History of Rome*. This 480-page history of Greece contains adequate maps and thirty

illustrations. Pages 435 to 470 yield chronological tables and summaries of the Periclean Age, the Peloponnesian War, the New Era, Spartan supremacy, the ascendancy of Thebes, Philip of Macedon, Alexander and Greece, Greek philosophy and science, Alexander's conquests, and Hellenistic times. Robinson knew the greatness of the ancient Greeks. But he does not close his eyes to their weaknesses and mistakes. Robinson knew his sources and used them well. He can describe and evaluate the tragedy of the Peloponnesian War well. He recognizes the greatness of Epaminondas. His description of the conflict between Philip of Macedon and Demosthenes is gripping. One of the great assets of this book is that it can be read either by layman or scholar with great profit.

H. Buls

III. Practical Studies

BIBLE AND ETHICS IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Bruce B. Birch and Larry L. Rasmussen. Augsburg Publishing Co., 1976. $8.95.

When I received this book for review, I really looked forward to reading it. The title suggested edification and stimulation, especially to someone who teaches a seminary course entitled "Christian Social Ethics." After all, there are hardly any books that relate the Bible to ethics. This book's title seemed to offer a welcome change. Moreover, the fact that the book was published by a Lutheran publishing company made it seem even more tantalizing. So I sat down to read it, a couple of days after receiving it in the mail.

My expectations and anticipations were short-lived. The book was a total disappointment. Imagine reading statements like the following: "A strict view of inspiration [which is never defined] leaves no room for the ongoing activity of God and the possibility that he might reveal himself through sources other than the Bible" (p. 147). "The Bible is a necessary source [for doing ethics], but it must also be in constant dialog with the many other sources of knowledge and insight through which God might be disclosing himself" (p. 150). "The Bible is not given to generalized, universal address" (p. 165). "The rules, principles and other norms take their authority from the defining relationships, not the reverse" (p. 120). "The Bible alone is not sufficient for the task of moral development" (p. 156). ". . . Christian ethics is not synonymous with biblical ethics" (p. 45).

The ancient rule of Biblical interpretation, *sensus literalis unus est*, is denied by the authors by stretching and allegorizing the meaning of the Lord's Supper. The bread is "a symbol of division in the world between those who have bread and those who must die for lack of it" (p. 165). This interpretation the authors feel is valid and provides ethical import.

On virtually every page it is very apparent that the authors have internalized a liberal, neo-orthodox view of theology. Conservative theology is set aside by calling it "fundamentalism," and by saying that "fundamentalism is no longer an influential position in the major Protestant denominations . . ." (p. 31). The documentation for this is, of course, nowhere provided.

A number of liberal scholars and their views on ethics are approvingly cited. From these theologians the authors develop a framework for relating the Bible to Christian ethics. From James Gustafson they develop the position that Scripture alone is not sufficient criterion for making ethical decisions. From C. Freeman Sleeper they derive the argument that the Bible must dialog with non-biblical sources in order to obtain correct ethical insights. That Scripture is not to be seen as an absolute authority is also argued by appealing to Gustafson.

As I finished reading this book, two things bothered me most. One, if the Biblical directives concerning morality are not to be seen as absolutes, then we

are obviously forced to opt for moral relativism, which blurs the distinction between right and wrong and makes the atrocities of Stalin, Hilter, or for that matter, abortion on demand impossible to condemn. Two, if God reveals Himself today apart from the canonical Scriptures, then how can anyone know that what is "revealed" is God, a demon, or an illusion? The answer is that there is no way of knowing once it is granted that God reveals Himself outside of Scripture. Our Lutheran forefathers understood this well when they said: "the sole rule and standard according to which all dogmas together with all teachers should be estimated and judged are the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament alone . . ." (Preface to the Book of Concord). Had the authors of *Bible and Ethics in the Christian Life* been of like mind, they would undoubtedly have lived up to the promise made by the title.

