CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 42 Number 3

JULY 1978

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 CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Concordia Theological Seminary, 6600 North Clinton Street, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46825.
Annual subscription rate: $4.00.

Celebrating The Confessions

Anniversaries give those who are involved an opportunity to examine the past and to reaffirm its meaning for the present and the future. This is, indeed, the very purpose of the liturgical calendar observed in the orthodox Lutheran Church from the beginning of its history. This calendar has a divine precedent in the Old Testament, wherein God established holidays to commemorate certain events in the history of Israel which were acts of divine deliverance. As well as yearly commemorations of the past, there were also special practices connected with the celebration of a year of jubilee every fifty years.

The years 1977, 1979, and 1980 are jubilee years of Confessional Lutheranism, in which we celebrate God's deliverance of His Church from the oppression of false teachers and teachings. The years 1977 and 1980 are the fourth centennials of the Formula of Concord and the Book of Concord respectively. The latter year will also be the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Augsburg Confession.

In this issue of the *Concordia Theological Quarterly,* as part of this jubilee of Confessional Lutheranism, there appear four essays presented at the first convocation sponsored by the International Center for Lutheran Confessional Studies at Concordia Theological Seminary on January 4-6, 1978. Commitment to the Lutheran Confessions means more than devotion to the past; it involves the application to the modern world of the confessional principles to which we, as orthodox Lutherans, have pledged ourselves. It is to this goal that Concordia Theological Seminary has dedicated its annual symposium series on the Lutheran Confessions, as will be evident from the essays printed here.

The second convocation sponsored by the International Center of Confessional Lutheran Studies has been set for January 3-5, 1979. The following pages present a tentative schedule of the participants, their topics, and the days on which they will speak. A more detailed schedule will be made available in the autumn. The symposium of January 1979 will be dedicated, of course, to commemorating the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Small and Large Catechisms of Dr. Martin Luther. For the Small Catechism remains the confession most influential in maintaining the distinctive character of Lutheranism among the heirs of the Reformation. It continues to serve as the chief means of instruction in Lutheran doctrine in our churches and schools.

The Editors

Second Annual Symposium on the Lutheran Confessions "The 450th Anniversary of Luther's Small and Large Catechisms"

Concordia Theological Seminary Fort Wayne, Indiana

January 3-5, 1979

Wednesday, January 3

Dr. William Weinrich	"Early Church and Reformation Catechetics: A Comparison of the Didache and the Small Catechism"
Prof. E. C. Friedericks	"The Evangelical Character of Luther's Catechism"
Dr. James Voelz	"Luther's Use of Scripture in the Small Catechism"

Thursday, January 4

Dr. James Schaff	"The Pastoral Perspective in the Large Catechism"
Dr. David Scaer	"The New English Translation of Luther's Small Catechism: Is It Faithful to Luther's Spirit?"
Dr. N. S. Tjernagel	"Forerunners of the Catechism: Catechetical Instruction at the Dawn of the Reformation"
Prof. Daniel Reuning	"Luther's Small Catechism in Word and Song"
Dr. Ulrich Asendorf	"Luther's Small Catechism and the Heidelberg Catechism: The Catechism's Role as a Confessional Document"

Friday, January 5

Dr. Robert Kolb	"Later 16th Century Attitudes to the Small Catechism: The Development from Theology to Devotion"
Dr. Uuras Saarnivaara	"Baptism and Faith: The Catechisms' Teaching in the Context of Luther's Other Teachings"

The Future of Confessional Lutheranism in the World

Samuel Nafzger

Before proceeding to review recent developments regarding "Confessional Lutheranism in the World," it is first necessary to set forth very briefly the criteria for distinguishing between "positive" and "negative" developments. In order to do this, one needs to have a working definition of the term "confessional Lutheranism." In this paper the term "confessional Lutheranism" refers to commitment to the Book of Concord "as a witness to the truth and as exhibiting the unanimous and correct understanding of our predecessors who remained steadfastly in the pure doctrine" (FC, SD, Rule and Norm, 13) "because it is drawn from the Word of God" (FC, SD, Rule and Norm, 10). The members of a "Confessional Lutheran Church," therefore, accept "without reservation . . . all the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as a true and unadulterated statement and exposition of the Word of God."[1] This means that a pastor (or professor or teacher) of a confessional church body subscribes unconditionally to the doctrinal content of the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church "because," in the words of C. F. W. Walther, "he recognizes the fact that it is in full agreement with Scripture and does not militate against Scripture in any point, whether that point be of major or minor importance . . . [and] that he therefore heartily believes in this divine truth and is determined to preach this doctrine without adulteration."[2] Such an understanding of "confessional Lutheranism" necessarily implies that all forms of conditional subscription to the Lutheran Symbols are incompatible with and actually contradictory to it. As Dr. Walther put it, "It is evident that a mere conditional subscription runs counter to the purpose of Symbols . . . an unconditional subscription is indispensable."[3]

It is necessary to point out that such an understanding of "confessional Lutheranism" is of no recent innovation. As Walter pointed out already in his 1858 essay to the Western District Convention of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod entitled "Why Should Our Pastors, Teachers and Professors Subscribe Unconditionally to the Symbolical Writings of Our Church," as early as 1532 Luther, together with Jonas and Bugenhagen, drew up the regulation that all those who wanted to be ordained "should give the assurance beforehand that they accept the unadulterated doctrine of the Gospel and understand

it in the same sense in which it is understood in the Apostolic, the Nicene, and the Athanasian Symbols, and in which it is presented in the Confession which our churches read before Emperor Charles at the Diet of Augsburg in the year 1530."[4] Moreover, beginning in 1602 all the servants of churches and schools in Saxony were asked to take the following oath:

> You shall vow and swear that you will continue and remain steadfastly and without guile in the pure, Christian understanding of the Gospel current in this territory as it is recorded in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, repeated and explained in the Christian Book of Concord, and preserved against all falsifications, and will neither secretly nor openly practice anything against it, but will at once fearlessly reveal anyone who departs from or practices against, that understanding. If God should decree—May He graciously prevent it!—that you follow the dreams and vagaries of men, depart from this pure doctrine and understanding of God's Word, and turn to the Papists or Calvinists or other sects that are described and rejected in the religious peace because they are not in sympathy with our pure Confession, you shall swear that because of your oath you will without fear immediately report your change of mind to the proper authorities and await further regulations and resolutions. May you do this faithfully and without deceit![5]

Understood in this way, "confessional Lutheranism," as Dr. Harry Huth has pointed out, says something about *both* the church which requires unconditional subscription to the Lutheran Symbolical writings *and* the individual who subscribes them.[6] It says in the first place that such a church body (1) has a confessional position; (2) is convinced that what it believes is correct; (3) wishes to preserve its confessional identity in distinction from all others; (4) is willing to present a clear statement of what it believes and teaches; and (5) has a genuine concern for the Gospel. At the same time, unconditional subscription to the Lutheran Confession indicates that an individual who so subscribes (1) is not performing a meaningless formality; (2) that he has fully investigated and knows the contents of the Lutheran confessions; (3) that he has compared the confessions with the Holy Scriptures and is deliberately, voluntarily, genuinely, and publically prepared to identify himself with the church's confession because (*quia*) they are a true exposition of the Word of God. Unconditional subscription to the Lutheran symbolical writings in no way implies (1) a lack of a sense of history; (2) an enforced, legalistic conformity; (3)

an uncritical acceptance of tradition; (4) that an individual is saved by the good work of having an orthodox faith. In what follows those factors which militate against "confessional Lutheranism" as defined here will be called negative developments, and those developments which facilitate it will be called positive.

Negative Developments for Confessional Lutheranism

There are a number of developments in the latter half of twentieth century Lutheranism which do not bode well for the future of confessional Lutheranism. I shall refer tonight to only two of these developments, developments which raise the most serious problems for confessional Lutheranism. The first is the acceptance of historical criticism by the majority of Lutheran theologians throughout the world; and the second development, in some ways a result of the first development, is conditional subscription to the Lutheran Confessions by the majority of Lutherans in the world today. Although neither of these developments is particularly new, both have made deep inroads among Lutherans.

Dr. Herman Sasse, in a 1949 letter to his "Brethren in the Ministry," spoke of a contemporary decadence of Lutheran doctrine," which he described in the following words:

> It is the dying away of a faith which hides itself, as many another decline in the spiritual life of Christendom, behind a theological trend which seems to be on the up-grade. And as is the case with every decline in Christian life, so also this one goes hand in hand with a shocking weakness of character. To put it very frankly: The present-day theologians do no longer believe what they say and do no longer say what they believe. What great characters were the liberals of the past century who in public worship refused to confess the Apostolic Creed, because they did not any more believe some of its pronouncements! Today no theologian stumbles over such thin threads. We have no Sydow, Schrempf, or Knote incident any more; not because our times have a greater desire for dogma, but because theologians are no longer serious-minded in regard to their own confession and to confession as such. This is true despite all confessional movements of our times. No confessional church would dare to exclude one from its midst who denies the Trinity or the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. And that heresy has not yet been discovered which would compromise a pastor in one of our Lutheran Land churches. At the most it could only be the very un-

> timely and inopportune loyalty to the Formula of Concord. Here, of course, all tolerance ceases and for no other reason than that it would involve insubordination toward a practically unconfessional church government. Proudly our churches acknowledge the fact that errorists are no longer being disciplined.[7]

If these words were an accurate description of the state of affairs in Lutheranism thirty years ago, then they are even more on target today. It is my contention that this contemporary "decadence of Lutheran doctrine" or dying away of faith results primarily from the acceptance of historical criticism as a way of studying and investigating the Holy Scriptures by the majority of Lutheran theologians today.

It was Peter Brunner who pointed out in his very timely and perceptive essay of almost ten years ago entitled "Commitment to the Lutheran Confessions - What Does It Mean Today?" that "all talk of commitment to confession is senseless when the Holy Scriptures have been lost as the concrete judge over all proclamation. Confession presupposes the Scriptures, that is, the Scriptures as a communicating authority, not merely as a historical factor![8]

But it is precisely the acceptance of the Scriptures as "a communicating authority, not merely as a historical factor" which historical criticism makes impossible. As has been pointed out by many, a fundamental presupposition of historical criticism is that historical documents are not themselves history and do not offer immediate access to history.[9] The development of historical critical methodology presupposes "a revolution in the consciousness of Western man."[10] In view of this "Copernican revolution,"[11] as Van Harvey calls it, regarding the very nature of historical knowledge itself - that is, that "no witness simply hands down a complete, photograph-like description of an event, rather, he selects, alters, interprets, and rationalizes"[12] - it is the function of the historian to assess the judgments of the witness reported in historical sources and "to establish not only their meaning but their truth."[13] As R. G. Collingwood has pointed out, this is nothing less than a radical declaration of autonomy for the historian:

> . . . The historian is his own authority and his thought autonomous, self-authorizing, possessed of a criterion to which his so-called authorities must conform and by reference to which they are critized.[14]

In short, historical criticism holds that historical reports are to be regarded like witnesses in a court of law. The historian submits them to a rigorous cross-examination, evaluates the answers given, and confers authority upon them in proportion

to their demonstrated reliability and credibility. As Van Harvey has put it:

> The historian, in short, is radically autonomous because of the nature of historical knowledge itself. If the historian permits his authorities to stand uncriticized, he abdicates his role as critical historian. He is no longer a seeker of knowledge but a mediator of past belief; not a thinker but a transmitter of tradition.[15]

The far-reaching implications of the application of historical criticism to the Biblical documents for confessional Lutheranism are immediately obvious and all but impossible to overestimate. What is a constant source of amazement is the apparent inability (or unwillingness) of some would-be confessional theologians to perceive the absolutely contradictory presuppositions which inform historical criticism and the understanding which the Lutheran Symbols manifest of Scripture as the Word of God and the authority which consequently belongs to it.[16] Of course, the Confessions use the phrase "Word of God" to refer to the Second Person of the Trinity, the Gospel in the narrow and in the broad sense, and in a variety of other ways. Nevertheless, it has been clearly demonstrated by many that most frequently the Confessors use the phrase "Word of God" to refer to the Holy Scriptures. For the Confessors "Word of God" is a broader concept than Scripture, but Scripture *is* the Word of God.

Without attempting to present an exhaustive list of the problems which result from the attempt to apply historical criticism to that which the Confessions say is to be distinguished from all other human writings (FC, Ep., Rule and Norm, 7), let it suffice here to point out that the use of historical criticism undermines the understanding of the clarity and trustworthiness of the Scriptures and contradicts the Reformation principle of *sola scriptura.* Ted Peters, in a recent article in *Dialog,* after noting that the world view of the Reformation was "not fundamentally different from that of the Biblical period,"[17] recognizes this fact. He writes:

> We live in a different cultural or intellectual time and place from the sixteenth century, wherein the doctrine of *sola scriptura* received its definitive formulation. The assumptions regarding the literal and historical validity of the Bible which Luther could make we can no longer make. Life in Bible times looks strange to us. And nearly two centuries of Biblical criticism - which is a working out of the modern world view - have uncovered inaccuracies and literal impossibilities that undermine both the scriptures' clarity and trustworthiness.[18]

The rise of historical consciousness in the nineteenth

> century on top of the naturalistic world view of post-Enlightenment modernity has undercut the supports for the scripture principle. Textual inconsistencies in the Bible, possible errors in historical data, and the rise of natural science which throws into doubt the veracity of mythical accounts of natural phenomena have all eroded our confidence that the Bible's literal content can be trusted as genuine history, let alone as guide for meaningful daily living. Critical consiousness has estranged us from the world of meaning found in Scripture.[19]
>
> . . . whatever we make of *sola scriptura* today we cannot pit it clearly over against tradition as was done in the 16th century. We ourselves are immersed in a linguistic and cultural tradition that encompasses us . . .
>
> Even without this, mere historical study has demonstrated that scripture is itself as much a product of tradition as it is a producer of tradition. It was the tradition of the Ecumenical Councils that determined the canon. And Luther's canon within a canon . . . makes clear that just what is and what is not scripture is unclear. . . . Given the alternatives, 'scripture alone' or 'scripture and tradition,' the Roman Catholic Church undoubtedly has the better position; for whoever admits *sola scriptura,* in the sense of holding that the canonical New Testament is the sole norm, rule, and standard, goes the way of the Roman Catholic - only not as consistently.[20]

But how is confessional Lutheranism possible if Scripture is not essentially clear, and if it is not trustworthy?[21] What possible meaning can subscription to the Lutheran Confessions have if the *sola scriptura* is forfeited? Peter Brunner presents the obvious answer to these questions:

> But if the New Testament no longer harmonizes, if in the canonical writings of the New Testament a consensus is no longer heard regarding the Gospel that is to be proclaimed, then a confessional commitment has become fundamentally impossible. In the same measure that the Church loses the concrete authority of the Holy Scriptures, she also loses a binding consensus in regard to the content of the Gospel proclamation. The place of commitment to confession is taken by commitment to this or that theological opinion, which now itself must necessarily appear with the exclusive authority of a dogma. Where the authority of the Scriptures is lost,

the *hairesis* of a school of thought takes the place of the *confessio* of the Church.[22]

The rise of historical criticism presents the greatest challenge to confessional Lutheranism. Where this methodology is applied to the Scriptures there can be no commitment to the Lutheran Confessions "without reservation." Vance Eckstrom does not overstate his case in opposition to what he calls "exclusivist confessionalism" at all when he says:

> The greatest challenge to confessional commitment is modern critical thought, the kind of thought which takes as little as possible for granted, respects no authority but that of reason and concrete evidence, and looks with great scepticism on all truth claims based on any other kind of authority. Unless one chooses to retreat entirely from the contemporary scene, there is no way to escape this critical point of view . . .
>
> Another form of critical thought is the historical-critical method of study of the Bible. A majority of Christian scholars have accepted this seemingly inimical method because they have wanted to come to terms with critical thought by submitting their interpretations of and beliefs about the Bible to examination before the bar of reason and objective evidence . . . Many traditional beliefs about the Bible have been demolished by this method . . . Two centuries of using this method has forced many adjustments in what were once deeply-held-convictions. We have come to recognize such things as the biblical account of creation, and of the origins of man, as something other than literal scientific and historical truth.[23]

To a very great extent loss of confidence in the reliability of Scripture as a result of the use of historical criticism lies behind the undeniable fact, as Sasse charges, that many theologians no longer believe what they say and no longer say what they believe.

A second negative development for the future of confessional Lutheranism is the wide-spread tendency in contemporary Lutheranism to couch a conditional subscription to the Book of Concord in effusive rhetoric of praise for the Lutheran confessional writings. Only rarely does one hear today an open rejection of the sixteenth century Lutheran confessions and a direct call for a repudiation of them.[24] Most Lutheran theologians, despite their acceptance of historical criticism, profess some form of conditional subscription to the Lutheran Confessions. Perhaps the most common form of a qualified subscription is to accept the confessions as historically conditioned. While it is certainly correct to say that the Symbols

must be interpreted in their historical context, it is quite another matter to conclude from this fact that the Symbols do not teach eternal truths. Theodore Tappert has given classic expression to the view which would qualify subscription to the confessions because of their historical conditionedness. He writes:

> When subscribing the confessions today, Lutherans assert that, in view of the issues which were then at stake and the alternatives then offered, the confessors were right.[25]

More recently the president of a Lutheran seminary in this country has espoused this view: "When we state that we believe the Lutheran Confessions are true and completely reliable expositions of the doctrinal truth of the Gospel, we want to declare, without equivocation, that we are convinced that they correctly answered the issues which were at stake at the time the confessions were made."[26] Just how far such an acceptance of the Lutheran Confessions "without equivocation," no less, departs from an unconditional subscription is revealed by the writer's subsequent call for "repentance of the theological formulations - yes even confessional formulations." He goes on to say:

> Only in repentance of our most treasured formulations can we find that honest openness to a renewed and vital hearing of the Gospel. Confessional integrity is served when we can acknowledge that.[27]

Such a view regards the confessional writings as merely forming the starting point for theological reflection rather than as presenting final conclusions. Another theologian from this same church body both caricatures the position he rejects and masks a *de facto* rejection of the position taken by the confessions when he writes:

> How is one to look on the Formula of Concord today? Is it the end point, the apex of Lutheran reflection on all matters therein contained? Or might it rather be but a beginning, a basis for further reflection which could enrich the thinking of the church and its proclamation? If we are to be at all serious about our confessions it must surely be the latter.[28]

No one has suggested that unconditional subscription to the Confessions implies that the last word has been spoken on "all matters therein contained." If it means anything at all, however, it surely means that the Confessors were most certainly correct in the doctrinal position which they present. On the basis of such a conditional acceptance of the confessions, this theologian proceeds to criticize Holsten Fagerberg for pointing out that the attempt to use law and gospel as a

general hermeneutic affecting all of Scripture is a modern development and not to be found in the Confessions. He writes:

> It would seem almost as though Fagerberg wants to celebrate what is a fault as a virtue. Fagerberg may be quite right in his assessment of what the confessions do at this point, but he seems oblivious to the fact that quite possibly that is just why there was so much trouble.[29]

Others regard the Book of Concord as a *confession* rather than as *confessions*. This approach reduces the role of the confessions to a function, namely, the function of serving as an evangelical witness. Such a view regards unconditional subscription to the Lutheran Symbols as "symbolatry" or doctrinal legalism. According to this view, the confessions present us today with an example or model of how the church in the sixteenth century gave an evangelical witness during the crisis of their day. True obedience to the confessional writings, therefore, consists not in a passive submission but in an active obedience that trusts "the intuitions to be discovered in these writings," intuitions, of course, which are "yet to be revealed." One contemporary commentator writes:

> The confessions, then, are not binding as a form of canonical law, but provocations toward expanded and free reflection. They do not establish the lowest common denominator of agreement but are identifying marks, literally 'symbols,' of a movement. The symbols are more or less adequate, depending on the direction the movement takes.[30]

"Theology," he writes, "must argue rather than assert, convince rather than coerce, persuade rather than appeal to authority". It is precisely in such a view that we see most clearly manifested what Sasse calls the deadly disease which has taken hold of all churches including Rome. "Catholics and Protestants, Anglicans and Lutherans seem to agree with Erasmus who rejected Luther's 'firm assertions' and had to hear Luther's reply: *'Tolle assertiones et tulisti Christianismum.'* Take away the dogmatic statements and you have taken away Christianity!"[31]

Conditional subscription to the Lutheran Confessions takes any number of other forms: it is sometimes asserted that the Lutheran Confessions are "ecumenical" rather than "particular," dialogical rather than assertive, and that they offer a "particular perspective" to the truth rather than carrying "any claim to exhausting the truth."[32] Vance Eckstrom has recently argued the case for what he calls "pluralist confessionalism," which he distinguishes from "exclusivist confessionalism."[33] But there are, in actuality, only two forms of confessional

subscription: unconditional and conditional, normative and historical, *quia* and *quatenus*.[34]

An unconditional subscription to the Lutheran confessions is indispensable for confessional Lutheranism. It is in accordance with the purpose of symbols to be a confession of faith by which the church distinguishes itself from heterodox bodies and sects and by which the church norms the teaching of its pastors and teachers. Conditional subscription, on the other hand, leaves no symbol and establishes another norm. As Dr. C. F. Walther has stated:

> By demanding only a conditional subscription to its Symbols the Church forfeits its distinctively Lutheran characteristics, and by admitting that its Symbols contain errors it places itself on the same level with the heterodox bodies . . . when the church is satisfied with a conditional subscription, it openly admits to its teachers that its Symbols may contain doctrines which are contrary to Scripture . . . if congregations demand only a conditional subscription to their Symbols they give the false teacher a weapon against themselves, and rob themselves of the right of deposing a teacher who teaches contrary to their Symbols . . . A mere conditional subscription . . . opens the door for a renewal of controversies that have already been settled and paves the way for everlasting discord.[35]

Conditional subscription to the Lutheran Confessions undermines confessional Lutheranism, and the fact that such a view characterizes the subscription of the majority of Lutheran theologians today casts a dark shadow over the future of confessional Lutheranism.

Lutheranism is seriously and deeply divided today. It is difficult to argue with Carl Braaten's 1975 conclusion:

> Lutherans have never been more seriously divided than they are now. In the past we could blame our divisions on linguistic, geographical, cultural and ethnic differences, on so-called non-theological factors. Now it is clear the division goes to the heart of our faith, to the meaning of the gospel and its implications for the universal mission of the church.[36]

While we must deplore this state of affairs and plead for God's forgiveness for those sins which we have committed which have contributed to this scandal of division, we dare never apologize for unconditionally subscribing to the Lutheran Confessions which correctly teach the Scriptural Gospel of Jesus Christ. It is Kierkegaard who has reminded us that the symptoms of truth are polemical. We are faithful to the Lutheran Confessions because

they teach us, on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, the truth about the depths of human sin and also about the greater glory of divine mercy and forgiveness through faith in Jesus Christ. Herman Sasse has stated it well:

> We are faithful to this church, not because it is the church of our Fathers, but because it is the church of the Gospel; not because it is the church of Luther, but because it is the church of Jesus Christ. If it became something else, if its teaching were something else than a correct exposition of the plain Word of God, it would no longer be our church. It is not the Lutheran liturgy that matters. The church can get along without it if it must. It is not the Symbolical Books that count. If it should ever be demonstrated that their exposition of the Gospel is false, that they contain essential errors, we would be the first ones to cast them into the fire; for our *norma normans,* the standard by which we judge doctrines, is the Bible alone . . . Since this is the character of Lutheran Confessionalism, it is in harmony with the breath of genuine ecumenical feeling. We are confident that the Evangelical Lutheran Church which is faithful to its Confessions is truly the church of Jesus Christ.[37]

If the Lutheran Confessions are correct in their exposition of the doctrine of the Gospel and all its articles, then unconditional subscription to these confessions is necessary. Insofar as the divided state of affairs in Lutheranism today results primarily from differences regarding the doctrine of Scripture as taught in the Scriptures and confessed in the Lutheran Symbols, an understanding which some claim the rise of criticism makes untenable,[38] then the recognition of this doctrinal division within Lutheranism must also be regarded as a positive development.

Positive Developments for Confessional Lutheranism

The most positive development in recent years for confessional Lutheranism has been the effort of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod to reclaim its unconditional commitment to the Lutheran Symbols. The Synod had been organized in 1847 by a group of German immigrants who wanted, above all, to remain faithful to the Scriptures as the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions as a correct interpretation of them. Carl S. Mundinger writes of the founders of the Missouri Synod:

> Not since the 16th century and never on American soil,

> had a body of men so completely and so sincerely subscribed to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and its Apology, the Smalcald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord. They regarded these instruments as clear and true expositions of the meaning of the inspired Word of God and they declared their readiness to abide by the decisions of the Lutheran Confessional writings.[39]

But with the beginning of the Synod's second century of existence came the influence of the negative trends referred to in the first portion of this paper which had already made deep inroads into much of world Lutheranism, and the Synod began a slow but steady drift towards the acceptance of historical criticism and a qualified subscription to the Lutheran Confessions. Not until 1967 did the first signs of an impending reversal of this drift become visible. Significantly, in this year the Synod officially in convention reaffirmed its conviction "that the Holy Scripture is the inerrant Word of God."[40] At this same convention, the Synod "rejected and condemned" all those "world views, philosophical theories, exegetical interpretations, and other hypotheses which pervert biblical teaching and thereby obscure the Gospel."[41] What has taken place since that time in The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is well known to all of you and does not need to be reviewed here. It is sufficient to note at this time that through the painful ten years which have followed, a major Lutheran church body has made unprecedented strides toward reclaiming its historical confessional stance. One of the clearest evidences of the Synod's intent to take the Lutheran Confessions seriously was the adoption of "A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" in 1973 as a doctrinal resolution of the Synod, for, as F. E. Mayer had written in 1947:

> It is true that the Lutheran Confessions are a sufficient basis for Lutheran union. But there must also be a clarification of such antitheses as are not discussed in the Lutheran Confessions. Modern doctrinal statements are necessary as guidelines for doctrinal discussions on controverted points and as satisfactory summations of such discussions.[42]

Moreover, as a direct result of the controversy which has ensued, a positive on-going program for the study of the Scriptures and the Confessions was inaugurated this past fall under the theme "That We May Grow." Pastors and lay-people throughout the Synod are actually studying the confessional writings of the Lutheran church. For the first time in a generation there is concord on the campuses of synodical seminaries and colleges. Healing is taking place throughout the

Synod. What has taken place in The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in recent years has given hope to all those committed to Confessional Lutheranism throughout the world.

There are positive developments also taking place in other Lutheran churches throughout the world. Only a few isolated examples can be listed here. The Lutheran Church of Australia, which resulted from the merger of two Lutheran bodies in that country in 1965, has presented the world with an exemplary model for the carrying out of ecumenical endeavors. Their merger was achieved, not through compromise of doctrine, not by agreeing to disagree, not by searching for some lowest common denominator, but only after many years of discussions had resulted in doctrinal agreement and the adoption of a document entitled "Theses of Agreement." Careful scholarship under the norm of Holy Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions has resulted in some excellent statements on the inerrancy of Scripture, on the interpretation of Genesis 1-3, and more recently on the charismatic movement. In 1972 three Lutheran Free Churches in Germany merged to form the new *Selbständige Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche.* Like the merger in Australia, this union demonstrates ecumenical confessionalism in the best sense of the term. Despite the fact that plans for one Lutheran Church in Canada by 1980 have had to be shelved, the Joint Commission on Inter-Lutheran Relationships (JCILR) voted this past November to continue to work towards altar and pulpit fellowship among the three Lutheran bodies by scheduling doctrinal discussions on the ordination of women and on the nature of Scriptural authority and methods of Biblical interpretation, thereby demonstrating their commitment to take doctrine seriously instead of opting for compromise. Confessional Lutheranism is alive and well in various parts of the world.

Exciting things are happening in many parts of the world with respect to making the Lutheran Confessions available in a variety of languages. Luther's Small Catechism has recently been translated into Indonesian, and the Augsburg Confession is presently being translated into this language by the Batak Church. Exciting developments are taking place among Lutherans in Brazil, a country which is bursting forth in a thousand directions. Progress is being made in translating the Lutheran Confessions into Portuguese. Elsewhere in South America work continues in translating the Lutheran Confessions into Spanish and is nearing completion. In India, in England and France, in Ghana and Nigeria, in New Guinea and the Philippines, in Japan, Korea, Taiwan and Hong Kong, in Venezuela and Argentina, pastors and teachers committed

unconditionally to the Lutheran Confessions are witnessing, often under the most trying circumstances, to the Scriptural Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Time allows me to refer to only one additional positive development with respect to confessionalism. I refer to the report of the recently concluded five-year study of "the function of doctrine and theology in light of the unity of the church" by representatives from the three large Lutheran church bodies in the United States, convened under the auspices of the Division of Theological Studies of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. Despite the fact that the American Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Church in America, and The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod all have solid statements in their constitutions regarding commitment to the Holy Scriptures and to the Lutheran Confessions, it is well known that major differences exist between these church bodies. Therefore, it must be regarded as a positive development when a committee of official representatives from these church bodies issues a report which clearly delineates the areas of disagreement. This report states that on such important questions as the basis for fellowship, the authority of Scripture, the role of confessions, and the limits of diversity, representatives of the three participating bodies tend to find themselves in two theological camps. LCMS representatives tend to take one position, ALC and LCA representatives another. The mutual recognition of these serious differences can only be viewed as a positive development beyond the frequently articulated claims that formal commitment to the Lutheran Symbols constitutes doctrinal agreement. It is to be fervently hoped that this report's recommendation for "theological discussions among professors, pastors, and laity" and for "official consultations" between representatives of the churches participating in LCUSA will be taken seriously and implemented.

Concluding Observations

We have come to the end of this presentation, and we have yet to speak directly to the topic "The *Future* of Confessional Lutheranism in the World." Having briefly defined what we understand by confessional Lutheranism and having reviewed some of the negative developments which work against it and some of the positive developments which give witness to its continuing vitality, I will content myself with offering five concluding observations about confessional Lutheranism.

1. *Confessional Lutheranism always finds itself under attack.* Dr. Herman Sasse once wrote: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church is a church which has been sentenced to death by the

world. For four hundred years, now, it has been threatened by the sentence of death pronounced upon it."[43] Today is no different. This world, the modern world, is unalterably opposed to confessional Lutheranism. We dare never forget this nor be lulled into thinking that a momentary success here or there signals final victory. As Ralph Bohlmann has recently reminded us in his convocation essay, "The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is one of a very few major Lutheran bodies in the world who still confess and cling to the whole doctrinal content of the Lutheran Confessional writings."[44] Confessional Lutheranism always has been and always will be under attack, if not from those who would destroy the Scripture principle apart from which subscription to the Confessions has no meaning, then by the enthusiasts of all ages who undercut the objective certainty of God's free grace of forgiveness for the sake of Christ in Word and Sacrament. Confessional Lutheranism always has been and always will be under attack, if not from those who reject outright the contents of the Church's Symbols, then by a conditional subscription which insidiously empties them of any significance in practice. Confessional Lutheranism always has been and always will be under attack, if not from the external and internal enemies of the church, then from the ever present temptation to degenerate into a smug and self-righteous "dead orthodoxy."

2. *Confessional Lutheranism is showing some signs of renewed vitality today.* Although it is doubtful that *Time* will soon feature a cover story on "Confessional Lutheranism, New Empire of Faith," there nevertheless are some small signs that a resurgence of confessional Lutheranism in the world is possible. In a presentation before the annual meeting of LCUSA last March, Harold Lindsell, editor of *Christianity Today* and author of *Battle for the Bible,* offered this appraisal of Lutheranism from the perspective of an Evangelical: "Lutherans possess a wonderful and rich well of water in their confessional writings, but they rarely draw from it." Recent developments, especially within The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, indicate that at least some Lutherans intend to go back to this well. Encouraging is also the fact that Lutherans in the U.S.A. seem to be somewhat more open to the recognition that doctrinal differences actually exist among them and should be opened up for discussion.

It is interesting to note that the *Time* December 26, 1977, story on the Evangelicals does not make a single reference to contemporary Lutheranism. This, it seems to me, is indicative of the opportunity and challenge which confronts confessional Lutheranism today. To meet this challenge, confessional Lutheran churches must place three tasks high on their agenda:

a) The recruiting and training of sensitive, alert, and confessionally committed men for the pastoral ministry;
b) The writing of apologetic and dogmatic texts in which the riches of the Symbols' insights are applied to contemporary problems and developments in society and in the world of theology;
c) Close contact and doctrinal discussions between those Lutheran churches throughout the world who are unconditionally committed to the Lutheran Confessions as a correct interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

Commitment to the Lutheran Confessions demands, as Peter Brunner has put it, "not a repetitive, formalistic recitation of the statements of the fathers, but rather their binding, actualizing interpretation and application."[45]

3. *Confessional Lutheranism is genuinely ecumenical.* Far from being the cause of division in the church, unconditional subscription to the Symbolical Books demands that every effort be made to manifest the unity of the church in external and visible harmony. Once again I turn to Sasse for an appropriate word:

> Indeed, not such a one thinks and acts in an ecumenical fashion who looks upon the Confessions as something relative, who reduces them to a low level and practically does away with them, but who, like Luther, searches for the one truth of the one Gospel for the one Church. Let us again become *Confessional Lutherans* for the sake of the unity of the Church"[46]

4. *Confessional Lutheranism rules out pride and demands a humble spirit.* Precisely because confessional Lutheranism demands unconditional subscription to the Lutheran Confessions as a correct interpretation of God's Word, it leaves no room for self-righteous pride. As Alexander Schmemann, the Orthodox theologian, has written: "Truth always makes humble, and pride in all its forms and expressions is always alien to truth and is always a sin."[47]

5. *Confessional Lutheranism is fundamentally eschatological in outlook.* In his Great Confession, quoted in the Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, Luther said (FC, SD, VII, 29):

> I see that schisms and errors are increasing proportionately with the passage of time, and that there is no end to the rage and fury of Satan. Hence lest any persons during my lifetime or after my death appeal to me or misuse my writings to confirm their error, as the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists are already beginning to do, I desire with this treatise to confess my faith before God and all the world, point by point. I am

> determined to abide by it until my death and (so help me God!) in this faith to depart from this world and to appear before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ.

A generation or so later, the authors of the Formula of Concord concluded their confession with these words (FC, SD, XII, 40):

> Therefore, in the presence of God and of all Christendom among both our contemporaries and our posterity, we wish to have testified that the present explanation of all the foregoing controverted articles here explained, and none other, is our teaching, belief, and confession in which by God's grace we shall appear with intrepid hearts before the judgment seat of Jesus Christ and for which we shall give an account. Nor shall we speak or write anything, privately or publicly, contrary to this confession, but we intend through God's grace to abide by it. In view of this we have advisedly, in the fear and invocation of God, subscribed our signatures with our own hands.

Such confessionalism as this has a brilliant future; if not always in this world, then most certainly in the world to come.

FOOTNOTES

1. Constitution of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Article II.
2. C. F. W. Walther, "Why Should Our Pastors, Teachers and Professors Subscribe Unconditionally to the Symbolical Writings of Our Church," *CTM,* Vol. XVIII, April 1947, p. 241. In this essay, Walther, to be sure, notes that "since the Symbols are confessions of faith or doctrine, the Church necessarily cannot require a subscription to those matters which do not belong to doctrine." Nor does unconditional subscription imply for Walther that it is "impossible to improve on the line of argument employed in the Symbolical Books for arriving at purity of doctrine" (p. 242).
3. *Ibid.*, p. 244. For a different understanding of "confessional," see Vance L. Eckstrom's "Pluralism and Lutheran Confessionalism," *Lutheran Quarterly,* XXIX (May 1977), p. 10. Eckstrom distinguishes between "exclusivist confessionalism" and "pluralist confessionalism." From the perspective of this paper "exclusivist confessionalism" is redundant and "pluralist confessionalism" is a contradiction in terms.
4. Walther, *op. cit.*, p. 250.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 251.
6. This point is made and demonstrated with copious references to the Lutheran Symbols in an unpublished outline on "Confessional Subscription" prepared by Dr. Harry Huth in 1971 which is on file in the office of the CTCR in St. Louis.
7. Herman Sasse, "Concerning the Status of the Lutheran Churches in the World," *CTM,* XX (August 1949), pp. 622-3.
8. Peter Brunner, "Commitment to the Lutheran Confession - What Does It Mean Today?" *The Springfielder,* XXXIII, 3(December 1969), pp. 4-5.