Alvin J. Schmidt

IS THAT THE TRUTH, PASTOR? By Merle Lebahn. Vantage Press, New York, 1976. 50 pages. $4.95.

This fifty-page book is written by a Missouri Synod Lutheran layman, who is currently a businessman in Minnesota. The author's primary objective is to arouse Christian laymembers to demand that they hear the Biblical truth from their pastors. He argues that in all too many churches pastors no longer preach and teach the historic truth as found in the Bible. Lebahn sees this as tragic, and the tragedy is made worse by a "conspiracy of silence" on the part of church leaders, who "refuse to discuss the changes that have occurred in their theological stand. . . ." (p. 8).

It is interesting to note that the author is very much aware of inroads that liberal theology has made in the Missouri Synod. He writes that at one of his church's conventions (apparently New Orleans or Anaheim) he "listened to pastors who were near tears because the new theological stand was questioned. They couldn't understand how if they as pastors doubted the very truth of God's word, this would cause trouble in the pews of their churches" (pp. 10-11).

The author scathes theological liberalism on virtually every page. In doing so he is no respecter of persons, and rightly so. He asserts: "We have doctors of divinity, doctors of philosophy, doctors of education - with all this education have we forgotten about 'thus saith the Lord?" In each of the 12 chapters, bearing headings such as "The Church," "Prayer," "Family," "Divorce," "Sex," etc., Mr. Lebahn depicts pastors as frequently not providing proper Christian leadership. He cites one pastor in response to divorce, saying: "There is nothing we could do; they don't love each other any more."

Every pastor should read this book, not because it presents arguments that are scholarly or new (it does not), but because what the author is saying is undoubtedly felt by hundreds of laymembers. Pastors need to read this book to be reminded that dedicated, conviced Christians do not want to hear sermons preached "which reflect deep insight into nothingness, or a sort of recitation without the reality of faith, questioning even the very truth of God's word" (p. 49).

Alvin J. Schmidt

EVERYTHING YOU WANT TO KNOW ABOUT THE MISSION FIELD, BUT ARE AFRAID YOU WON'T LEARN UNTIL YOU GET THERE. By Charles Troutman, InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 114 pages. Paper. $2.95.

The author, a missionary to Costa Rica with the Latin American Mission, in a series of letters answers questions prospective foreign missionaries ask: How will I cope with the strange language and culture? What will life be like for my family? One thing that comes through loud and clear is that today mission work is carried out according to the principle of autonomy in partnership. "The Community, though it includes North Americans, is Latin in leadership, Latin in operation, Latin in responsibility, and Latin in vision" (p. 13).

Henry J. Eggold

ABINGDON FUNERAL MANUAL. By Perry H. Biddle, Jr. Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1976. 252 pages. $4.95.

Says the author: "The purpose of this service book is to furnish the working pastor with a selection of funeral services and guidance in planning and conducting the funeral service. The book also offers help in developing a funeral policy in a local church and resources for educating a congregation in death, dying, and the Christian funeral service" (p. 5). The author fulfills these objectives with helpful suggestions for planning the service, conducting the service, music for the funeral, and the funeral sermon. An added feature is the inclusion of funeral liturgies of major Protestant denominations.

Henry J. Eggold

BODY AS SPIRIT. The Nature of Religious Feeling. By Charles Davis. The Seabury Press, New York, 1976. 181 pages. Cloth. $8.95.

EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS AND THE GOSPEL. By Vernon Grounds. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1976. 111 pages. Paper. No price given.

THE LANGUAGE OR FEELINGS. By David Viscott. Arbor House, New York, 1976. 151 pages. Colth. $6.95.

HOW TO BE LOVED. By W. W. Broadbent. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1976. 198 + xvi pages. Cloth. $6.95.

LONELINESS. Understanding and Dealing with It. By Harvey H. Potthoff. Abingdon, Nashville, 1976. 128 pages. Cloth. $5.95.

MAKE YOUR ILLNESS COUNT. By Vernon J. Bittner. Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1976. 126 pages. Paper. $3.50.