9. See Van A. Harvey, *The Historian and the Believer* (Toronto: The MacMillian Company, 1966), pp. 38 ff.; Edgar Krentz, *The Historical-Critical Method* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975) pp. 41 ff. Ted Peters, "Sola Scriptura and the Second Naivete," *Dialog,* XVI (Fall 1977), pp. 268 ff.
10. Harvey, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
14. R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 236.
15. Harvey, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
16. For example, see Krentz, *op. cit.* After noting that "historical criticism serves the historian's need for valid, reliable evidence by enabling him to establish whether or not testimony actually was given by a competent and reliable witness" (p. 41) and that "historical criticism produces only probably results" (p. 67), he can nevertheless say that "historical criticism is not a threat to the Scriptures because it is congruent with its object, the Bible" (p. 61), "to refuse to use historical criticism in the face of the Bible's claim would deny that the history told is true history [and] . . . would be a form of the docetic heresy" (p. 63), and "the utility of historical criticism can no longer be questioned" (p. 87). Incredibly, Krentz seems to be unaware of the fact that the Biblical writers as well as the sixteenth century Reformers believed that God is the primary author of the Scriptures, that the Bible is God's Word, and that to question its reliability is to question the truthfulness of God Himself.
17. Peters, *op. cit.*, p. 271.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 270.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 271.
20. *Ibid*, p. 275. See also my review of *Peter in the New Testament* in *The Lutheran Witness,* August 25, 1974, pp. 26ff. Often, however, adherence to *sola scriptura* is professed, while it is denied in practice.
21. Herman Sasse, "Confessional Churches in the Ecumenical Movement," *The Springfielder,* 1967. "The sectarian relies on human opinions which he reads into the Bible. He is always sure of himself. The Reformer is never sure of himself, but he relies entirely on the written Word. He knows that this word contains immeasureable depths which no human mind can grasp, that also his understanding of that word, of this or that Biblical book may be insufficient or even wrong. So Luther spent a lifetime in searching the Scripture, constantly improving his translation and his exegesis, seeking always the advice of others. But this study of the Scriptures has convinced him of the '*claritas scripturae.*' In all things pertaining to our salvation Scripture is clear, it explains itself and does not need a teaching office which explains it infallibly. For in the Scriptures the Holy Spirit speaks. This is what Scripture says of itself, what Christ taught when he quoted Scripture . . . The clarity of the Scripture is, of course, not the clarity of a mathematical textbook, nor is it that kind of clarity which we expect in a work of modern Western historiography. It is the clarity with which the Holy Spirit speaks to those whose ears He has opened: He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the Churches" (p. 31).
22. Brunner, *op. cit.* pp. 7-8.

23. Eckstrom, *op. cit.* pp. 111, 112.
24. For an exception to this trend, see Rachael Conrad Wahlberg's "Let's Update the Confessions," *Lutheran Forum,* March 1970, pp. 10-11. Referring to the Augsburg Confession, Wahlberg contends that "parts of the statement are embarrassingly polemical and even ludicrous to a 'world come of age' " (p. 10). She continues: "We might even be so bold as to take issue with some of the statements in the confessions . . . If the Lutheran confessions were to be updated, such inconsistencies would be considered and reshaped in light of modern theology" (pp. 10-11). J. R. Christianson, Chairman of the History Department at Luther College in Decorah, Iowa, recently criticized *The Lutheran Standard* for printing a series of articles on the Formula of Concord as being "strangely out of place . . . our church, the ALC, is a church of the Augsburg Confession, not really a church of the Formula of Concord." *The Lutheran Standard,* December 6, 1977, p. 16. It is also worthy of note that the June 1977 Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation in Dar es Salaam gave no formal recognition whatsoever to the 400th Anniversary of the Formula of Concord.
25. *Essays on the Lutheran Confessions Basic to Lutheran Cooperation,* (The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and The National Lutheran Council), 1961, p. 29.
    William Weiblen, "Confessional Integrity and the Crisis in the Church,"
26. *Lutheran Forum,* November 1974, p. 16.
    Ibid.
27. Gerhard O. Forde, "The Formula of Concord Article V: End or New
28. Beginning?" *Dialog,* XV (Summer 1976), p. 184.
    Ibid., p. 190.
29. Richard J. Neuhaus, "The Supreme Court and Confessionalism," *Lutheran*
30. *Forum,* April 1969, p. 15.
31. Herman Sasse, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
32. Paul Jersild, letter in response to Horace Hummel's "No Other Gospel," *Lutheran Forum,* February 1970, p. 72.
33. Eckstrom, *op. cit.*, pp. 130 ff.
34. It was maintained by Theodore Tappert that the Confessions themselves "assert both a *quatenus* and a *quia,* both that the Confessions should be acknowledged only insofar as (*quatenus*) they agree with the Scriptures and then also because (*quia*) they agree with the Scriptures." Tappert, *op. cit.*, p. 30. But as Carl Braaten and others have noted, this is really only a "new declension of the old *quatenus* formula."
35. Walther, *op. cit.*, pp. 245-6. In response to the question whether or not it is possible that the Symbols of the orthodox church contain errors in less important points, Walther says "yes, but the possibility does not establish reality. Only a skeptic, who is always learning and never coming to the truth, despairs of ever finding the truth and will maintain: Men have written this, and therefore it must contain error. But if error should really be found in our Symbols, we would be the first to pass the death sentence on them. But we defy the whole world to point out an error in doctrine in our Book of Concord. For the past three hundred years all the enemies of our church have tried in vain to find an error, but have failed" (pp. 248-9).
36. Carl Braaten, *Dialog,* Fall 1975, p. 245.
37. Herman Sasse, *Here We Stand* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1977), p. 172.

38. Peters, *op. cit.*, p. 270 ff.
39. Carl S. Mundinger, *Government in the Missouri Synod* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1947) p. 195.
40. *Convention Proceedings, 1967*, p. 95 (Resolution 2-30, "To Reaffirm Our Position on Certain Doctrines").
41. *Ibid.* (Resolution 2-31, "To Reaffirm Our Position on Creation, Fall, and Related Subjects").
42. F. E. Mayer, from an editorial note prefacing Herman Sasse's "Concerning the Lutheran Free Churches in Germany," *CTM*, January 1947, p. 39.
43. Sasse, *Here We Stand, op. cit.*, p. 179.
44. Ralph Bohlmann, "The Celebration of Concord," Mimeographed essay, November 1977, p. 31.
45. Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
46. Sasse, "Concerning the Status of the Lutheran Church in the World," *op. cit.*, p. 624.
47. Alexander Schmemann, "The Task of Orthodox Theology in America Today," *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, X (April 1966), p. 186.

The Rev. Samuel Nafzger is executive secretary of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

Confessional Emphasis on Law and Gospel for Our Day

Eugene F. Klug

Little is gained by disputing another man's tastes, *de gustibus non est disputandum.* In 1877 Philip Schaff published his monumental *Creeds of Christendom.*[1] His so-called "impartial estimate" of the Formula of Concord was that it should be recognized as "the sectarian symbol of Lutheranism." Not suprisingly he dubs it "The Formula of Discord," though he admits that Luther would no doubt have endorsed it.[2]

In that same year, C. F. W. Walther, in an eloquently stirring sermon, stated that "the Formula of Concord was nothing other than the same old flag on a new staff." He underscored the fact that it proposed no new articles of faith but sought only to state on the articles under dispute what it meant to be a Lutheran according to the intent and meaning of the Augsburg Confession.[3] It was Walther's considered judgment that "all who tried to hide behind the Augsburg Confession, as behind a mask, had their deception exposed and masks removed by the Formula of Concord."

Self-evidently much depends upon where the theologizer himself stands! To Walther, giant voice of conservative Lutheran theology, the Formula of Concord was a veritable Rock of Gibraltar, guarding the straits of genuinely Biblical and Confessional theology. To Philip Schaff, progenitor of "Mercersburg theology," professor later at Union Seminary, New York, and sympathizer with liberalistic, watered-down nineteenth century theology, the Formula of Concord was merely the "last and most disputed of the Lutheran Symbols." Patronizingly he described it as a document of "high authority during the palmy period of Lutheran scholasticism," whose "first centennial was celebrated with considerable enthusiasm," but which by the time of its second centennial lay literally "dead and buried."[4] It is significant that Schaff takes absolutely no note whatsoever of the great revival of Confessional Lutheran theology around him in this country during the years prior to the tri-centennial, 1877, let alone of the wide-ranging celebrations from coast to coast in various Lutheran parishes. It is characteristic to ignore what is deemed unimportant.

Lutheran theology today is in the same sort of ennui or state of disinterest. Lutherans mouth adherence to the Lutheran Confessions, particularly the Augsburg Confession; but the Formula of Concord unmasks their charade. It was Schaff's

considered opinion that only high orthodoxy had made "doctrine the corner-stone of the Church and the indispensable condition of Christian fellowship."[5] The Formula of Concord continues to be an irritant and a roadblock in company whose ecumenical strivings lie on shallow, soft, shifting sands. Theologians yawn in boredom over its careful distinctions, particularly its use of the *damnamus*. At the conference of theologians, sponsored by the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. in Chicago, April 11-14, 1977, Dr. George Harkins, general secretary of LCUSA, acknowledged in his opening remarks of welcome to the participants that he had re-read the Formula for the occasion and that he had found it to be "pretty damned dry." One of the featured speakers at the conference, Prof. George Forell of the University of Iowa, could merely muster enough enthusiasm for the Formula to brand it "a thoroughly political event," a "historical document" which "was a compromise between two extreme positions," something produced by men who, according to Forell, were little more than "house theologians," literally kept or controlled by the princes. Only a jaundiced, distorted, anti-orthodox sort of prejudice would label redoubtable champions like Chemnitz and Andreae and their heroic efforts in that way.[6]

Confessional "Roots"

Confessions like the Formula of Concord are born out of anguished need, pressed forth from the Church as antidotes to error. They bloom like blessed fruits out of the midst and mist of swirling controversy and heat of the moment, bulwarks to ward off confusion and error, ensigns or standards for trooping the colors and rallying the faithful. Thus the Lutheran Confessions were never mere political mechanisms, nor purely and alone arbitrary historical documents, then or now. With thesis and antithesis they state for their day and ours what is truly apostolic, catholic, and ecumenical Christian teaching. When the Lutheran Confessions, therefore, level their antitheses against errorists, they do so precisely because the Scripture demands no less,[7] for the sake of "concord within the Church,"[8] in order to preserve the Church from error,[9] and to warn "pious, innocent people" swept by error in the heretical communions.[10] Thesis always stands first and takes precedence over antithesis; never do the Confessions foster "needless and unprofitable contentions," but address "necessary controversy" only.[11] As a result, all the Symbols in the Book of Concord have timeless value and significance, with the Formula of Concord no exception.

It is one of the ironies of Reformation history that erstwhile

co-champions like Luther and Melanchthon, or their followers, should be arrayed on opposing sides. Death had no sooner taken Luther, in 1546, when political defeat of the Smalcald League at Muehlberg in 1547 and ecclesiastical discomfiture, as a result of the intolerable Interims forced upon the Lutherans, totally and dramatically tore apart the solid phalanx of Lutheran orthodoxy. With Elector John Frederick a captive of the emperor's forces, Agricola fashioned the infamous Augsburg Interim early in 1548, and Melanchthon, under severe pressure, compromised himself and the Lutheran cause by creating the substitute Leipzig Interim, which was no better than the other, late in 1548.

How should these dramatically swift changes be accounted for? Whatever the answer, they opened a veritable Pandora's box of bitter controversy and division within the Lutheran churches, territories, cities. In Schaff's opinion, "the seeds of these controversies lay partly and chiefly in the theological differences between Luther and Melanchthon in their later years." He explains those differences as involving "from the year 1533, two types of Lutheranism, the one the conclusive and exclusive, the other the expansive and unionistic type."[12] "Conclusive and exclusive" he attaches to Luther; and "expansive and unionistic" to Melanchthon. Schaff, it seems, has his adjectives partly mixed and has misunderstood both Luther and Melanchthon. Obviously, Luther with his broad, deep, firm, robust Biblical faith and theology was always conclusive (or assertive) and expansive, hardly exclusive. Melanchthon was a vacillator, "too gentle for the theological leadership thrust on him" and a man "who longed to be delivered from the 'fury of the theologians,' " according to Schaff. As a result, Melanchthon succumbed to a unionistic and exclusivistic sort of spirit, like all so-called moderates or compromisers.

There is absolutely no basis to Schaff's charge that Luther "assumed a hostile attitude towards other churches" and was "disposed to rest in his achievements," the older he got.[13] When Schaff acknowledges that Melanchthon moved toward a qualified subscription to the Smalcald Articles (1537) and gave the Augsburg Confession an "improved" rendering in 1540 (the "Variata"), he demonstrates that he no longer is an objective historian of the Lutheran Reformation. He has tipped his hand towards Melanchthon, and he applauds Luther's colleague for "exchanging his Augustinianism for Synergism, and relaxing his Lutheranism in favor of Calvinism."[14] Need more be said, either about Schaff's stance, or Melanchthon's switch? *Satis est.*

Confessional Hub

It seems incredible at first glance that four articles of the Formula of Concord were required to settle the disputes involving the proper distinction of Law and Gospel: the Osiandrian (Stancarian) Controversy (1549-1566) by Article III on "Righteousness of Faith"; the Majoristic (1551-1560) by Article IV on "Good Works"; the Antinomistic (1527-1556) by Articles V and VI on "Law and Gospel" and "The Third Use of the Law" respectively. All could be said to involve reintroduction of the confusion that had existed under Romanist theology on the proper distinction between Law and Gospel, or justification and sanctification, or regeneration and renewal. Luther had foreseen what would happen, and he predicted that, precisely because of man's sinful tendencies and Satan's accute temptations, "after our time it [the article on justification] will be obscured again," and the meaning of Law and Gospel in their respective spheres and offices would be obfuscated "even among those who want to seem 'evangelical.' "[15] Walther drew heavily, as is commonly known, on Luther's magnificent lectures on *Galatians* for the writing of his own *Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel,* the classic in American Lutheran theological circles.[16] But already in 1877, as Walther composed the commemorative book, *Der Concordienformel, Kern und Stern,* for the tricentennial celebration of the Formula of Concord, he stated the critical significance of properly distinguishing these two basic Scriptural doctrines, Law and Gospel: "For the man who does not understand this distinction the Bible is a tightly locked and sealed book; but whoever understands this distinction has the key by which the Holy Scriptures alone is unlocked."[17]

The Lutheran Confessions exemplify the highest fidelity in distinguishing Law and Gospel. They orchestrate both the sharp difference and also the close interacting of these two great doctrines in the existential needs of sinful man and the whole of the Christian church. In defining the Law, Melanchthon in the Apology correctly draws a line between man's knowledge of the Law by nature[18] and Scripture's teaching, stating: "By 'law' in this discussion we mean the commandments of the Decalogue, wherever they appear in the Scriptures."[19] This corresponds exactly with Luther's lofty regard for the Decalogue, for example, in the Large Catechism: "Here, then, we have the Ten Commandments, a summary of divine teaching on what we are to do to make our whole life pleasing to God. They are the true fountain from which all good works must spring, the true channel through which all good works must flow. Apart from these Ten Commandments no deed, no conduct can be good or pleasing to God, no matter

how great or precious it may be in the eyes of the world."[20] Here already Luther lays to rest the Antinomian objections to the concept of the third use of the Law. He is addressing Christians, of course, who faithfully live out of the content of God's Word, Holy Scripture. "To faith in Christ," Schlink states, "the glory of the Ten Commandments is evident," and it is the believer who, as Luther states in his Conclusion to the Ten Commandments in his Large Catechism, sees "how highly these Ten Commandments are to be exalted and extolled above all orders, commands, and works which are taught and practiced apart from them."[21] What God revealed in written form at Sinai was nothing other than the *aeterna lex,* the holy will of His divine majesty which Adam and Eve once possessed in purity as part of the divine image and likeness they bore.[22]

Usus Elenchticus

Since the fall into sin man's response to the Law is hostile and hate-filled;[23] or he presumes to substitute his own sophisticated pieties in its place,[24] which are nothing more than "the inventions of his natural religion."[25] Accordingly, the chief function of the Law has become a negative one, smashing or powdering man's pretensions of righteousness, so that "he is terror-stricken and humbled, becomes despondent and despairing, anxiously desires help, but does not know where to find it."[26] "This is what is meant by Rom. 4, 15, 'The Law brings wrath,' and Rom. 5, 20, 'Law came in to increase the trespass,' " Luther goes on to say in the Smalcald Articles.[27] The sense of despair which is thus worked in man is no spiritual improvement, no basis for forgiveness, no good work creditable to his account. The Confessions label as sin the idea that man is capable of keeping God's Law outside the state of grace, or without faith.[28] Since the fall, therefore, the Law's primary function is that of accusing, judging, condemning; and the Confessions repeatedly stress this with their "always" and "only" in connection with this truth, *Lex semper accusat.*[29] When the sinner stands thus before the Law he is stripped of all righteousness of his own, or any pretense of the same, and knows that he, not merely his sin, is the just object of God's righteous and fearful wrath.[30] Christian preaching falls short when it fails to drive this point home to the sinner, each sinner, that by his sinful condition and sinful acts, he is the direct target of God's righteous anger.[31] With purpose Fagerberg stresses that it was "a hallmark of Reformation theology" to put the "stronger emphasis on what man cannot do than on what he can do."[32]

It is no secret that much of what the Confessors, from Melanchthon to Chemnitz, knew and learned about the proper

distinction of Law and Gospel, they derived from the master teacher himself, Luther.[33] Luther remained absolutely consistent and in perfect harmony with Scripture throughout his life on the meaning of Law and Gospel, their sharp cleavage, as well as their close inter-working in the life of the believer. Yet, even as a doctor of Holy Scriptures, he recognized that a pastor would have to be a student of God's Word for a hundred years, especially in handling Law and Gospel correctly, before he could achieve adequate competence in dealing with the flock.

Luther's "Katie"

Of all writings stemming from Luther none had greater influence and abiding significance on the subject of Law and Gospel than did his *scholia,* his lectures, or commentary, on St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians. Luther called Galatians affectionately his "Katie." No book of the Bible, in other words, was dearer to him. It was so, precisely because it laid out with such brilliant clarity the whole matter of justification. He well knew, and so he stated, that "if the doctrine of justification is lost, the *whole* of Christian doctrine is lost," and also, therefore, that "between these two kinds of righteousness, the active righteousness of the Law and the passive righteousness of Christ, there is no middle ground," or mean.[34] Accordingly, Luther very carefully drew the line between this Christian righteousness, imputed righteousness, alien righteousness, the righteousness of faith, passive righteousness, all of which form the Gospel of Christ's righteousness gained for sinners by the vicarious atonement; and works-righteousness, the righteousness of the Law, active righteousness, domestic righteousness.[35] The latter is earthly, and "by it we perform good works," and yet, "even when we do much, we do nothing," except we first become righteous through Christ's righteousness by faith.[36] This other righteousness is heavenly, because it comes as a gift of God through Christ, and "we do not perform it" but "we accept it by faith, through which we ascend beyond all laws and works."[37]

Luther waxes particularly eloquent on the apostle Paul's question in Galatians 3:19, "Why then the Law?" The apostle, as we know, answers his own question: "It was added because of transgressions." Therefore, says Luther, we must keep it "as far as heaven is from earth" in the matter of justification, for "it does not belong to the Law to be used for justification."[38] The Law's "true function and the chief and proper use of the Law is to reveal to man his sin, blindness, misery, wickedness, ignorance, hate and contempt of God, death, hell, judgment, and the well-deserved wrath of God."[39] There probably is no

more succinct, thorough-going definition of the Law anywhere! When it does this work, the Law, says Luther, fulfills an "extremely beneficial and very necessary" function. It is the same function which the Law had at Sinai, where God thundered "with a thunderbolt to burn and crush that brute which is called the presumption of righteousness." "To break and crush this horrible monster, God needs a large and powerful hammer, that is, the Law, which is the hammer of death, the thunder of hell, and the lightning of divine wrath."[40] Those that "are drunk with the presumption of their own righteousness" need the clout of God's Law which "reveals sin and shows the wrath and judgment of God, (so that) they are driven to despair."[41] Luther calls man's spiritual ailment or sickness unto death a "dropsy of the soul" in his comments on Thesis 22 in his famous Heidelberg Disputation of 1518.[42] His counsel to those who preach and teach God's word in the church is:

> I urge you, who are to be the teachers of others, to learn this doctrine of the true and proper use of the Law carefully; for after our time it will be obscured again and will be completely wiped out.