COPING WITH COUNSELING CRISES. First Aid for Christian Counselors. By Jay E. Adams. Baker, Grand Rapids, 1976. 91 pages. Paper. $1.95.

Throughout the last half century the "nature-nurture" controversy has stirred the minds and research interests of teachers and educational psychologists. For as many centuries as men have written and talked about themselves they have also argued about the source of behavioral control. The terms commonly used are "head vs. heart." In more recent years other word patterns have been employed, such as intellect vs. emotion and cognition vs. affectivity. But just as the "either-or" dilemma has given way to "both-and" in the case of heredity and environment, so also both head and heart are now

seen as necessary determinants of behavior. However, comparative emphases seem to vary from person to person. For some, emotions are regarded as almost inherently sinful, and logic must therfore repress emotions, while for others feelings are given extreme precedence as the central part of one's being, almost to the exclusion of holding any behavioral standards or of the usefulness of cognitive direction.

Even in theological studies, which have regularly not even been conscious of the head-heart problem, the degree of balance varies. The current charismatic controversy supplies good evidence for an apparent lack of recognition of the centrality of this problem. Careful Scriptural study should elicit the conclusion that both cognitive deliberation and affective activity are essential elements of the total human organism. However, in its relation to the heart the head is necessary to control the use of one's feelings, not by repressing them but by *allowing* and *governing* their overt expression.

Although each of the seven books listed above could be reviewed more completely on its own merits, I have chosen to summarize and evaluate all of them primarily according to their treatment of the head-heart problem.

Charles Davis, a former Roman Catholic priest now teaching in a Quebec university, points up the importance of religious feeling in *Body and Spirit.* Of particular helpfulness is his straightforward presentation of the necessity of feelings in one's life. He defines feeling, not to be confused with emotion which he sees as referring to bodily agitation, as "an intelligent, insightful relationship with what is felt" (p. 6). It is a *total* response of the person in contrast with the *restricted* response of mere intellectual activity (p. 13). Behavior stimulated by one's moral values, for example, represents such a total response involving both cognitive and affective activity.

Davis also makes a meaningful distinction between sensuousness and sensuality. The pastor who attends to a dying person by just staying with him, being sensitive to his unspoken needs, praying with and for him without falsity, assuring him of his (and God's) love with the single touch of his hand, is responding with *sensuousness,* i.e., participating in the total responses of the body with its joys and delights as well as its pain and stress. In contrast, *sensuality* is characterized by an egocentric attitude and response which would prefer to avoid being with the dying and is manipulative. For such a person, the "body is driven by the mind and used as an instrument of pleasure for reasons found in man's mental and spiritual state" (p. 41).

Although Davis ordinarily seems to operate from a Scriptural base, he sometimes slips into a more rationalistic line of thinking by following a preference for a relativism in discussing, for example, some practical aspects of sexual experience.

Emotional Problems and the Gospel begins with Biblical statements and examples in treating specific feelings of anxiety, anger, pride and guilt. An evangelical scholar, the president of Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary with a Ph. D. from Drew University, Vernon Grounds first presented this material in lecture form at Ontario Bible College. He acknowledges the lack of a detailed approach necessary for professionals in psychotherapy. Nevertheless, the substantiation he provides for the reality of feelings can help a minister in his work with parishioners who come to him with emotionally biased problems. He presents a very helpful distinction between anger as a positive feeling and anger which becomes hatred as a destructive feeling, although hatred itself is sometimes necessary and justified (cf. Rev. 2: 6; Mk. 3:1-5; Ps. 139: 19-22; Ro. 12:9, Eccl. 3:8). A chapter is devoted to the Scriptual means of dealing appropriately with each of the feelings discussed. The question of controlling anger, for example, (Eph. 4: 26-27, ". . . . Be angry and sin not. . ." is faced directly.

Grounds also recognized "that many Christians are by no means shiny examples of healthymindedness" (p. 19) and that "sainthood and psychic

soundness are not commensurables" (p. 108) - both radical statements for those who would assert that emotional illness requires only more faith for cure. He devotes the final two chapters to "A Christian Perspective on Mental Health."

Two secularly-oriented books, *The Language of Feelings* and *How to Be Loved*, both assert the validity of feelings without going extremely overboard and excluding a cognitive or rational involvement. Both authors attempt to bring their readers to a fuller awareness of the importance of feelings.

Viscott in *The Language of Feelings* employs a simple and clear framework for understanding the relationships between and among the feelings of anxiety, hurt and loss, anger, guilt and depression. He defines anxiety as the fear of a hurt or loss. This fear or the actual experience of a hurt or loss results in a feeling of pain. Pain creates an imbalance within the person and demands a response of energy directed at the source of the pain. This response is called anger. When anger cannot be expressed outwardly it is turned inward against the self and is perceived as guilt. If the guilt is not relieved and is deepened, it leads to depression.

In individual chapters Viscott treats each of the feelings and their behavioral expressions more completely. He writes very clearly and simply without the ordinary psychiatric jargon of his own profession. His final chapter on "Getting out of Emotional Debt" brings out simply stated assertions based upon his own humanistic presuppositions. His assertions and prescriptions can readily be identified and evaluated by the discerning theologically trained reader.

Broadbent, another psychiatrist who has also bridged the gap between the abstruseness of professionalism and the concrete world of reality, elaborates upon his secret of being loved - "not to try to be loved" (p. 11). He identifies and explains nineteen *quasi-belonging* styles. They are really only shadows of *actual-belonging* which is characterized by mutual respect and a mutual concern for well-being, without the attempt to manipulate the other person for acceptance, approval, or love. The pastor may perhaps be able to see certain styles in himself, his peers, and his parishioners, such as the martyr, the seductive, and the one-upsman styles - all, at core, attemtps to be loved.

By becoming responsible for his own thoughts, words, feelings and behavior (an apt Scriptural principle, by the way), Broadbent explains that a person thus "owns himself." He then finds that no one can *make* him mad or angry, because he can control his own feelings.

Chapters on techniques of becoming conscious of one's own feelings and behavior, the semantic problems we get ourselves into by letting words mould us, our logic and our values, and questions and answers frequently asked about the problem of being loved can be of practical help to the pastor in clarifying his understanding of human behavior. The Christian's basic understanding of such problems and their solutions will stem, of course, from his own Scriptural study of the nature of man and the power of the Spirit in man's life.

In contrast with Viscott and Broadbent, Potthoff and Bittner write from a religious point of view and about more specific parts of human life experience. From a background of experience as a pastor in Denver and a seminary professor at the Iliff School of Theology, Harvey Potthoff gives a very thoroughgoing down-to-earth description of the feeling of loneliness. In a very empathic manner he shows how loneliness appears in various stages of the life cycle, especially in the later years of one's life, but also in separation and in grief. The universality of the feeling is brought out in his statement that "to be oneself involves both satisfaction and loneliness" (p. 51). Loneliness is moreover a necessary result of other more desired experiences, as, for example, in grief (". . . . grief is . . . . the price of love," p. 79), in which it is just one phase of a larger process of affirming the love we experience with others. Thus it can have its own meaning and purpose.

Potthoff rightly asserts that "what the experience of loneliness does *to* us and *in* us is partly a matter of our own attitudes and responses" (p. 50) and that "we cannot always change external facts, but we can do something about our responses to them" (p. 110). This point is reminiscent of the Scriptural principle of being responsible for our own behavior (and Broadbent's principle of "owning oneself"). Potthoff does offer some resources and strategies for dealing with loneliness in his final chapter, such as being interested, developing a sense of humor, exercising one's creative powers, and living one day at a time. The section on religious life and a life of devotion as a resource is highly general and does not even come close to recognizing the fact of our relationship to God through Jesus Christ as the most important resource. Throughout this book, however, the pastor will also find many poetical quotations and life experiences which can be useful in helping him communicate his empathy to lonely people.