Luther is as fearful of those who now profess to be "evangelical" as of those who blatantly distort and twist the Word of God. Therefore, he adds:

> It is a matter of no small moment to believe correctly about what the Law is and what its use and function are. Thus it is evident that we do not reject the Law and works, as our opponents falsely accuse us. But we do everything to establish the Law, and we require works. We say that the Law is good and useful, but in its proper use, namely, first as we have said earlier, to restrain civic transgressions; and secondly, to reveal spiritual transgressions. Therefore the Law is a light that illumines and shows, not the grace of God or righteousness and life, but the wrath of God, sin, death, our damnation in the sight of God, and hell. For just as on Mt. Sinai the lightning, the thunder, the dark cloud, the smoking and burning mountain, and the whole horrendous sight did not make the Children of Israel happy or alive but terrified them, made them almost helpless, and disclosed a presence of God speaking from the cloud that they could not bear for all their sanctity and purity, so when the Law is being used correctly, it does nothing but reveal sin, work wrath, accuse, terrify, and reduce the minds of men to the point of despair. And that is as far as the Law goes.[43]

God's "Other Law," or Gospel

"And that is as far as the Law goes!" Thank God for the Gospel! Opposite our sin and God's wrath stands our Savior, Jesus Christ, who is the bridge between God and man. In the same context as above, Luther defines the Gospel and its function:

> The Gospel is a light that illumines hearts and makes them alive. It discloses what grace and the mercy of God are; what the forgiveness of sins, blessing, righteousness, life, and eternal salvation are; and how we are to attain to these. When we distinguish the Law from the Gospel this way, we attribute to each its proper use and function . . . When this distinction is recognized, the true meaning of justification is recognized. Then it is easy to distinguish faith from works, and Christ from Moses.[44]

While the Law is "the minister of wrath," the Gospel is the "minister of grace." Against the Law I have "another Law," or champion, Christ my Savior, says Luther. After the Law has thundered home, then it is time for the Gospel to cover the terrified hearts with the canopy of grace. "Now it is time for grace and for listening to Christ," Luther comments, "from whose mouth there come messages of grace." Quite in contrast, "now it is time to see, not the smoking and burning Mt. Sinai, but Mt. Moriah, where the seat, the temple, and the mercy seat of God are, that is, Christ, who is the King of righteousness and peace."[45] At the point of justification, "when the debate is about righteousness, life, and eternal salvation, the Law must be removed from sight completely, as though it had never existed or would never exist but were a mere nothing."[46] Therefore, in the matter of one's justification, "the highest art and wisdom of Christians is not to know the Law."[47] It is important to note that this sweeping dictum of Luther is closely attached to justification, or the righteousness that avails before God, *coram Deo*. It was grossly misunderstood and misquoted by his Romanist adversaries, and later terribly distorted by the Antinomians, especially Agricola.[48]

Confessional Clarion

Jesus Christ is "the mediator and propitiation through whom the Father is reconciled."[49] Jesus is the priceless treasure which the Confessions attest over and over again.[50] It is He who has stood between us and the Father's consuming wrath and reconciled the Father with sinners. Schlink is quite right when he emphasizes, on the basis of Augustana III, that "by his suffering and death Christ influences the Father to abandon his

wrath against the sinner."[51] In the same context he notes: "The reconciliation of God with us is also our reconciliation with God. But the statements about the reconciling influence of the Son on the angry Father preponderate."[52] Thus the Gospel content is precisely Christ's redemptory work. As Melanchthon emphasizes in the Apology, to know about Christ, about His person, His two natures, etc., is not yet to know Christ really. One must know and receive His benefits. *Hoc est Christum cognoscere, beneficia eius cognoscere.*[53] Those benefits are precisely Christ's reconciliation of God with sinners, the justification which God pronounces upon sinners for Christ's sake. Schlink has the mind of the Confessions when he asserts that "the Confessions are not interested in a strict dogmatic distinction between reconciliation and justification . . . Justification *is* reconciliation . . . Christ's obedient suffering and death is his merit . . . Jesus Christ, then, is the mediator not in the sense of a general bridging of the gap between God and man, . . . but very concretely he is the mediator between the angry God and the sinner . . . Since the whole world became guilty, he took away the sin of the *whole* world."[54]

Faith vs. Fideism

Faith saves because it lays hold on or trusts God's forgiveness through Christ. "Justifying faith is not a 'feeling,'" Schlink states, but "confidence, 'confidence in God and in the fulfillment of his promises.' . . . This conception of faith as confidence deflects our view entirely from man's introspection . . . He is directed exclusively to him . . . who gives himself to the sinner by grace . . . Everything in faith is the work of Jesus Christ. Therefore the classic formula reads: Men are justified 'for Christ's sake, through faith' (*propter Christum per fidem,* AC IV, 1), but the formula may not be inverted - 'for the sake of faith through Christ."[55] Saving faith, *fides qua creditur,* is never shallow, internalized fideism, faith for its own sake, but the *organon leeptikon* that receives God's promise. It is not a deed, accomplishment, or spiritual performance or high wire act by man, but the simple reception of the gracious deed of God whose outstretched arms safely enfold us thereby to keep us from falling and ruin. The Confessions never lose sight of the fact that faith is "a strong, powerful work of the Holy Spirit," and that it is He who not only kindles it but sustains it in the believer day for day unto the end.[56] The Gospel in the hands of the Holy Spirit has this gracious quality about it that, at the same time that it is an offer and exhibition of God's grace, it is also a powerful instrument efficaciously working the work the Spirit intends.

Antinomianism — Antigospelism!

The terrible threat of Antinomianism, as Luther saw it, was precisely in the subversion of Law and Gospel. In their feigned piety they mouthed his words that the Christian is to have nothing more to do with the Law,[57] meanwhile turning the Gospel itself into a prescription of legal requirements devised by themselves. Luther saw this Antinomianism as plain, brazen antigospelism. By subverting Law and Gospel, they turned them both upside down, much to the pleasure of Satan. "It is apparent from this," Luther wrote in fourth disputation with the Antinomians, "that the devil's purpose in this fanaticism is not to remove the law but to remove Christ, the fulfiller of the law."[58] The Reformer has his finger directly on the neuralgic point.

The signators of the Formula of Concord underscored the same point in Article V on Law and Gospel. The principal issue they clearly identified as that which turns the Gospel, the preaching of grace, into a preaching of repentance and punishment, thus completely reversing God and these two doctrines of utmost importance. The great tragedy, then, is that "the Gospel is again transformed into a legal doctrine; the merit of Christ and the Holy Scripture are obscured, Christians are robbed of true comfort, and the doors are again opened for the papacy."[59]

Antinomianism vs. the Third Use

But the Antinomian threat rode off in another direction. Agricola was a kind of sixteenth century Don Quixote who did not seem to know where he was going.[60] Agricola led the attack on the so-called third use of the Law in the Christian's life, along with his assault on the Law's continuing relevance and need as the accusing, contrition-working instrument in the hands of God. Regenerate Christians do not require the Law, he stated; they know and they do the will of God of themselves, spontaneously, and do not require its instruction or guidance.

This bizarre, un-Scriptural position caused havoc in the church, and the authors of the Formula of Concord, therefore, clearly stated the threefold purpose still served by the Law in the lives of Christian believers. Because even the regenerate man still has the old sinful nature, the Law continues its pommeling and punishing, restraining, curbing.[61] Secondly, and above all, it rebukes and works contrition: "To reprove is the real function of the law."[62] But "when a person is born anew by the Spirit of God and is liberated from the law . . . he lives according to the immutable will of God as it is comprehended in the law and, in so far as he is born anew, he does everything

from a free and merry spirit."[63] The difference is that while the unregenerate man works under compulsion and with an unwilling spirit, the Christian believer acts willingly, in faith, working the fruits of the Spirit freely, conforming himself in full harmony to God's will as taught in His commandments, something which no threat of the Law could extract from him.[64] This is the *usus tertius,* as it came to be called.[65] The *usus puerilis,* or *paedagogicus,* the informatory function of the Law is known to the regenerate only, because it has its base and starting point in faith.

The Confessors of 1577 were in full harmony not only with the Scriptures, which they quoted copiously, but also with Luther, whom they preferred not to quote so frequently, simply because they wanted their confession to stand on the *norma normans* in the same way as the Augsburg Confession. But as far as Luther was concerned, they were in total agreement with him, or he with them. The life of the Christian believer was to be filled with good works, according to the norm of the Ten Commandments, and not some self-chosen rule. These were fruits of the Spirit done freely, in faith. The same man who stood in the freedom of the Gospel saw himself willingly and without coercion under God's will, the Ten Commandments. He was free from sin's condemnation, but he was not free from good works; that would be a contradiction of the will of God for his sanctification of life. Accordingly, in the same commentary in which Luther stresses the righteousness which is ours before God through faith in Christ, he repeats over and over again, in tune with the apostle Paul, the urgency and spontaneity of good works, works that conform to the holy will of God, *ex praescripto verbi Dei,* according to the rule of God's Word.

The Nexus Indivulsus

The Christian, on the one hand, is the man who confronts the accusing Law of God with confident trust in his Savior and, as Luther states, stands unflinchingly on this platform:

> Law, you want to ascend into the realm of conscience and rule there. You want to denounce its sin and take away the joy of my heart, which I have through faith in Christ. You want to plunge me into despair, in order that I may perish. You are exceeding your jurisdiction. Stay within your limits, and exercise your dominion over the flesh. You shall not touch my conscience. For I am baptized; and through the Gospel I have been called to a fellowship of righteousness and eternal life, to the kingdom of Christ, in which my conscience is at peace, where there is no Law but only the forgiveness of sins,

> peace, quiet, happiness, salvation, and eternal life. Do not disturb me . . . In my conscience not the Law will reign, . . . but Christ, the sweet Savior.[67]

Immediately thereupon, on the other hand, Luther goes on to say:

> When I have this righteousness within me, I descend from heaven like the rain that makes the earth fertile. That is, I come forth into another kingdom, and I perform good works whenever the opportunity arises. If I am a minister of the Word, I preach, I comfort the saddened, I administer the sacraments. If I am a father, I rule my household and family, I train my children in piety and honesty. If I am a magistrate, I perform the office which I have received by divine command. If I am a servant, I faithfully tend to my master's affairs. In short, whoever knows for sure that Christ is his righteousness not only cheerfully and gladly works in his calling but also submits himself for the sake of love to magistrates, also to their wicked laws, and to everything else in this present life - even, if need be, to burden and danger. For he knows that God wants this and this obedience pleases Him.[68]

Thus Luther ties together, what must be tied together in a *nexus indivulsus,* justification and sanctification, passive righteousness and active righteousness, the righteousness of faith and the righteousness of works, alien righteousness and domestic righteousness, *gratia Dei propter Christum* and *gratia infusa.* There is no thought in Luther's mind that would ever qualify the Law's primary function as the accusatory instrument in God's hand in the slightest. It is like the yoke of an ox around the neck and upon the back, driving home the fact that "in the Law [we] are captives and oppressed by the yoke of bondage."[69] The Law unquestionably, as taught by the apostle Paul, is the letter that kills, the instrument of death.[70] But in that very same context the apostle also stresses, says Luther, that "apart from the matter of justification . . . we should think reverently of the Law."[71]

Faith, the Gospel, the righteousness which we have in Christ, these are the power behind the Christian believer's new life, renewal of life, or sanctification. The grace of God is like the water that is poured over the lime so "that the lime becomes hot."[72] "It is the lovely, joyous preaching of the Gospel of Christ," says Luther, which effects the following change: "Since human nature utterly lacks the ability to obey God, and yet God would have the Ten Commandments kept and obedience rendered to Him, He must undertake to change the old, disobedient, corrupt nature of man, must renew it and

create the sort of hearts, minds, and will that gladly and with pleasure render God a real and perfect obedience."[73] Even before he posted his famous Ninety-Five Theses, Luther had stated in his theses drawn up against scholasticism that "it is impossible to fulfill the law in any way without the grace of God."[74] To do the Law of God in a truly Christian manner, is to do it in faith. Because faith is the springboard from which works bound forth, Luther states:

> Therefore 'to do' is first to believe and so, through faith, to keep the Law. For we must receive the Holy Spirit; illumined and renewed by Him, we begin to keep the Law, to love God and our neighbor. But the Holy Spirit is not received through the Law—for 'those who are under the Law,' says Paul, 'are under the curse' —but through hearing with faith, that is, through the promise . . . Therefore, clearly and properly defined, 'to do' is simply to believe in Jesus Christ, and when the Holy Spirit has been received through faith in Christ, to do the things that are in the Law.[75]

Conclusion

We have these treasures in earthen vessels, it is true. But let us never grow dull in their appreciation. The distinctions which Luther and the other Confessors drew up on the Law and the Gospel, in all their singular splendor and marvelous interacting in the Christian's life, are truly of timeless, imperishable value. Sometimes that which is closest to us, we appreciate least. We grow so accustomed to it that it takes an unusual sort of twitting of the mind to bring it to full impact once more. Recently I received a letter from a lady who had been brought up, as she says, "quite strictly as a Seventh-day Adventist; my father was a church school teacher and a pastor; all my elementary, high school, and six years of college were in S.D.A. schools, and my husband was a theology student . . . Two years ago I had *no* concept of Christ's active obedience, [nor] of the relationship between law and gospel; the first five articles of the Formula of Concord are against teachings I used to believe. Although I knew I hoped to be saved by Christ's righteousness, this righteousness was understood as the obedience the Holy Spirit works in my life, which is identical with the Council of Trent. I am Lutheran primarily because of the clarity and centrality of justification and its carrying through in other doctrines."

I doubt that anyone could say it better. We have a legacy from the Confessors. It was they who set forth in such an ingenously simple way the distinction between Law and Gospel. They also laid bare the great tragedy that results, if this is not

done: "The Gospel is again transformed into a legal doctrine; the merit of Christ and the Holy Scripture are obscured, Christians are robbed of true comfort, and the doors are again opened for the papacy."[76]

This legacy is our inheritance from the Reformation. It was restored to the church through Luther's anguished struggle under a theology which had distorted the true and pure Word of God. We need to rededicate ourselves to the stance that Luther took in 1517 in Thesis 62 of his Ninety-Five Theses: "The true treasure of the church is the most holy gospel of the glory and grace of God." We will have to recognize and live with the hard facts that this Gospel is repugnant to man by nature and only the Law can drive home the need that we have for God's grace in Christ: "Dulcia non meminit, qui non gustavit amara" ("he who has never tasted the bitter will not remember the sweet").[77] "Thus with the sweetest names Christ is called my Law, my sin, and my death, . . . in order that He might redeem me from the curse of the Law, justify me, and make me alive."[78]

FOOTNOTES

1. Baker Book House has recently republished this classic in paperback, a reprint in three volumes of the sixth edition of Schaff's work.
2. *Ibid.*, I, p. 338.
3. The fascinating account of how more than 300 congregations of the fledgling Missouri Synod celebrated the 300th anniversary of the Formula of Concord is told in a remarkable chronicle of the event published that same year: *Denkmal der dritten Jubelfeier der Concordienformel* (St. Louis, 1877). Walther's entire sermon, pp. 223-244, as well as the sermons of other of the young synod's leading pastors, e.g., Friedrich Lochner, Heinrich C. Schwan, *et al.*, were reprinted *verbatim.* Many of the largest Lutheran centers held two and even three day celebrations on and around May 29, the anniversary date. The book depicts graphically the vibrant confession-minded nature of the Missouri Synod and of the Synodical Conference, the latter founded just five years earlier, in 1872, at Milwaukee.
4. *Op. cit.*, I, pp. 331, 336.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 337.
6. See Forell's essay, available through LCUSA offices.
7. *FC,* Rule and Norm, 10, 17.
8. *Ibid.*, 14.
9. *Ibid.*, 10-12.
10. Preface to Book of Concord, 11.
11. *FC,* Rule and Norm, 15
12. *Op. cit.*, I, p. 259.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 261.
15. *LW* 26, p. 312 (from his *Commentary on Galatians,* specifically chapter 3:19).