Bittner's book, *Make Your Illness Count*, comes from the wealth of experiences of an ALC hospital chaplain. A recognized leading practitioner in his field, he relates nine chapters of significant experiences of patients which he uses to show how illness presents opportunities for a person and is not just a waste of time. Bittner himself appreciates the difficulty in facing an illness, as he shows in sharing personal crises in his seminary days and also later in his life when he experienced a serious illness. In each of the cases he describes his own approach and way of handling it (not all of which were successful - he is to be commended for including these cases, too). Familiar and not too familiar questions and circumstances are raised: the question of "Why me?", anger towards God, denial of the seriousness of an illness, fear and anxiety about a forthcoming operation and the future, the manipulative style of an alcoholic with his wife, the meaning of an illness, the need for a suburban housewife to admit her dependency upon tranquilizers, the acceptance of death by a cancer victim and his growth through suffering, the ways in which a mother, a brother, and fellow-patients were helped through the illness of a young man after he had changed his attitude.

Feelings are prominent in each example, but readily accepted (though not always approved of) by the chaplain. I would have preferred a clearer recognition and statement of Lew and Gospel as they were applied in each of the cases, but even without that Bittner's skillful and empathic handling of the feelings offers a helpful model for the pastor. In addition, he has given insightful explanations of the significance of background and interpersonal relationships to the suffering person.

Both Adams and Bittner deal with crises in their books. However, Adams' material is directed toward pastors (a series of lectures presented to students at Talbot Theological Seminary), while *Make Your Illness Count* is more immediately pointed for use by hospital patients and others facing physical problems. Bittner's presentation is much more experiential while Adams used a didactic approach in his lectures. Again, although both recognize the importance of feelings, Adams advocates implicitly a more cognitively-oriented style of dealing with a crisis. The guidelines he suggests (analysis, inventory, and direction) are exceedingly helpful for the pastor and necessary to be applied in the case of people in crises who ususlly need to learn to control the feelings which the immediate upsetting experience has elicited. And he makes no bones about emphasizing the pastor's responsibility to bring Scriptural comfort and direction to bear upon the situation at hand. The cognitive emphasis is seen in the specifics Adams lists for the guidelines. Analysis requires gathering, reinterpreting assessing, sorting or sifting out the programming the facts in the situation. The counselor must also take inventory of the counselee's state, response, motives, resources, and growth. Direction must finally be authoritative, concrete, and tentative.

It is evident that a directive, cognitively-oriented approach is necessary at

some points in crises, but a danger can occur if it is employed without consideration for other factors, as appears to be the emphasis also in Adams' other works (e.g., *Competent to Counsel* and *The Christian Counselor's Handbook*). Adams recognizes the existence of feelings but uses a directive style which can override feelings if used arbitrarily without adaptation to individual circumstances such as the degree of trust in the counselor-counselee relationship or the ability and freedom of expression on the part of the counselee.

I would prefer an approach balanced between those of Adams and Bittner, insofar as they are adequately represented by their books reviewed here. The method should recognize both the positive and negative aspects of feelings as reflected in the other books listed above. It should also employ a Scripturally informed cognitive approach which allows the Spirit room to control affective behavior. This would mean that feelings or emotions which are not entirely in accord with God's ways be allowed to be expressed under reasonably controlled circumstances to avoid the danger of "acting out" and so that underlying problems can be accurately identified and effectively handled. There should also be expression of other God-pleasing feelings of which Scripture names a large number, with free rein given under the stimulation of the person's cognitive functions.

Our concern as pastoral counselors must therefore focus on enabling the total person to function fully with all his God-given faculties, be they called head or heart, toward the end of worshipping and serving the Lord more completely in all righteousness, innocence and blessedness.

Allen Nauss

Books Received

PRAISE GOD. COMMON PRAYER AT TAIZE. Oxford University Press, New York, 1977. 318 pages. Cloth. $10.95.

THE FIRST CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. Studies in Romans. By Herman A. Hoyt. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 187 pages. Paper. $2.95.

FATHERING: FACT OR FABLE? Edited by Edward V. Stein. Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1977. Cloth. 190 pages. $6.95.

TELLING THE TRUTH: THE FOOLISHNESS OF PREACHING IN A REAL WORLD. By James Armstrong. Word Books, Waco, Texas, 1977. 114 pages. Cloth. $5.95.

SOLI DEO GLORIA. Essays in Reformed Theology. Edited by R. C. Sproul. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Nutley, New Jersey, 1976. 210 pages. Cloth. $6.95.

JOHN THE MAVERICK GOSPEL. By Robert Kysar. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1976. 118 pages. Paper. $4.95.

THESSALONIANS. By Donald Grey Barnhouse. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1977. 111 pages. Cloth. $5.95.

ABRAHAM: GOD'S MAN OF FAITH. By C. Donald Cole. Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 223 pages. Paper. $3.95.

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION WE NEED. Edited by James Michael Lee. Religious Education Press, Inc., Notre Dame, Indiana, 1977. 174 pages. Paper. $5.95.

FROM NOW TO ETERNITY. Nathan M. Meyer. BMH Books, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1976. 216 pages. Paper. $4.00.

CONFIDENT PASTORAL LEADERSHIP. By Howard F. Sugden and Warren W. Wiersbe. Moody Press, Chicago, 1973. 160 pages. Paper. $2.95.

INTRODUCTION TO THE REFORMED TRADITION. By John H. Leith, John Knox Press, Atlanta. 1977. 253 pages. Cloth. $10.00.

VITAL RELATIONSHIPS FOR THE GROWING CHRISTIAN. By Haddon Robison, Larry Moyer, and Michael Cocoris. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 133 pages. Paper. $1.95.

STUDIES IN JAMES. THE GAME OF LIFE. By Roy R. Roberts. BMH Books, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1976. 196 pages. Paper. $3.50.

THE BIBLE MAKES SENSE. By Walter Brueggemann. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 96 pages. Paper. $3.95.

NOT MY OWN. By Alfred Martin. Moody Press, Chicago, 1968. 110 pages. Paper. $2.25.

THE PURSUIT OF THE DIVINE SNOWMAN. By Peter Macky. Word Books, Publisher, Waco, Texas, 1977. 240 pages. Cloth. $6.95.

THE ALEPHS. Edited by Jeffrey Barnhart and Stephen Barnhart. J. Barnhart, Hershey, Pennsylvania, 1977. 123 pages. Paper. $1.95.

RICH CHRISTIANS IN AN AGE OF HUNGER. By Ronald J. Sider. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1977. 249 pages. Paper. $4.95.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ORDER. By William Temple. The Seabury Press, New York, 1977. 119 pages. Cloth. $5.95.

THE JOURNAL OF PASTORAL PRACTICE. Jay E. Adams, Editor. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Nutley, New Jersey, 1977. 143 pages. Paper. $3.50.

THE ORIGINS OF NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY. By I. Howard Marshall. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 132 pages. Paper. $2.95.

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. By James Montgomery Boice. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1977. 407 pages. Cloth. $9.95.

GREAT VERSES FROM THE PSALMS. By Charles H. Spurgeon. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1977. 267 pages. Cloth. $8.95.