16. Delivered as evening lectures to the students at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, between Sept. 12, 1884 and Nov. 6, 1885. The German edition of these lectures appeared in 1897, and the English translation by W. H. T. Dau in 1929.
17. *Op. cit.*, p. 35; English translation as given in *Getting Into the Formula of Concord* by Eugene F. Klug, Concordia, St. Louis, 1977, p. 35.
18. Holsten Fagerberg observes with pertinence, however, that "with regard to its content, natural law coincides in a general way with the Decalog, which was thought to have been written on all men's hearts." *A New Look at the Lutheran Confessions* (Concordia, St. Louis, 1972) p. 65.
19. Apol. IV, 6.
20. *LC* I, 311.
21. Edmund Schlink, *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions* (Fortress, Philadelphia), 1961, p. 72. The quotation is from Luther's *Large Catechism,* LC I, 333.
22. In his second disputation against the Antinomians Luther emphasized this very point, stating: "The Decalog is not of Moses, nor did God give it to him first. On the contrary, the Decalog belongs to the whole world; it was written and engraved in the minds of all human beings from the beginning of the world." *WA* 39 I, p. 478. Translation by Ewald Plass, *What Luther Says* (Concordia, St. Louis, 1959), II, p. 748.
23. *SA* III, ii, 2.
24. *Ibid.*, 3.
25. Schlink, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
26. *SA* III, ii, 4.
27. *Ibid.*
28. Apol. IV, 28.
29. Apol. IV, 128, 295.
30. *Ibid.*
31. Cp. Rom. 5; Ps. 5:4; Eph. 2:3.
32. *Op. cit.*, p. 76.
33. True it is, of course, that neither Melanchthon nor Chemnitz had actually sat at Luther's feet as students. Melanchthon learned as Luther's colleague, working at his elbow; Chemnitz pored through Luther's writings from beginning to end during a crucial self-instruction period of his life while librarian at the ducal library in Koenigsberg (1550-1553).
34. *LW* 26, p. 9.
35. In his rightly famous *Bondage of the Will* Luther discourses eloquently on this crucial difference: "No man can make any advance towards righteousness by his works . . . The other righteousness is that of faith, and consists, not in any works, but in the gracious favor and reckoning of God." Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will,* ed. and tr. by J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston (Westwood, N.J.: Revell, 1957), p. 296.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
37. *Ibid.*
38. *LW 26,* p. 306.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 309.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 310.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 312.
42. *LW* 31, p. 54.
43. *LW* 26, p. 312f.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 313.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 315.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 316.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
48. Already in the Ninety-Five Theses, 1517, Luther had begun to clarify very well the distinction between Law and Gospel. This was especially evident in his comments on Thesis 62, which Gordon Rupp has called "the noblest of them all." Luther stated: "Through the law we have nothing except an evil conscience, a restless heart, a troubled breast because of our sins, which the law points out but does not take away. And we ourselves cannot take it away. Therefore for those of us who are held captive, who are overwhelmed by sadness and in dire despair, the light of the gospel comes and says, 'Fear not' (Is. 35,4) 'Comfort, comfort my people' (Is. 40:1). . ., 'behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world' (John 1, 29). Behold that one who along fulfils the law for you, whom God has made to be your righteousness, sanctification, wisdom, and redemption, for all those who believe in him (1 Cor. 1, 30)." *LW* 31, p. 231.
49. AC XX, 9.
50. *LC* II, 31, 37; Apol. IV, 57; XXI, 19.
51. *Op. cit.*, 84.
52. *Ibid.*
53. Apol. IV, 101.
54. *Op. cit.*, pp. 83-87 *passim.* The Apology, with its "unicum esse sacrificium Christi," stresses the wondrous truth that it was Christ's sacrifice for sins on the cross, and no other, that won forgiveness for man, all men. The objective nature of this atoning work of Christ is clearly taught by the Confessions. The Apology (IV, 75f.), for example, underscores that "forgiveness of sins is the same as justification." To that same point Schlink speaks: "By forgiving the sins of the sinner God justifies him. By receiving 'forgiveness of sins' the sinner receives 'righteousness before God.' AC IV, 1. Forgiveness of sins and justification are not only repeatedly used side by side, but there are also interchanged promiscuously." *Op. cit.*, p. 91f.
55. Schlink, *op. cit.*, p. 98. Cp. Apol. IV, 44, 48, 71, 142, 163, 211, 214ff; AC XX, 25, 26.
56. Cp. AC V, 2; SA II, 16; Apol. IV, 99.
57. Agricola Asserted that the Law belonged in the courthouse and not in the church. Luther spoke directly to this mistaken notion in his six disputations against the Antinomians. Cp. also his Genesis commentary where Luther states: "So . . . the Law is not to be preached in the church, . . . for they say that their consciences are burdened when they listen to such sermons . . . Shall we, then, let everybody do what he pleases and pronounce him blessed to boot?" (*LW* 3, p. 222)
58. *LW* 47, p. 110.
59. *Epit.* V, 11; translation from *Getting Into the Formula of Concord,* p. 88.
60. His personal grudge against Luther and Melanchthon, chiefly because he did not get the appointment to the Wittenberg faculty at the time it went to Melanchthon, is well known. He carried on his vendetta with especially sharp vigor after Luther's death, and the antinomianism which he had long harbored and peddled now ran rampant, without Luther's forceful presence to squelch it.
61. *FC* VI, 9.
62. *FC* VII, 14.

63. *FC* VI, 17.
64. *Epit.* VI, 7.
65. Whether Luther ever used this term is of no consequence. The important thing is that he always taught the concept. Elert is quite in error when he challenges the latter, as is also Ebeling, apparently also Bornkamm, and most recently, Wm. Lazareth at the Valparaiso convocation on the Formula of Concord.
66. *LW* 27, p. 82.
67. *LW* 26, p. 11.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 11f.
69. *LW* 27, p. 7.
70. *LW* 26, p. 362.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 365.
72. *LW* 27, p. 276.
73. *LW* 13, p. 289f. (from Luther's commentary on Ps. 110:3).
74. *LW* 31, p.14. Thesis 68.
75. *LW* 26, p. 255 (from Luther's commentary on Gal. 3:10).
76. *Epit.* V, 11.
77. *LW* 26, p. 329.
78. *LW* 26, p. 163.

Christian Apologetics in the Light of the Lutheran Confessions

John Warwick Montgomery

"What indeed has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" queried the church father Tertullian,[1] expecting a negative as the only possible answer. In the same vein one might ask, "What indeed has apologetics to do with the Lutheran Confessions?" A confession is, after all, a public declaration of belief, not an argument. The very title given in 1580 to the official collection of Lutheran confessional writings was *Concordia: Book of Concord*—suggesting the peace and unity of common belief, not the disputatious refutation of other viewpoints.

And even if the controversial nature of material in the *Concordia* is recognized, must one not also admit that the controversies leading up to it occurred strictly within Christendom—between the Lutherans, on the one hand, and the Roman Catholics, the Sacramentarians, etc., on the other—not between Christians and unbelievers?[2] Aside from a few passing references to the "Turks," the Lutheran Confessions seem largely unaware of the existence, beyond the confines of internal Christian doctrinal discussion, of a world of unbelief to which apologetic argument ought to be addressed. Could one not apply to the Confessions with even greater force the tongue-in-cheek remark made concerning Thomas Aquinas, that when he wrote his *Summa Contra Gentiles* (his apologetic against the pagans) he had never met a pagan? In short, is not the *Book of Concord* simply a compendium of Christian belief-statements, written for an audience of believers, and is not its range of controversy limited to the correction of false doctrine within the narrow sphere of Christian profession? If so, the apologetic significance of the *Concordia* would seem, *ipso facto,* to be minimal at best.

There is another side to the matter, however. It is widely agreed that even the Ecumenical Creeds of the Patristic age, which are incorporated into the *Book of Concord* and form its first section, arose in a context of disputation and set forth orthodox doctrine in specific contradistinction to such heresies as Arianism and non-Christian belief-systems as Gnosticism.[3] Could not one go so far as to say that a true confession is always at the same time an apologia?

The very title of one of the chief Lutheran confessional writings, the *Apology of the Augsburg Confession,* displays a

concern that goes well beyond the mere proclamation of a theological position. Professor Allbeck does not exaggerate when he declares:

> Looking back from our time to the sixteenth century, we see the Apology as an outstanding example of the theological writing of the Reformation age. Those who would sample the literary style and the patterns of thinking of that day would do well to read the Apology. . . . The purpose of the Apology to defend the Confession, and with it the gospel doctrine, against a specific opponent was accompanied by a vigorous mood. For the Apology is a piece of polemical writing.[4]

Indeed, the tone of the Reformation Lutheran Confessions in general, with their constant stress on refuting "antitheses" as well as setting forth "theses," reveals a veritable preoccupation with the defense of sound teaching over against falsehood. Leonhard Hutter's great work, *Concordia Concors: De Origine et Progressu Formulae Concordiae,* appropriately begins with a book-length "Praefatio Apologetica," refuting views such as those of the Calvinist Hospinian.[5]

And if such considerations are regarded merely as further proof that the Lutherans, even when engaged in controversy, never went beyond intra-Christian disputation, it must not be forgotten that in those days doctrinal dispute was taken so seriously that particularly offensive views, even though maintained by professing Christians, were refuted as non-Christian. At Marburg Luther did not shrink from declaring that the sacramentarian views of Zwingli manifested another Christ from his own, and the Confessions retain this same perspective.[6] The *Book of Concord,* holding that justification by grace through faith is the "article by which the church stands or falls," classes Roman Catholic doctrinal works-righteousness as nothing short of Antichristic. When the Lutheran Confessions engage in apologetic controversy, they speak not primarily to minor internal differences within Christendom but more especially to fundamental issues dividing the true church from varieties of pseudo-Christian religiosity. The Lutheran Confessions do not tilt against windmills; they endeavor to storm the bastions of serious religious aberration.

And is this not what one would expect, after all? In my essay, "Lutheran Theology and the Defense of Biblical Faith," I have shown that both Luther himself and the Lutheran theologians of the Age of Orthodoxy maintained vigorous apologetic principles.[7] It would be strange indeed if the Lutheran Confessions—which historically link Luther and the Orthodox theologians together and whose authors include students of Luther and Melanchthon (such as David Chytraeus)

and Orthodox fathers in their own right (e.g., Martin Chemnitz)—were not to display the apologetic perspective and concerns of those who preceded and followed them in the same theological tradition.[8]

But deduction from "historical necessity" is a notoriously unreliable way to answer factual questions. We must turn from general speculation to the Lutheran Confessions themselves to see what degree of apologetic insight they manifest.

How Apologetic Are the Lutheran Confessions?

The task of the Christian apologist may be said to embrace three major activities: (1) clarification (he defends the faith by disabusing the unbeliever of misconceptions concerning its nature), (2) refutation (he defends the faith by showing the fallacies and unworthiness of opposing positions), and (3) positive argumentation (he defends the faith by offering positive reasons to accept the Christian world-view in preference to other philosophical or religious options).[9] To what extent, if any, does the *Book of Concord* engage in apologetic activity along these lines?

Undeniably present throughout the Lutheran Confessions are arguments of a clarifying and refutory nature in defense of biblical religion. Among innumerable examples of attempts to defend the orthodox position by clarifying its true nature is the following:

> We herewith condemn without any qualification the Capernaitic eating of the body of Christ as though one rent Christ's flesh with one's teeth and digested it like other food. The Sacramentarians deliberately insist on crediting us with this doctrine, against the witness of their own consciences over our many protests, in order to make our teaching obnoxious to their hearers. On the contrary, in accord with the simple words of Christ's testament, we hold and believe in a true, though supernatural, eating of Christ's body and drinking of his blood, which we cannot comprehend with our human sense or reason.[10]

Negative, refutory arguments are even more frequent. We have already noted the standard inclusion of "antitheses" throughout the *Concordia.* In the Preface written both for the *Formula of Concord* and for the whole *Book of Concord,* Jakob Andreae and Martin Chemnitz spend considerable time expressly justifying such material. "Condemnations," they declare, "cannot by any means be avoided," for (as Andreae noted in a marginal revision to the printed draft) "the responsibility devolves upon the theologians and ministers duly to remind even those who err ingenuously and ignorantly of the

danger to their souls and to warn them against it, lest one blind person let himself be misled by another." Typical of the refutory argumentation of the Confessions is the *Formula of Concord's* direct citation of Luther (*WA*, XXVI, pp. 321-22):

> If Zwingli's *alloeosis* stands, then Christ will have to be two persons, one a divine and the other a human person, since Zwingli applies all the texts concerning the passion only to the human nature and completely excludes them from the divine nature. But if the works are divided and separated, the person will also have to be separated, since all the doing and suffering are not ascribed to the natures but to the person. It is the person who does and suffers everything, the one thing according to this nature and the other thing according to the other nature, all of which scholars know right well. Therefore we regard our Lord Christ as God and man in one person, neither confounding the natures nor dividing the person.[11]

To be sure, those who question the apologetic character of the Lutheran Confessions will not be especially disturbed by the presence of clarifying or refutory arguments in these documents—even when such arguments appear there with great frequency (as they do). The real issue will be said to lie with the third type of apologetic reasoning as set forth above, viz., the presence or absence of *positive proofs*, consciously designed to convince an unbelieving opponent through the marshalling of facts and evidence in behalf of orthodox religious truth. Proofs of this kind are held by many to be not only absent but in fact utterly foreign to the teaching of the Confessions. "Proving the faith," we are told, contradicts confessional Lutheranism in the following respects: (1) it gives reason a place in man's salvation and therefore constitutes a return of the dog to the vomit of works-righteousness; (2) it elevates "historical knowledge" (*fides historica*) to the level of saving faith and ignores the monergistic work of the Holy Spirit in salvation; (3) it disregards the total depravity produced by the fall and the noetic effects of original sin; and (4) it is oblivious of the fact that Scripture does not make sense to the unbeliever through argumentation but solely through illumination of the Spirit and the influence of justification by grace through faith.

If this is indeed the viewpoint of the Confessions, a positive Lutheran apologetic would admittedly be excluded on principle: at best the confessional Lutheran could only defend his position by attempting to remove misconceptions concerning it or by endeavoring to point out fallacies in his opponents' reasoning. (Indeed, as I have maintained elsewhere,[12] the problem for the witnessing Christian would be far more acute, for the just-

stated understanding of total depravity as precluding meaningful positive argument to the sinner would *also* make any clarifications or refutations correspondingly ineffective when presented to him!) But we shall quickly see that the Confessions do not at all require us to avoid positive apologetic argument. Let us analyze confessionally each of the four points raised.

(1) *The problem of reason.* Every Lutheran is familiar with Luther's explanation of the Third Article of the Apostles' Creed in his *Small Catechism:* "I believe that by my own reason or strength I cannot believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to him."[13] Does this mean that a rational defense of the faith—any positive apologetic for Christian truth—turns out to be superfluous at best and highly dangerous at worst? Edmund Schlink comments:

> The opinion that man can arrive at a true knowledge of divine matters on the basis of human thought and emotion is again and again traced in the most diverse doctrines of the opponents, refuted, and finally made ridiculous. All this is only *"multa fingere,"* to "invent many things in one's own brain," which leads only to such opinions as are "totally unfounded in Scripture and touch neither above nor below" (Ap. XII, 178). Reason cannot even come to a knowledge of original sin, but this "must be believed because of the revelation in the Scriptures" (S.A. III, i, 3).[14]

Indeed, the Confessions seem to exclude reason from even a preparatory role in the evangelistic task: "There is no power or ability, no cleverness or reason, with which we can prepare ourselves for righteousness and life or seek after it."[15]

But a closer look at the Confessional passages just cited will show that they do not condemn reason (in the sense of the rational process) as such: they condemn a particular *misuse* of man's rational faculty. What this misuse is will become plainer from other references in the *Concordia.*

The *Apology* roundly criticizes those "scholastics, Pharisees, philosophers, and Mohammedans" who "reason" that justification can be attained through the law. Such "reasoning" is just another name for "human wisdom," and is the exact opposite of "the foolishness of the Gospel": "We know how repulsive this teaching is to the judgment of reason and law and that the teaching of the law about love is more plausible; for this is human wisdom."[16] What is being condemned here is a non-Christian value system which passes itself off as "rational" but which in reality is one hundred and eighty degrees removed from true wisdom. As would later occur in the eighteenth century "Age of Reason" (the misnamed

"Enlightenment"), the idea of rationality was being elevated to the status of a philosophy of life, and a anti-Scriptural philosophy at that. The Lutheran Confessions are simply declaring that they will tolerate no such competition with God's saving message.

What did the scholastics' pseudo-rational value system entail? In a word, works-righteousness. When the Confessions set the Gospel over against "reason," they are employing the word "reason" as a synonym for works-righteousness. "Blind reason," says Luther in the *Smalcald Articles,* "seeks consolation in its own works."[17] Throughout the long article on Justification in the *Apology* the same emphasis is to be found: "The scholastics have followed the philosophers. Thus they teach only the righteousness of reason—that is, civil works—and maintain that without the Holy Spirit reason can love God above all things."[18] "It is false that by its own strength reason can love God. . . . Reason cannot free us from our sins or merit for us the forgiveness of sins."[19] "Being blind to the uncleanness of the heart, reason thinks that it pleases God if it does good."[20] Here, reason is not being rejected *per se*; it is being rejected only when it evinces the irrational pretention to self-salvation.

Since man is incapable of saving himself, his only hope lies in a revelation from God. God's thoughts are higher than man's thoughts (Is. 55:9), so God's Word will necessarily contain truths that go beyond man's comprehension. The *Book of Concord,* while never suggesting that Christian revelation contradicts good reasoning, emphasizes that when Scripture does transcend man's rational categories it must be accepted anyway. Thus human reason needs to bow to God's transcendent truth in such areas as the depth and extent of original sin,[21] predestination,[22] our Lord's descent into hell,[23] and his real presence in the Holy Eucharist.[24]

In technical theological parlance, the *Concordia* rejects not the *ministerial,* but the *magisterial* use of reason. "We take our intellect captive in obedience to Christ," declare the authors of the *Formula.*[25] As long as reason is brought into genuine captivity to Christ, and is not allowed to usurp a self-justifying role in the salvatory operation, the Confessions in no way exclude its apologetic use. Indeed, major confessional authors such as David Chytraeus were so emphatic in marshalling proofs for biblical revelation that they have made orthodox Lutherans of our own day a bit uncomfortable.[26]

(2) *The problem of "historical knowledge."* Nonetheless, it is argued that the depreciation of *fides historica* by the Lutheran Confessions renders apologetic argument of little or no consequence. If the Holy Spirit and not factual knowledge does the

saving, what possible good can apologetics serve?

One must note first of all that the *Concordia* does not reject historical knowledge as such, any more than it rejects reason as such. In virtually every instance where the *Book of Concord* speaks negatively of the *fides historica,* it carefully qualifies the condemnation (generally by the words "merely" or "only"), as in the following typical examples from the *Apology*: "Our opponents imagine that faith is *only* historical knowledge"; "The faith of which the apostles speak is not *idle* knowledge, but a thing that receives the Holy Spirit and justifies us"; "As we have often said, faith is not *merely* knowledge but rather a desire to accept and grasp what is offered in the promise of Christ"; "We are not talking about *idle* knowledge, such as even the demons have"; "Faith is not *merely* knowledge in the intellect but also trust in the will"; "The scholastics . . . interpret faith as *merely* a knowledge of history or of dogmas, not as the power that grasps the promise of grace and righteousness, quickening the heart amid the terrors of sin and death."[27]

What is here being taught becomes particularly plain in the Latin text of the *Augsburg Confession,* where we read: "The term 'faith' does not signify *merely* knowledge of the history (such as is in the ungodly and the devil), but it signifies faith which believes not only the history but also the effect of the history."[28] The Roman Catholic opposition had restricted the meaning of "faith" to factual, historical knowledge of saving truth so as to be able to argue that works were also essential to salvation; therefore the Confessional writers had to point out that the proper biblical understanding of faith, as set forth by Saint Paul, embraced "not only the history but also the effect of the history."[29] This did not mean, however, that the Confessions were denigrating historical knowledge! The Lutheran fathers were anything but *Schwaermer* or modern existential mystics. They believed thoroughly that the assent (*assensus*) and trust (*fiducia*) elements of faith had to be grounded in objective knowledge (*notitia*).[30]

Such knowledge could go only so far: it could not justify or save; only the Holy Spirit imparting faith to the heart could do that. But since the Spirit works through the Word, and since the Word sets forth accurate historical knowledge of Christ's life and saving work, the Confessions hardly preclude the apologetic use of such evidence. Historical knowledge, like reason, can be misused by sinful man; but it—again like reason—can be brought into obedience to Christ and employed ministerially to persuade men to accept the historical Christ as Lord of their personal history.

(3) *The problem of original sin.* But what value can

apologetic arguments have—even if based upon sound logic and historical fact—when the sinner is incapable of appreciating them and is actively engaged in twisting them to justify himself? Schlink understands the Confessions to paint such a picture; his discussion is worth quoting in extenso:

> God is hidden from the empirical observation of human reality. He is completely hidden behind the *simul* of creatureliness and corruption. Neither God the Creator nor God the exacting Lawgiver, neither God's love nor God's wrath can be recognized in this fallen world. . . .
>
> At first glance this seems to be contradicted when it is occasionally said of "man's reason or natural intellect" in a subordinate clause, ". . . although man's reason or natural intellect still has a dim spark of the knowledge that there is a God, as well as of the teaching of the law (Rom. 1:19 ff.)" (S.D. II, 9; cf. V, 22). A similar thought is hidden in the expressions concerning the loss of the *"notitia Dei certior"* of paradise (Ap. II, 17), where already the German text, however, passes over the problem of the comparative. How do the Confessions arrive at equating this "spark" of the knowledge of God with ignorance of God?
>
> This question occupied the Confessions surprisingly little. They give no direct answer. The problem involved in the natural knowledge of God is treated in the Confessions as so unimportant and insignificant that apparently no need of harmonizing the opposing formulations was felt. Only indirectly can we seek to attain clarity in the matter. . . .
>
> By analogy, then, we may say of the natural knowledge of God in general:
>
> a) Man has a "dim spark of the *knowledge that there is a God*" (S.D. II, 9).
>
> b) This knowledge, however, is only "a dim spark," an indefinite and general knowing.
>
> c) As soon as man tries to take this vague knowing seriously and to put it into practice concretely by calling God by name and devising a ritual for him, he only falls more deeply into sin with his natural obedience to the law and does not come to God but to idols. . . .
>
> Thus natural man knows that there is a God but not who God is, and so he does not know God the Creator. He knows in part what is demanded but not who demands it, and therefore he does not recognize God's wrath. He knows neither God nor his own reality; the

> innate internal uncleanness of human nature is not seen by him, and "this cannot be adjudged except from the Word of God" (Ap. II, 13; cf. 34). "This hereditary sin is so deep a corruption of nature that reason cannot understand it. It must be believed because of the revelation in the Scriptures" (S.A. III, i, 3; cf. also Ep. I, 9; S.D. I, 8). Original sin is "ultimately the worst damage . . . , that we shall not only endure God's eternal wrath and death but that we do not even realize what we are suffering" (S.D. I, 62). Thereby our creatureliness too is hidden from the natural knowledge.[31]

Schlink's catena of passages from the *Book of Concord* showing the effect of man's fall upon his natural knowledge of God is a fair and accurate one, but the general interpretation he places upon these passages is too extreme. The Confessions deal with this issue to make clear beyond all doubt that no natural knowledge on the part of fallen man is capable of bringing him to salvation. Natural knowledge has precisely the same limitations as reason or historical knowledge: not one of them or all of them in combination can form a ladder reaching to heaven. The *Smalcald Articles* declare it to be "nothing but error and stupidity" to hold "that after the fall of Adam the natural powers of man have remained whole and uncorrupted, and that man by nature possesses a right understanding and a good will, as the philosophers teach."[32] Salvation is a gift, and is brought home to the heart only by the sovereign work of God the Holy Spirit.

But it by no means follows that in the *Concordia* "God is hidden from the empirical observation of human reality." As Schlink admits (grudgingly), the authors of the Confessions allow the natural man knowledge that there is a God; and their overwhelming emphasis on the reality of the incarnation—the personal union of the divine and human natures—makes them the strongest possible supporters of the biblical affirmation that God submitted to the "empirical observation of human reality" by becoming true Man in Jesus Christ.

Thus there is nothing in the Confessions which would in principle militate against the use of apologetic arguments for God's existence from nature, or for the deity of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ from empirical observation of His resurrection appearances, or for the inspiration of Scripture from fulfilled prophecy and other external proofs—as long as such arguments do not purport to substitute for the Spirit's converting work in the heart. As already noted, the orthodox Lutheran theologians of the post-Reformation time—including authors of the confessional documents—feel comfortable with

apologetic arguments of this kind; indeed they seem driven to use them because of their great concern to employ every legitimate means to bring men to the Savior and to His revealed truth (cf. I Cor. 9:22; I Pet. 3:15).

(4) *The problem of spiritual illumination.* Yet does not the *Book of Concord* teach that the very scriptural revelation God gives to a fallen race remains a closed book until the sinner's eyes have been opened—not by argument, but by God's Spirit who teaches him to read it from the vantage point of justification by grace through faith? Again let us hear Schlink:

> Without the knowledge of the Gospel the Bible remains unintelligible and useless. Only from the Gospel do all individual statements of Scripture receive their proper place and meaning. Erasmus, Zwingli, the peasants, and the Enthusiasts had also waged their battle with Bible quotations, as did also the Roman adversaries. By means of Scripture texts employed "in either a philosophical or a Jewish manner" it is possible to abolish the certainty of faith and to exclude Christ as mediator (Ap. IV, 376). Only in the light of the Gospel can we determine which words of Scripture are commands and promises, which words serve to terrify or to comfort, which words are valid for us as God's commandments, and which commandments of the Old Testament have been abolished by Christ. Only by faith in the Gospel can Scripture be interpreted correctly, that is, by receiving the benefits secured for us by the crucified Christ.[33]

What we have said repeatedly earlier in this paper applies here with equal force: the Confessions will not allow a man to save himself by any work, rational, cognitive—or even biblical! The sinner cannot pull himself up to heaven by the bootstraps of his own ability to interpret the Scriptures. God alone can give fallen man the illumination necessary to comprehend the Bible in a salvatory way.

However, the *Book of Concord* never suggests—as Schlink does—the modern Neo-Orthodox teaching that the Bible possesses no inherent clarity, but somehow waits for the Spirit's work on the heart to acquire the meaning God intended for it. After discussing a number of biblical passages and their relationship to justification by grace through faith, the *Apology* bluntly says: "No sane man can judge otherwise."[34] Then Melanchthon goes on to quote Romans 10:10 and states: "Here we think that our opponents will grant that the mere act of confessing does not save, but that it saves only because of faith in the heart."[35] Later the same confessional writing utters the following imprecation: "May God destroy these wicked sophists

who so sinfully twist the Word of God to suit their vain dreams!"[36]

Such passages from the *Concordia* show beyond question that the confessional authors believed that Scripture is inherently perspicuous—that it speaks clearly and ought to say exactly the same thing to their opponents as it did to them. If it did not, the reason was simply that the opposition twisted it by sinful sophistry. Indeed, it should be obvious that had the confessional writers not been convinced that the Bible could speak clearly and persuasively to their opponents, they would not have gone to the trouble of continually presenting and arguing from Scriptural texts!

And since their opponents were particularly of the Roman Catholic camp and therefore did not believe in justification by grace through faith, the confessional authors could not have cited Scripture against them and at the same time have held the Bible to be a closed book to those who had not already accepted the Scriptural teaching on justification. They believed that the Bible itself was capable of convincing their opponents as to the proper view of justification, and they quoted it to that end.

Likewise with the Sacramentarians. In arguing for Christ's real presence in the Holy Eucharist, the *Formula of Concord* stresses that the words of Scripture are clear and plain and that the only reasonable course for any Bible reader to take is to accept Jesus' own understanding and interpretation of Scripture:

> There is, of course, no more faithful or trustworthy interpreter of the words of Jesus Christ than the Lord Christ himself, who best understands his words and heart and intention and is best qualified from the standpoint of wisdom and intelligence to explain them. In the institution of his last will and testament and of his abiding covenant and union, he uses no flowery language but the most appropriate, simple, indubitable, and clear words, just as he does in all the articles of faith and in the institution of other covenant-signs and signs of grace or sacraments, such as circumcision, the many kinds of sacrifice in the Old Testament, and holy Baptism. And so that no misunderstanding could creep in, he explained things more clearly by adding the words, "given for you, shed for you."

In sum, though only the Holy Spirit can apply Biblical texts in a salvatory way to human hearts, believers can and should employ Scripture to convince unbelievers of the nature and truth of God's message. Good interpretation can be distinguished from bad interpretation in such a way as to lead

opponents to discover the meaning of the Biblical texts. Both an apologetic for Scripture and an apologetic through Scripture must be seen as compatible with the *Book of Concord.*

Fundamental Apologetic Axioms in the Lutheran Confessions and Their Contemporary Application

Admittedly, we have done no more than to show that the *Concordia* opens the door to apologetic operations. Can we go beyond this point (which, *nota bene,* should not be minimized, considering the number of anti-apologetic Lutherans who have tried to eliminate all apologetics on the basis of supposed confessional teaching!), and find positive apologetic substance in the *Book of Concord*? To be sure, we should not expect to discover any general programmatic against unbelief in confessional documents composed before the rise of modern secularism in the eighteenth century.[38] But we can derive from the *Concordia* a fundamental apologetic axiom-set which will serve as a kind of template outlining the characteristics which a truly confessional apologetic would need to display. Wittgenstein observed that though the propositions of logic do not describe the world they do serve as a "scaffolding" to show the shape of the world;[39] the Lutheran Confessions, *mutatis mutandis,* do not provide an apologetic for an age of unbelief, but they can display the shape such an apologetic ought to have to be Scripturally meaningful and doctrinally sound. We shall list the fundamental apologetic axioms derivable from the *Book of Concord,* and then, on the basis of them, say a few words as to the apologetic challenge facing confessional Lutheranism today.

(i) *Fallen man retains the ability to reason deductively—to employ logic.* Note how, throughout the Confessions, when bad reasoning is condemned, proper logic is offered as a substitute and opponents are expected to respond to its force:

> If the old witch, Dame Reason, the grandmother of the *alloeosis,* would say that the deity surely cannot suffer and die, then you must answer and say: That is true, but since the divinity and humanity are one person in Christ, the Scriptures ascribe to the deity, because of this personal union, all that happens to the humanity, and vice versa. And this is likewise within the bounds of truth, for you must say that the person (pointing to Christ) suffers, dies. But this person is truly God, and therefore it is correct to say: the Son of God suffers. Although, so to speak, the one part (namely, the deity) does not suffer, nevertheless the person who is true God suffers in the other part (namely, in the humanity). For the Son of God truly is crucified for us—that is, this

person who is God, for that is what he is—this person, I say, is crucified according to the humanity.[40]

(ii) *Fallen man also retains the ability to reason inductively—to draw correct factual inferences from empirical data.* The Augsburg Confession quotes approvingly from the pseudo-Augustinian *Hypognosticon*: "We concede that all men have a free will which enables them to make judgments according to reason,"[41] and the *Apology* comments: "Human nature still has reason and judgment about the things that the senses can grasp."[42] The Confessions evidently regard the inferential functioning of man's mind, in regard both to logic and to facts, as an aspect of the human essence. Man did not lose this essence when he fell, for had he done so he would have ceased to be human. The *Concordia* guards itself carefully from the Flacian error—the gross doctrinal mistake of Matthew Flacius, who in attempting definitively to answer the semi-Pelagians and synergists, toppled into the opposite error of holding that Adam's fall resulted in a different essence in man.[43]

(iii) *A common ground of logic and fact unites believer and unbeliever, so that the believer can persuasively employ the unbeliever's own reasoning against him.* Note how the *Apology* engages in just such an argumentative process in the following passage:

> Where is the "divinely instituted order that we should take refuge in the help of the saints"?. . . Perhaps they derive this "order" from the usage at royal courts, where friends must be used as intercessors. But if a king has appointed a certain intercessor, he does not want appeals to be addressed to him through others. Since Christ has been appointed as our intercessor and high priest, why seek others?[44]

(iv) *The common ground of logic and fact uniting believer and unbeliever permits the effective use of analogy-reasoning to convince the unbeliever.* In the same section of the *Apology* from which the preceding illustration is taken, Melanchthon offers this persuasive analogy-argument for the biblical doctrine of propitiation, as against the invocation of saints:

> If one pays a debt for one's friend, the debtor is freed by the merit of another as though it were his own. Thus the merits of Christ are bestowed on us so that when we believe in him we are accounted righteous by our trust in Christ's merits as though we had merits of our own.[45]

(v) As demonstrated in detail in the previous section of this paper, the Confessions hold that *fallen man is capable of acquiring natural knowledge of God's existence, historical knowledge ("fides historica") of Biblical events, and un-*

derstanding as to the meaning of the perspicuous Scriptural text.

(vi) However, the Confessions are even more concerned to emphasize, as we have seen, that *none of the above capacities of the unregenerate man* (or any other abilities he may possess, for that matter) *are such as to permit him to mend his broken God-relationship: the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit alone, converts men to Christ.* "To be born anew, to receive inwardly a new heart, mind, and spirit, is solely the work of the Holy Spirit."[46]

Now what kind of apologetic approach ought today's confessional Lutheran to build on this axiomatic foundation? Let us be very clear, first of all, as to what approach he must *not* take. He must not fall into the trap of *presuppositionalism* or *apriorism* so attractive to orthodox Calvinists of the Dutch school (Van Til, Dooyeweerd, *et al.*). Even the ostensibly milder, revisionist presuppositionalism advocated in Reymond's provocative little work, *The Justification of Knowledge,* cannot be accepted by a confessional Lutheran. Reymond correctly sees that Van Til's epistemology destroys the divinely created common ground between believer and unbeliever: "The solution to all of Van Til's difficulties is to affirm, as Scripture teaches, that both God and man share the same concept of truth and the same theory of language."[47] But Reymond still rejects any positive apologetic to the unbeliever on the theory that the universe of facts and possible interpretations is so vast that the unbeliever can consistently interpret all evidence in line with his sinful presuppositions.

The *Book of Concord* much more wisely perceived that the unbeliever, living in the same universe with the Christian and using the same inferential faculties of mind, should respond to reasoning that proceeds by analogy from ordinary decision-making in secular affairs to the meaning and significance of biblical evidence. If the unbeliever refuses to do so, he acts irrationally by analogy with his ordinary experience and displays his *real* reason for rejecting the truth; not intellectual dissatisfaction but willful egocentricity.

Here, on the basis of the apologetic axioms of the *Concordia,* the contemporary Lutheran apologist begins to discover his battle plan. What will be its characteristics?

The Lutheran apologist will not be afraid to "become all things to all men that by all means some may be saved": convinced of the common ground of logic and fact between believer and unbeliever, he will argue by analogy that bad reasoning leads to religious heresy just as it produces catastrophe in the secular realm, and that the same good reasoning as is essential to survival in ordinary life, if applied

to religious issues, will vindicate the Holy Scriptures and their Christ.

The contemporary confessional apologist will not be afraid of developing effective modern arguments for God's existence (such as is afforded by the application of the classical contingency proof to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, or such as Peter Berger creates on a sociological base in his *Rumor of Angels*); but—in line with the fundamental stress of Lutheran theology on the incarnation, the Gospel, and the Cross—he will especially endeavor to provide a case for the deity of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ beginning from, but not limited to, the *fides historica.*[48]

Rather than giving today's religious seeker the impression that the Missouri Synod's uncompromising stand on the inerrancy of the Bible is an aprioristic asylum of invincible ignorance, the Lutheran apologist will offer the best evidence in support of our Lord's own assertion that Scripture cannot be broken.

Finally, the confessional apologist will see himself not as a Holy-Spirit-substitute but as a John the Baptist in the wilderness of a secular age, preparing the way of the Lord, making the paths intellectually straight which lead to the Lamb of God—to the only One who can take away the sins of the world.

Admittedly, such an apologetic is not provided, full-blown, in the *Book of Concord.* Apologetics speaks to the fallen man, and the *Zeitgeist* constantly changes. There is no absolute apologetic; the apologetic task faces each generation of Christians anew. But we of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod have taken a giant step forward to meet that challenge. A Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. news release of December 1, 1977, quotes the report of a five-year official LCUSA theological study observing that "the LCA and ALC have not felt it necessary to adopt doctrinal statements in addition to the confessional articles. The LCMS, on the other hand, has reserved for itself the right to restate its positions on doctrinal matters throughout its history."

The Missouri Synod has rightly seen that modern secularism requires new confessional responses; she has not been intimidated into accepting modern heresies such as result from the application of historical-critical hermeneutics just because the sixteenth century Confessions antedated them. Surely, then, in the realm of apologetics—a domain far less static than dogmatics—we can no longer employ our theology as the fundamentalists do their sociological blue laws, to wall the church off from the real challenges of the age. Only the Word of God remains forever; nothing else is changeless. Now that

our battle for the Bible has been won, let us with apologetic vigor show modern secular man that the Holy Scriptures still have the last Word.

FOOTNOTES

1. Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum,* VII.
2. Cf. Johann Georg Walch, *Introductio in Libros Ecclesiae Lutheranae Symbolicos, observationibus historicis et theologicis illustrata* (Ienae [Jena]: sumtu viduae Meyer, 1732).
3. See, *inter alia,* the writings of J. N. D. Kelly (*Early Christian Creeds*; *Early Christian Doctrines: The Athanasian Creed*).
4. W. D. Allbeck, *Studies in the Lutheran Confessions* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1952), pp. 142-43.
5. Leonhard Hutter, *Concordia Concors: De Origine et Progressu Formulae Concordiae* (Witebergae [Wittenberg]: Clement Berger, 1614).
6. See Hermann Sasse, *This Is My Body* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1959), pp. 148-55.
7. Published in Swedish in *Ditt Ord ar Sanning: En Handbok om Bibeln, tillagnad David Hedegaard,* ed. Seth Erlandsson ("Biblicums Skriftserie," 2; Uppsala: Stiftelsen Biblicum, 1971), pp. 234-58. Available in English in the *Lutheran Synod Quarterly,* XI, 1 (Special Issue; Fall, 1970), and in John Warwick Montgomery, *Faith Founded on Fact* (New York and Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1978).
8. Cf. Montgomery, *Chytraeus on Sacrifice* (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 1962); Montgomery, *Cross and Crucible* ("Archives Internationales d'Histoire des Idees," 55; The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 2 vols.; and Montgomery, "Chemnitz on the Council of Trent," in *Soli Deo Gloria: Essays in Reformed Theology*; *Festschrift for John H. Gerstner,* ed. R. C. Sproul (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1976), pp. 73-94.
9. See Montgomery, *Christianity for the Toughminded* (Minneapolis: Bethany, 1973) and *Myth, Allegory and Gospel* (Minneapolis: Bethany, 1974).
10. F. C. Ep. VII, 42 (486.42). Throughout this essay, citations to the *Concordia* follow the standard system employed by Schlink in his *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften.* For convenience we have also added in parentheses page and paragraph references to the Tappert edition of the *Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), and unless otherwise indicated, English translations of Confessional sources have been quoted from that edition.
11. F.C. S.D. VIII, 43 (599.43).
12. See my essays, "Clark's Philosophy of History," in *The Philosophy of Gordon H. Clark: A Festschrift,* ed. Ronald H. Nash (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 353-90, 505-11; and "Once Upon an A Priori," in *Jerusalem and Athens: Critical Discussions on the Theology and Apologetics of Cornelius Van Til,* ed. E. R. Geehan (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyetian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 380-92, 482-83.
13. S.C. II, 6 (345.6).