EROS DEFILED. By John White. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1977. 169 pages. Paper. $3.95.
CARE FOR THE DYING. Richard N. Soulen, editor. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1975. 141 pages. Paper. $4.95.
FIRST AND SECOND PETER. By Louis A. Barbieri. Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 126 pages. Paper. $1.95.
EXPLORING HEBREWS. By John Phillips. Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 222 pages. Cloth. $6.95.
ROZELL'S COMPLETE LESSONS. By James Reapsome. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1977. 320 pages. Paper. $5.95.
CELEBRATIONS FOR TODAY. By Stephen W. Burgess and James D. Righter. Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1977. 111pages. Paper. $3.95.
IN TWO MINDS. By Os Guinness. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 302 pages. Paper. Paper $4.95. Cloth $8.95.
TWO SACRED WORLDS. By Larry D. Shinn. Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1977. 205 pages. Paper. $6.95.
THE HIDDEN QUESTION OF GOD. By Helmut Thielicke. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Radpds, 1977. 183 pages. paper $4.95.
BETWEEN TWO WORLDS. By Diogenes Allen. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 155 pages. Paper. $3.95.
ON HUMAN CARE. By Arthur J. Dyck. Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1977. 189 pages. Paper. $4.95.
MYSTICISM: WINDOW ON A WORLD VIEW. By Margaret Lewis Furse. Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1977. 220 pages. Paper. $5.95.
THE BEST OF YOUR LIFE IS THE REST OF YOUR LIFE. By Donald L. Deffner. Abingdon, Nashville, 1977. 95 pages. Paper. $2.95.
HOW TO CONDUCT BACKYARD BIBLE CLUBS. By Pamela R. Prichard. Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 72 pages. Paper. $1.50.
SIMPLE SERMONS FOR A WORLD IN CRISIS. By W. Herschel Ford. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 107 pages. Paper. $1.95.
BIBLICAL INTERPRETATIONS IN PREACHING. By Gerhard von Rad. Translated by John E. Steely. Abingdon, Nashville, 1977. 125 pages. Cloth. $5.95.
WOMEN, MEN, AND THE BIBLE. By Virginia Ramey Mollenkott. Abingdon, Nashville, 1977. 144 pages. Paper. $3.95.
TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION. By Calvin Miller. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 185 pages. Paper. $1.95.
FROM SHADOW TO SUBSTANCE. By Roy Hession. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 204 pages. Paper. $2.95.
NAMIBIA. By Colin O'Brien Winter. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, 1977. 234 pages. Paper. $4.95.
CHRISTIANS AND SOCIOLOGY. By David Lyon. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1977. 89 pages. Paper. $1.95.
THE CHURCH UNDER SEIGE. By M. A. Smith. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 277 pages. Paper. $5.95.
WORD AND TABLE. Abingdon, Nashville, 1976. 80 pages. Paper.
BETWEEN THE EAGLE AND THE DOVE. By Ronald Kirkemo. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 218 pages. Paper. $4.95.
DEAR AGNOS. By Arlie J. Hoover. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 274 pages. Cloth. $7.95.
RITUAL IN A NEW DAY: AN INVITATION. Abingdon, Nashville, 1976. 128 pages. Paper.
SALVATION TOMORROW. By Stephen Neill. Abingdon, Nashville, 1976. 150 pages. Paper. $3.95.
THE JUSTIFICATION OF KNOWLEDGE. By Robert L. Reymond. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1976. 168 pages. Paper. $4.50.

WHAT NEW CREATION? By Paul A. Mickey and Robert L. Wilson. Abingdon, Nashville, 1977. 192 pages. Paper. $5.95.
GUIDELINES FOR URBAN CHURCH PLANTING. Roger S. Greenway, Editor. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 76 pages. Paper. $1.95.
JESUS—LORD FOR ALL TIMES. Leader's Guide. By Donald G. Dawe. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1975. 76 pages. Paper.
JESUS CHRIST TODAY. By Neil R. Lightfoot. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 274 pages. Cloth. $8.95.
PUTTING YOUR LIFE ON THE LINE. By Maurice A. Fetty. Abingdon, Nashville, 1977. 95 pages. Paper. $2.95.
CHAUVINIST OR FEMINIST? By Richard and Joyce Boldrey. Foreword by David M. Scholer. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 89 pages. Paper. $2.95.
YOUR JOB—SURVIVAL OR SATISFACTION? By Jerry and Mary White. Foreword by Lorne C. Sanny. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 191 pages. Cloth. $6.95.
FLESH AND SPIRIT. By William Barclay. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 127 pages. Paper. $1.95.
THE ETHICS OF ENJOYMENT. By Kenneth Cauthen. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1975. 124 pages. Paper. $3.95.
EXISTENTIAL STRUCTURES. By Roger A. Kenyon. Philosophical Library, New York, 1976. 63 pages. Cloth. $6.00
THE LIFE OF THE CHRISTIAN. By G. Campbell Morgan. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 101 pages. Paper. $1.95.
EVANGELISM. By G. Campbell Morgan. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 99 pages. Paper. $1.95.
I BELIEVE IN THE GREAT COMMISSION. By Max Warren. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, 1976. 190 pages. Paper. $2.95.
BEHOLD, HE COMETH By G. Campbell Morgan. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 95 pages. Paper. $1.95.
I WANT MY MARRIAGE TO BE BETTER. By Dr. Henry Brandt with Phil Landrum. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 159 pages. Paper. $2.95.
THE ESSENE PLAN. By Leo F. Motylewski. Philosophical Library, New York, 1976. 164 pages. Cloth. $8.75.
WORLD MISSION. By Ada and Ginny Lum. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 72 pages. Paper. $1.75.
THE GREAT COMMISSION FOR TODAY. By David M. Howard. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 112 pages. Paper. $1.95.
INDEPENDENCE FOR THE THIRD WORLD CHURCH. By Pius Wakatama. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 119 pages. Paper. $2.95.
PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIANITY. By Malcolm A. Jeeves. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 177 pages. Paper. $3.95.
THE JOURNAL OF PASTORAL PRACTICE. Jay E. Adams, editor. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Nutley, New Jersey, 1977. 143 pages. Paper. $3.50.
MY BEAUTIFUL FEELING. By Walter and Ingrid Trobisch. Intervarsity Press, Downers Grove 1976. 123 pages Paper. $2.25
THE HEART OF PAUL. By Ben Campbell Johnson. Word Books, Waco, Texas, 1976. 174 pages. Cloth. $5.95.
A REFORMATION DEBATE. Edited by John C. Olin. Foreword by Dr. Lester DeKoster. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 136 pages. Paper. $2.95.
PERSPECTIVES ON THE NEW PENTECOSTALISM. Edited by Russell P. Spittler. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids,1976. 268 pages. Cloth. $7.95.
THE DAYS OF HIS FLESH. By David Smith. Foreword by Paul L. Maier. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1976. 549 pages. Paper. $8.95.

HE GAVE US A VALLEY. By Helen Roseveare. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 188 pages. Paper. $3.95.

TWO SACRED WORLDS. By Larry D. Shinn. Abingdon, Nashville, 1977. 205 pages. Paper. $6.95.

DON'T JUST STAND THERE! By Martin Goldsmith. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976. 128 pages. Paper. $2.25.

DENOMINATIONALISM. Edited by Russell E. Richey. Abingdon, Nashville, 1977. 288 pages. Paper. Cloth $15.95. Paper $6.95.

BAPTISM AND FULLNESS. By John R. W. Stott. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1976 119 pages Paper. $2.25.

GOD, SUFFERING, AND BELIEF. By Howard R. Burkle. Abingdon, Nashville, 177. 128 pages. Cloth. $5.95.

CONSCIENCE AND OBEDIENCE. By William Stringfellow. Word Books, Waco, Texas, 1977. 112 pages. Colth. $5.95.

GETTING THE CHURCH ON TARGET. By Lloyd Perry. Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 256 pages. Cloth. $6.95.

TRANSCENDENT SELFHOOD. By Louis Dupre. The Seabury Press, New York, 1976. 118 pages. Cloth. $8.95.

ELECTION/LOVE BEFORE TIME. By Kenneth D. Johns. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Nutley, New Jersey, 1976. 93 pages. Paper. $2.50.

DREAMS, VISIONS AND ORACLES. Edited by Carl E. Armerding and W. Ward Gasque. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 262 pages. Cloth. $9.95.