14. Edmund Schlink, *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions,* trans. P. F. Koehneke and H.J.A. Bouman (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), pp. 3-4.
15. F.C. S.D. II, 43 (529.43).
16. Ap. IV, 229-30 (139.229-30).
17. S.A. III, iii, 18 (306.18).
18. Ap. IV, 9 (108.9).
19. Ap. IV, 27-31 (111.27-31).
20. Ap. IV, 288 (151.288).
21. F.C. Ep. I, 9 (467.9); F.C. S.D. I, 8 (510.8); F.C. S.D. II, 60 (519.60).
22. F.C. Ep. XI, 9, 16 (495.9; 497.16); F.C. S.D. XI, 26, 91 (620.26; 631.91).
23. F.C. Ep. IX, 4 (492.4); F.C. S.D. IX, 3 (610.3).
24. F.C. S.D. VII, 102-106 (587.102-588.106).
25. F.C. Ep. VII, 42 (486.42); F.C. S.D. VIII, 96 (609.96).
26. Robert D. Preus, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism* (2 vols.; St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 1970-1972), I, pp. 100-103; II, p. 35.
27. Ap. IV, 48, 99, 227, 249, 304, 383, (113.48; 121.99; 139.227; 142.249; 154.304; 165.383).
28. A.C. XX, 23 (44.23).
29. See Carpzov's discussion of this point: Johann Benedict Carpzov, *Isagoge in Libros Ecclesiarum Lutheranarum Symbolicos,* ed. Johann Olearius and Johann Benedict Carpzov, Jr. (third ed.; Lipsiae [Leipzig]: David Fleischer, 1699), pp. 206-207, 224, 286.
30. Cf. John Warwick Montgomery, *The Suicide of Christian Theology* (Minneapolis: Bethany, 1970), pp. 289 ff.
31. Schlink, *op. cit.* (in note 14 above), pp. 48-52.
32. S.A. III, i, 3-4 (302.3-4).
33. Schlink, *op. cit.,* p. 7.
34. Ap. IV, 375 (164.375).
35. Ap. IV, 383-84 (166.383-84).
36. Ap. XII, 123 (200.123).
37. F.C. S.D. VII, 50 (578.50). See also Gottfried Olearius, *Isagoge Anticalvinistica secundum Formulae Concordiae* (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: Johann Wittigau, 1662), pp. 91-114; and Sebastian Schmidt, *Articulorum Formulae Concordiae repetitio* (Argentorati [Strasbourg]: Josias Staedel, 1696), pp. 348-74.
38. Cf. Montgomery, *The Shaping of America* (Minneapolis: Bethany, 1976).
39. "Die logischen Satze beschreiben das Gerust der Welt, oder vielmehr, sie stellen es dar. Sie 'handeln' von nichts" (Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus,* 6.124; cf. 3.42 and 4.023).
40. F.C. S.D. VIII, 41-42 (599.41-42). The *Formula of Concord* is here quoting Luther (*WA,* XXVI, 321-22).
41. A.C. XVIII, 4 (39.4); we follow the Latin text here.
42. Ap. XVIII, 4 (225.4).
43. Cf. Henry W. Reimann, "Matthias Flacius Illyricus," *Concordia Theological Monthly,* XXXV (February, 1964), pp. 69-93.
44. Ap. XXI, 24 (232.24).
45. Ap. XXI, 19 (231.19).
46. F.C. S.D. II, 26 (526.26).
47. Robert L. Reymond, *The Justification of Knowledge: An Introductory Study in Christian Apologetic Methodology* (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian

and Reformed Publishing Co., 1976), p. 105. Dr. Robert H. Countess provides an excellent review of this work in *Christianity Today,* November 18, 1977, pp. 34-35.

48. See Montgomery, *Sensible Christianity* cassette series (3 vols.; Santa Ana, Ca.: Vision House/One Way Library, 1976).

A Survey of Protestant and Roman Catholic Confessional Statements in the Twentieth Century

C. George Fry

This paper will consist of two unequal halves. The first portion will address itself to Protestantism in the twentieth century, the second to Roman Catholicism in the identical period.

I. Protestantism in the Twentieth Century

Of the four great branches of the Christian Church - the Oriental, the Eastern Orthodox, the Roman Catholic, and the Protestant - it is the latter that is the most difficult to describe. Protestantism consists of a series of paradoxes. The most recent of the developments within Christianity, with a history of less than five centuries, Protestantism claims to be faithful to the most ancient doctrines of Christianity. The youngest member of the Christian family, Protestantism has rapidly outstripped in size two of its elder brothers. By 1975 Protestants vastly outnumbered the Oriental Churches - any statistical comparison would make the venerable communions of the East appear insignificant. In that year, the three-quarter mark of the twentieth century, Protestants, who counted almost 325,000,000 members, were four times as numerous as the adherents of Eastern Orthodoxy (the Orthodox Churches claimed some 92,000,000 members that year). This meant that Protestantism was second in size only to Roman Catholicism, and though the Church of Rome outnumbered the Protestant denominations by almost two to one (the Roman Catholic Church totalled more than 552,000,000 followers in 1975), there were signs of phenomenal Protestant growth in previously predominately Latin areas (especially in South America).[1] Protestantism began as a confessional movement within the Roman Catholic Church; today it is virtually impossible to find any criteria by which to unify this family of believers that includes everyone from the Lutherans to the Unitarians and the Anglicans (at least some of them) to the Universalists. The best that *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* could manage was this: "Any Christian belonging to a sect descending from those that seceded from the Church of Rome at the time of the Reformation."[2] No wonder Will Herberg could remark that when an eccentric Unitarian neigh-

bor of his embraced Buddhism, the U.S. census merely listed him as "non-denominational Protestant." It is, therefore, extremely dangerous to make any generalizations about Protestant theology. As J. Leslie Dunstan, Professor of Christian World Relations at Andover Newton Theological School, wrote:

> . . . compared to the unity which characterizes those other branches (of Christendom), Protestantism is divided within itself among hundreds of separate organizations, some of which deny all relationship to others. The many denominations and sects have differing beliefs and carry on a variety of practices, which give them the appearance of being distinct from one another. There are those who insist, because of the structure which Protestantism has, that it is incorrect to deal with it as a whole.[3]

While Protestantism may have a bit of an "identity crisis," enormous doctrinal diversity, and perhaps an inordinate amount of anarchy in profession and practice, it remains the most dynamic branch of the Christian Church. Once limited to Northern Europe, it is now a global fellowship. Initially German and Scandinavian, Protestantism is now thoroughly Asian and African, though its leadership is today predominantly North American. Seldom has so much vitality been evident in Christian history, and surely for the newer Protestant Churches there is no spiritual "energy crisis." Furthermore, it is safe to say that until the Second Vatican Council, the Protestant Churches—for better and for worse—were writing the agenda for World Christianity.

What was that agenda? As I see it, the Protestant Churches in the twentieth century have had four great concerns, each of which has involved some understanding of what it means for Christianity to be a confessing community:

(1.) The first area is that of faith. There has been a great concern for the reconstruction of the Christian faith by the Churches. This is a theological task. There have been efforts at the reformulation of inherited doctrinal statements so that a more relevant confession can be realized. The Churches have pioneered "Contemporary Creeds." It has been felt that in this way Protestantism can better meet the spiritual and mental needs of modern man with his longing for truth and authenticity.

(2.) The second area is that of virtue. There has been a great concern for the reformation of secular society by the Churches. This is an ethical task and it is a matter of personal and public piety. There have been efforts at the evolution of new standards of morality so that a contemporary ethic can be attained. The

Churches have produced "Social Creeds" out of the conviction that in this way Protestantism can better meet the moral needs of modern man, with his longing for justice and integrity.

(3.) The third area is that of order. There has been a great concern for the reunification of the Christian Churches —Oriental, Orthodox, Protestant, and, recently, even the Roman. This is an ecclesiastical task and it is a matter of polity. There have been efforts at the reintegration of a number of divided denominations into new fellowships, which, it is felt, will be more perfect approximations of what Christ has in mind for his people today. Councils have produced "Ecumenical Creeds" in the hope that in this way Protestantism may better meet the social needs of modern man, with his longing for love and community.

(4.) The fourth area is that of ardor. There has been a great concern for the evangelization of the world by the Churches. This is a missionary task and it is a matter of energy and strategy. There have been efforts at both motivating Christians to witness and toward the development of more effective methods of individual and corporate evangelization. It is hoped that in this fashion Protestantism may more faithfully and fruitfully fulfill the Great Commission of Christ, "Go . . . teach all nations. . . ." (Matthew 28:19). Often *ad hoc* assemblies of believers have produced "Evangelical Creeds" or "Covenants," convinced that in this way Protestantism may better meet the religious needs of modern man, with his intense longing for salvation.

Theology, morality, polity, and strategy—these have been the four areas of concern for the Protestant Churches from the Victorian to the Elizabethan Age. In each of them individuals and institutions have made some significant confessional statements. Whether they have enduring worth, future generations must decide; that they have had immediate value, no one can deny.

A. The Reconstruction of Theology

The first task of the Protestant Churches in the twentieth century, then, has been doctrinal—the reconstruction of theology.[4] This has become an ongoing process, giving rise to six distinctive movements - Liberalism and Fundamentalism (which dominated the initial third of the century), Neo-Orthodoxy (which prevailed in the middle three decades of the age), and Radicalism, Evangelicalism, and Pentecostalism (which have competed for the loyalty of Protestants in the last thirty years of the twentieth century). Let us consider each of these in its context.

This reconstruction of Protestant theology has its origins in the nineteenth not the twentieth century. After the Wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon there emerged an "Evangelical Consensus" among the major Protestant denominations in the Atlantic Community. There was an unprecedented harmony of spirit that was soon matched with a common confession of the tenets of "Core Christianity." Representative of this mood was the Evangelical Alliance. Founded in London in August 1846 by some eight hundred churchmen from North America and Western Europe, the Evangelical Alliance accepted the following doctrinal basis:

> . . . the parties composing the Alliance shall be such persons only as hold and maintain what are usually understood to be Evangelical views, in regard to the matters of Doctrine understated, namely: (1) The Divine Inspiration, Authority, and Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures; (2) The Right and Duty of Private Judgment in the Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; (3) The Unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of Persons therein: (4) The utter Depravity of Human Nature, in consequence of the Fall; (5) The Incarnation of the Son of God, His work of Atonement for sinners of mankind, and His Mediatorial Intercession and Reign; (6) The Justification of the sinner by Faith alone; (7) The work of the Holy Spirit in the Conversion and Sanctification of the sinner; (8) The Immortality of the Soul, the Resurrection of the Body, the Judgment of the World by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Eternal Blessedness of the Righteous, and the Eternal Punishment of the Wicked; (9) The Divine institution of the Christian Ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.[5]

This "Credo" undoubtedly reflected the beliefs of most of the Protestants involved in the Evangelical Alliance and it serves as a kind of "theological thermometer" of the opinions that prevailed during the "Golden Days" of the "Consensus." In America this kind of Evangelicalism reigned from the "Era of Good Feelings" under President James Monroe to the "Age of Disruption" under Abraham Lincoln. But at the very time the nation was torn asunder, the Evangelical Consensus began to collapse. There was a variety of causes - racism, and the secession of Black believers from the mainline Protestant Churches; sectionalism, with the creation of regional denominations in the American South—Southern Baptists, Southern Presbyterians, Southern Methodists, Southern Lutherans; Anglo-Catholicism, and the drift of the Protestant Episcopal Church away from Evangelicalism toward

Traditionalism; confessionalism, among both Lutherans and Calvinists, with the resurgence of a distinctive doctrinal identity; moralism or pietism, with the birth of the Holiness Movement as a protest against the secularism said to epidemic in the "establishment churches"; but, the key issue was theological and was occasioned by the "Ordeal of the Faith" endured by the Victorian generations. Between 1859, with the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species,* and 1925, with the so-called "Monkey Trial" at Dayton, Tennessee, the Evangelical Churches were ripped apart over the issue of what to do with the "New Learning" emerging from the laboratories and universities - Biblical Criticism, Darwinism, and the Historical and Social Sciences. Those who favored a reception of these teachings were called "Liberals." Those who advocated a rejection of them were named "Fundamentalists." For almost seventy-five years, the Protestant Churches were to be polarized along "Modernist-Fundamentalist" lines.

1. Liberalism

Classical Liberalism, which dominated in the mainline Protestant Churches from 1890 until 1941, defies any one definition. If the Fundamentalists lacked charity, the Liberals often were failing in clarity. Perhaps it is best to suggest that Liberalism was a mood more than a message. The Liberal Spirit drew heavily on four sources: (1) the Experiential Christianity represented by the Radicals of the Protestant Reformation and continued in Britain and America by the Quakers, the Unitarians, and the Congregationalists; (2) the Empirical Philosophy that was born in Great Britain during the Enlightenment and which was identified with the names of John Locke in England and David Hume in Scotland; (3) the Participatory Politics that resulted from the English Revolution of 1688, the American Revolution of 1775, and the French Revolution of 1789; and (4) the Humanism of the Renaissance, particularly with its emphasis on Platonism and Personalism, as these value-systems reappeared in the thought of Immanuel Kant and the Idealists. The fusion of these four influences could produce an almost infinite variety of theologies.

Walter Marshall Horton was persuaded that Classical Liberalism tended to fall into one of three possible types: (1) Scientific, or Empirical, with an emphasis on investigation and on factual evidence and which was exemplified by Henry Nelson Wieman of the University of Chicago; (2) Platonic, or Mystical, with a concern for the role of the Spirit in both history and personality, and which was advocated by Dean William Ralph Inge of St. Paul's, London; and (3) the Idealistic, or Social,

with a passion for social justice, and which was practiced by such parish parsons as Washington Gladden and Walter Rauschenbusch.[6]

It is sometimes assumed by conservatives that the Liberal Credo was the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, the Servanthood of the Church, and the sacredness of Personhood. We know, however, that the matter is not that simple. Because of the Liberal insistence on individual decision, their abhorrence of doctrine as a "test," and their belief in Progress, ultimate or even penultimate statements were avoided. Perhaps this testimony, "A Modern Affirmation," which appeared in *The Book of Worship* of the Methodist Church in 1944 is one such "Liberal Creed":

> Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is the one true Church, apostolic and universal, whose holy faith let us now reverently and sincerely declare:
>
> We believe in God the Father, infinite in wisdom, power, and love, whose mercy is over all his works, and whose will is ever directed to his children's good.
>
> We believe in Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of man, the gift of the Father's unfailing grace, the ground of our hope, and the promise of our deliverance from sin and death.
>
> We believe in the Holy Spirit as the divine presence in our lives, whereby we are kept in perpetual remembrance of the truth of Christ, and find strength and help in time of need.
>
> We believe that this faith should manifest itself in the service of love as set forth in the example of our blessed Lord, to the end that the Kingdom of God may come upon the earth. Amen.[7]

More indicative of the Liberal Spirit, I suspect, is the following course description from the Iliff School of Theology catalogue:

> Christian Theology 24 352 Credo
>
> Each member of the class will write and present an essay setting forth his/her own theological position, with special attention to designated problem areas.[2]

2. Fundamentalism

While Liberalism predominated in the institutions of established Protestantism, Fundamentalism found an outlet in a growing number of "Bible schools" and "independent seminaries," as well as in splinter denominations, independent and Bible churches, and the radio. Forming a kind of "theological counter-culture," the Fundamentalists came from a wide variety of traditions—with Calvinism and Arminianism

prevailing. Given a wide diversity of views on the church, the sacraments, and the ministry, most Fundamentalists

> . . . sought to maintain the inerrancy of the Bible and the convictions long held by Evangelicals. Among the latter were the deity and virgin birth of Christ, Christ's atoning and substitutionary death, his bodily resurrection, his second coming, the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner, the eternal blessedness of those accounted by God as righteous because of their faith in Christ, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.[9]

To these "Core Convictions" might also be added certain "Ethical Injunctions" or "Evangelical Counsels" concerning drinking, dancing, attending movies, proper attire, the correct observance of the Sabbath, as well as "Eschatological Doctrines" about the millenium, the rapture, and related matters. In 1919 the World's Christian Fundamentals Association was formed, and by the next decade the leading theologian of the movement was the Calvinist, John Gresham Machen (1881-1937).

What was the confessional significance of Fundamentalism? Even though a series of important Bible conferences were convened—Niagara, Winona, Rocky Mountain—and even though the Niagara Conference of 1895 articulated "the five points of Fundamentalism,"[10] as a whole the movement was unhistorical, anti-intellectual, and non-ecclesiastical in its orientation. For these reasons it did not result in any major confessions in the classic sense of the word.

3. Neo-Orthodoxy

By 1941 it was obvious to the theological *avant-garde* in America that both Liberalism and Fundamentalism had failed. Neither seemed to have a sense of realism as a new generation struggled with the Great Depression, the rise of the great dictatorships in Italy, Germany, Spain, and the Soviet Union, and the grim necessity of a Second Great War. Late in that year John C. Bennett wrote as follows:

> As a result of the events of the past year we know that we live in a new age which we do not yet understand but which arouses in us deep foreboding. There are many elements in the situation which are still unpredictable, but whatever events the next years may bring forth there are some characteristics of this new situation which will profoundly influence our lives. Those who speak about this new situation are usually classified as inhabitants of a dream world or as psychological victims of the war—so difficult is it to be

or to seem objective in one's attitude to it. This new situation in which we live may be a better one in which to make Christianity seem true and relevant, at least in those parts of the world where there is still freedom to teach a relevant form of Christianity at all; but Christianity will necessarily be taught with a different emphasis and to people who have lost faith in much that has been identified in their minds with the gospel.

The first of the underlying factors with which we must now reckon is the end of the spiritual unity of the West, a unity based upon a combination of Christianity and humanism as the sources of the moral standards recognized by the conscience of the West.

We used to live in a world in which people generally realized that Christian standards had a claim on them, in which minorities could speak freely and keep national life under judgment in the light of those standards, in which those who exercised power were at least inhibited by the scruples of their own or of other people's Christian conscience. Europe and America—the so-called West—belonged to that world, and we were conscious of membership in a common moral universe of discourse. It is the unity of that world that has been shattered and in most of its parts the authority of Christian standards is more seriously threatened than at any time since the days of Charlemagne. So long as we were able to take that kind of world for granted we thought little of it. Did we not find ourselves saying at times that good healthy paganism would be better than nominal Christianity? But we usually assumed that our healthy pagans would retain the Christian ethics.[11]

Neo-Paganism—Marxism in Russia, Fascism in Italy, Nazism in Germany, Materialism in the Western democracies—favored the spread of Neo-Orthodoxy. Often named "Crisis Theology," or "Dialectical Theology," or "Neo-Reformation Theology," this stance had spread in Europe rather rapidly after World War I. Reaching America a generation later, it was already associated with the "four Great B's"—Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Rudolf Bultmann, and Nicolai Berdayev—as well as Paul Tillich and Richard and Reinhold Niebuhr. While the Neo-Orthodox movement encompassed much diversity (just contrast a Paul Tillich and a Karl Barth), it exhibited five central concerns: (1) a rediscovery of the Bible (with the spirit of neither literalism nor liberalism, but attempting to combine a critical study of the Scriptures with a respect for them as "containing the Word of God"), (2) a recovery of the confessional theology of the Saxon and Swiss

Reformations, (3) an interest in the historic liturgies of the Churches, (4) a passion for social morality, and (5) a desire for Christian unity. The prevailing theological mood in America's "Age of Crisis" from the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 until the assassination of President John Kennedy in 1963, Neo-Orthodoxy was probably the most ecclesiastical, confessional, and historically-sensitive religious movement we will see in our century. For that reason it should not surprise us that both individually and institutionally the Neo-Orthodox Era produced significant creeds. Three examples are (1) the Barmen Declaration, drawn up by Lutheran and Reformed theologians, on May 29-30, 1934, in the face of the neo-pagan German Christianity advocated in the Third Reich;[12] (2) the Confession of 1967 of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., with its attempt to combine ancient, Reformation, and contemporary statements in a common anthology of doctrine to protest the facile identification of the "American way of life" with historic Protestantism;[13] and (3) the Hartford Affirmation of 1975, produced by several Neo-Orthodox theologians as a warning against the "loss of a sense of the transcendent" in recent Protestant thought.[14] Perhaps it was the very "confessional," or at least, "theological" nature of Neo-Orthodoxy that caused it to be challenged by the mid-1960's by three new currents in popular religion, which, as much as they differed from one another, were all grounded in "immediate experience" rather than "intellectual reflection"—Radicalism, Evangelicalism, and Pentecostalism.

4. Radicalism

The Radical Theology that surfaced in the 1960's was popularly known for its theological affirmations (or negations) that "God is dead" (with the parody of a creed, "There is no God and Jesus is his Son") and its political ramifications (Civil Rights struggle, opposition to the Indochina War, and the investigation of the Watergate Scandal through to the resignation of President Richard Nixon).[15] In my opinion these were simply two manifestations of the real contention of Radical Theology, which was this, Western Man/Woman is at the start of a New Age, with the dawning of an unprecedented kind of consciousness. The New Mentality was the subject of the number one best seller of 1970, Charles A. Reich's *The Greening of America.*[16] A forty-two year old Professor of Law at Yale University, Reich took as his text some poetry of Wallace Stevens:

There is not any haunt of prophecy,
Nor any old chimera of the grave,
Neither the golden underground, nor isle

Melodious, where spirits gat them home,
Nor visionary south, nor cloudy palm
Remote on heaven's hill, that has endured
As April's green endures, or will endure.[17]

The thesis developed in his 430-page sermon is that of the "coming Revolution," which is much more than secularization (welcomed by the Radicals), or modernization (that was already *passe*), or even innovation and reformation. It was, instead, an impending transformation, a metamorphosis of the psyche of the young generation which would produce "the new mentality." Consciousness III was appearing, to replace Consciousness I, that symbolized by Herbert Hoover, the Old American, the Rugged Individualist, and Consciousness II, incarnated in Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Middle American, the Organization Man. Difficult to describe, evident in the counterculture, subversive of all establishments (especially Organized Religion), the New Mentality would involve "multimedia experiences," "introspection," "reflection," "wholeness," "magic and mystery," "dance," "romance," "clothes to express various moods," "sex experiences with many people," "constantly learning new things," and much more.[18] Though officially rejected by the majority in America, especially in the security-conscious 1970's, there is growing evidence that millions of Americans, by default, are opting for elements of this "life style." This could easily mean a mass disaffection from the established churches in America comparable to what occurred in Europe in the 1920's. Already in the 1970's the United Methodists, the United Presbyterians, and the United Church of Christ, the "Big Three Mainline Churches," have lost 2.7 million members.[19] The Protestant Episcopal Church loses a member every fifteen minutes. Our major Lutheran bodies regard themselves fortunate to "break even" statistically. I would suggest that it might be time to seriously re-examine the statements of the Radical Theology—for there is some evidence it is becoming the *de facto* credo of many of the new generation.

5. Evangelicalism

At first glance the dominant spiritual movement of the 1970's, Evangelicalism, seems to have little in common with Radical Theology. As an author in *Time* magazine wrote for the December 26, 1977, cover story on the Evangelicals:

> Most Evangelicals . . . are conventional Protestants who hold staunchly to the authority of the Bible in all matters and adhere to Orthodox Christian doctrine. They believe in making a conscious personal com-

> mitment to Christ, a spiritual encounter, gradual or instantaneous, known as the born-again experience.[20]

One can summarize Evangelicalism as meaning five things: (1) acceptance of the authority and reliability of the Sacred Scriptures; (2) the centrality of God's saving grace; (3) the necessity of personal faith; (4) the opportunity for fellowship in the local gathered assembly of believers; and (5) the responsibility to lead a transformed life—personally and publicly. I suspect most Evangelicals, whether President Jimmy Carter, or his sister, evangelist Ruth Carter Stapleton, or President Gerald Ford, or his son, evangelist Michael Ford of Pittsburgh, or singer Anita Bryant (cited as "Most Admired Woman" by *Good Housekeeping* in 1977), or author Marabel Morgan (*Total Woman*), or convert Malcolm Muggeridge, or Preacher Billy Graham (who has spoken to at least eighty million people in person), or convict-converts Charles Colson (*Born Again,* to be released as a movie in 1978) and Eldridge Cleaver (*Soul on Ice*), or Robert Schuller ("Hour of Power" speaker), would agree with that "Credo." But, nevertheless, there are three important points of similarity to Radical Christianity: (1) an emphasis on the priority of experience (so much so that one Evangelical writer has recommended a second look at Friedrich Schleiermacher);[21] (2) a deep-seated suspicion of rational or intellectual articulations of the Christian faith inherited from earlier generations; and (3) a basic distrust of denominational Christianity and a weak understanding of the role of the Church. For these reasons I suspect that Radical, Evangelical, and Pentecostal Christianity all share certain common assumptions, or participate to some extent in the same "mentality." The Evangelical Resurgence of the late 1970's could, therefore, go one of two ways - either toward a "Second Evangelical Consensus," akin in mind and mood to that of the early nineteenth century, or toward a "Third Great Awakening" that would be significantly different from its historical precedents. With more than 45.5 million Evangelicals in the United States (of whom 33.5 million are members of Protestant Churches outside the National Council, with the remainder as minorities within the mainline Churches), Evangelicalism is, as historian Martin E. Marty suggested, "durable . . . it's not going to go away."[22]

6. Pentecostalism

The much-publicized Pentecostal or Charismatic Movement has been hailed as a "Third Force in World Christianity." While attention has frequently focused on the symptoms—whether audible sounds ("glossalalia" and "prophecies"), or visual sights ("visions" and "turnings"), or physical signs

("healings" and "cures")—I think the primary purpose of Pentecostalism is to produce "an altered state of consciousness." Upon receiving "the baptism of the Holy Spirit," the affected individual is said to be "beside himself" or "to be another person." If this observation is correct, then there is reason to look for some common links between Pentecostalism and Radical and Evangelical Christianity. It would be helpful, I believe, to explore the relationship between the experiences of "Consciousness III," "being born again," and "the baptism of the Spirit." Such a study could assist us to understand a major shift that may be under way in the American (and Western) mentality.[23]

So we have finished our survey of the efforts of the Protestant Churches at the reconstruction of theology—with the opinion that either one of two things is about to happen: either we have gone full circle and are on the eve of a second "Evangelical Consensus," or that we are on the threshold of a significant transformation of Western spiritual, social, and personal values, that will cut clean across all our existing institutions. Should the first occur, we may have a Confessional Age. Should the second transpire, the intellectual articulation of Christian truth will be relegated to a minority within the Churches.

B. The Reformation of Society

The Rev. Henry Patten, long the associate of Dr. Washington Gladden at the First Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio, once shared with the general public a revealing incident from his initial interview for a call to that parish. In the course of his conversation with Dr. Gladden, Patten assured the older gentleman that for him there were only two concerns—liberal thought and social action. At that Gladden winked and reported, "What else is there?"

Within each decade the Protestant Churches have stressed some aspect of the quest for social justice: (1) from 1900-1919, the thrust was for Industrial Righteousness, (2) from 1910-1920, the concern was for Peace and International Order, (3) from 1920-1930 the issue was Religious Toleration, (4) from 1930-1940, in a world gone mad with Fascism, the aim was Social Democracy, (5) from 1940-1950, the dream was of Global Reconstruction, (6) from 1950-1960 the quest was for Civil Liberties, (7) from 1960-1970 the problems were Equality for Black Americans and Peace in Vietnam, and (8) in the 1970's the goal is Liberation—for all manner of minorities. Each generation has seen both significant legislation in the state house and the Senate, and considerable polarization in the Churches.

One wit, observing this continuing struggle in the Churches, set side by side two verses, each a parody of the opposing points of view. First there was the hymn, "Rise Up, O Men of God," or, if you prefer, "Rise Up, O Saints of God," with the stanza:

Rise up, O Men of God,
His Kingdom tarries long,
Bring in the day of brotherhood,
And end the night of wrong.[24]

Then came the other text:

Sit down, O Men of God,
His Kingdom He will bring,
Whenever it may please His will,
You cannot do a thing.

Besides legislation and polarization, certain common affirmations resulted from the effort at the Reformation of Society. These "Social Creeds" were primarily in the areas of Industrial Justice and World Peace.

One of the earliest of these was the "Social Creed" of the Federal Council of Churches, issued in 1908. That had been a critical year for labor in the United States. The Supreme Court had issued several reverses in terms of labor legislation; three labor leaders of national reputation were indicted for not heeding an injunction. Child labor, the exploitation of women in industry, the seventy-two hour week, unsafe and unsanitary factory conditions, the absence of retirement plans, unemployment compensation, health and medical benefits, the importation of cheap foreign labor—all were matters very disturbing to some within the Protestant Community. Few denominations, however, had spoken to this concern. While the Presbyterian Department of Church and Labor had issued a statement, it was the Federal Council of Churches that took the initiative. A report was prepared for the Council by the Committee on the Church and Modern Industry, which was largely the work of Frank Mason North. The document presented not only a description of conditions in industrial America, but a prescription for a confessional witness by the Churches. The heart of the recommendations was Article 9, which contained fourteen points, soon to become known as the "Social Creed" of the Churches and to be adopted by the Methodist Episcopal Church within the year. It read:

> We deem it the duty of all Christian people to concern themselves directly with certain practical industrial problems. To us it seems that the churches must stand—
>
> For equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life.

For the right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance, a right ever to be wisely and strongly safe-guarded against encroachment of every kind.

For the right of workers to some protection against the handicaps often resulting from the swift crises of industrial change.

For the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions.

For the protection of the workers from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries, and mortality.

For the abolition of child labor.

For such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.

For the suppression of the 'sweating system.'

For the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labor to the lowest practicable point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

For a release from employment one day in seven.

For a living wage as a minimum in every industry and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

For the most equitable division of the products of industry that can ultimately be devised.

For suitable provision for the old age of the workers and for those incapacitated by injury.

For the abatement of poverty.

To the toilers of America and to those who by organized effort are seeking to lift the crushing burdens of the poor, and to reduce the hardships and uphold the dignity of labor, this Council sends the greeting of human brotherhood and the pledge of sympathy and of help in a cause which belongs to all who follow Christ.[25]

Though there were subsequent amendments and revisions of the Social Creed, this was to be the basic confession of the member Churches concerning the Industrial Order.

World Peace has been a second area of creedal concern to the Protestant Churches. The initial effort in this direction was made on December 16, 1921, when the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches adopted the "International Ideals of the Churches of Christ," or "A Declaration of Ideals and Policy Looking Toward a Warless World."

To properly understand the content of this confession, we must recall the context of the 1920's. "The war to end all wars" had just stopped in Europe on the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month. An almost apocalyptic struggle,

much more expensive in men and material than either World War II or Vietnam, the Great War of 1914 had to be justified as absolutely the *last* war. On November 11, 1921, a major naval disarmament conference had been convened in Washington, D.C. by President Warren G. Harding. The tomb of the Unknown Soldier had been dedicated, with a stirring address by Harry Emerson Fosdick. At the end of the decade, in the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the nations of the world would officially "outlaw war." It was from that setting that the following "Peace Creed" came:

1. We *believe* that nations no less than individuals are subject to God's immutable moral laws.
2. We *believe* that nations achieve true welfare, greatness and honor only through just dealing and unselfish service.
3. We *believe* that nations that regard themselves as Christian have special international obligations.
4. We *believe* that the Spirit of Christian brotherliness can remove every unjust barrier of trade, color, creed and race.
5. We *believe* that *Christian* patriotism demands the practice of goodwill between nations.
6. We *believe* that international politics should secure equal justice for all races.
7. We *believe* that all nations should associate themselves permanently for world peace and goodwill.
8. We *believe* in international law, and in the universal use of international courts of justice and boards of arbitration.
9. We *believe* in a sweeping reduction of armaments by all nations.
10. We *believe* in a warless world, and dedicate ourselves to its achievement.[26]

The Peace Movement continued, and during the Second World War, on March 16, 1943, the Federal Council convened a committee of twenty-six persons, under the Chairmanship of Professor Robert Lowry Calhoun of Yale University, to study and report on "The Relation of the Church to the War in the Light of the Christian Faith." The resulting document was in three parts—diagnostic, doctrinal, and practical.[27] The report was widely studied in the member Churches. A generation later, action as well as reflection was evidenced during the Indochina War. Thousands made their confession through demonstrations, either for or against the conflict, in every major city in the Western World.

Perhaps the best summary of some seven decades of Protestant confessional concern for Social Justice and World

Peace was uttered by Philip A. Potter, the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, in 1972:

> 'It is my conviction,' he said, 'that to separate the horizontal from the vertical, the immanent from the transcendent, is a denial of the cross and the resurrection.'
>
> Above all, Potter, also a student of history—believes that faith and action are inseparably entwined. 'Each new man in Christ is the promise of the renewal of society,' he says, declaring that Christ saves a man not so he can escape the world but so that he can be 'more genuinely involved in it as an authentic person.' 'To be for Christ,' he adds, 'is to be for humanity.'[28]

C. The Reunification of the Churches

A third area of concern for the Protestant family has been the reunification of the Christian Church. It was appropriate that it was Protestantism, the most fragmented branch of the Universal Church, that took the initiative in the movement for Christian unity. It has been also fitting that English-speaking Protestants, coming from the most sorely divided household of faith, have often provided the leadership within the Ecumenical Movement.

The Ecumenical Movement has expressed itself in a conciliar, denominational, and inter-confessional fashion. On the conciliar level we have seen the formation of the World Council of Churches in 1948, its subsequent meetings at Evanston, New Delhi, Upsala, and Nairobi, its continuing growth in membership, and its evolution of its own brand of "ecumenical theology." On the denominational level we have witnessed an enormous number of national and regional mergers within confessional families and the genesis of a host of global fellowships, as the Alliance of Reformed Churches Throughout the World Holding the Presbyterian System (1875), the International Congregational Council (1891), the Old Catholic Union of Utrecht (1889), the World Methodist Council (1881), the Baptist World Alliance (1905), the Lutheran World Federation (1923, 1947), the World Convention of the Churches of Christ (1930), the Friends' World Committee for Consultation (1920), the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops (1867), and the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom (1900). But perhaps the most striking development has been the merger of Churches across ancient confessional lines.[29] Perhaps four of these mergers, occuring in four different decades, in three diverse English-speaking

nations, can indicate the ecumenical and confessional significance of the movement for church union.

(1.) One of the earliest mergers across denominational lines happened in Canada in 1925. This United Church of Canada, which recently celebrated its first half-century, is an amalgamation of four groups of Canadian Churches which represent between them some forty distinct Christian bodies and some nineteen separate acts of Church Union. The Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, and Local Union (Community) Churches united—reflecting four different polities (congregational, connectional, presbyterial, and episcopal), three different theologies (Reformed, Wesleyan, and Free Church), and two different liturgical traditions (both the formal and the free). The New Church confessed its "allegiance to the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation" but in its Twenty Articles of Faith refused to follow either the Westminster Confession or one of the classic Wesleyan standards. Representative, perhaps, was a mediating statement between the Calvinist and Arminian positions on election:

> We believe that God, out of His great love for the world, has given His only begotten Son to be the Saviour of sinners, and in the Gospel freely offers His all-sufficient salvation to all men. We believe also that God; from the beginning in His own good pleasure, gave to His Son a people, an innumerable multitude, chosen in Christ unto holiness, service, and salvation.[30]

(2.) A second bold merger occurred in the United States in 1957, bringing together heirs of both the British and Continental Reformations, American Revivalism and European immigration, Lutherans, Calvinists, Congregationalists, and non-confessional Disciples or Christians in the United Church of Christ.

(3.) A third merger, even more comprehensive in scope, had transpired in India.[31] The Church of South India, constituted in 1947 after prolonged merger negotiations, united more than one million Christians of the Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist traditions. It was the first union to involve the Anglicans.

(4.) An even more audacious scheme was to be proposed in an Episcopal Cathedral in the United States. The most ambitious plan of church union yet devised, it came to be called the Consultation on Church Union or, later, the Church of Christ Uniting. The Consultation on Church Union had its beginning on December 4, 1960, when the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, the Stated Clerk of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. preached a sermon in Grace Cathedral (the seat of the Rt. Rev. James A. Pike), San Francisco, entitled "Toward the

Reunion of Christ's Church." The occasion was the triennial meeting of the National Council of Churches. In what was soon called the "Blake-Pike Proposal" the Presbyterian leader suggested that representatives of the United Presbyterian, the Episcopal, and the Methodist Churches, together with the United Church of Christ, form "a plan of church union both catholic and reformed," and he made it clear that "any other churches which find they can accept both the principles and the plan of union would also be warmly invited to unite with us."[32] Response to the sermon was immediate and positive. It became the number one religious news story of the year and the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. at its General Assembly in May 1961 asked the Protestant Episcopal Church to join with it in inviting the Methodist Church and the United Church of Christ "to explore the establishment of a united church truly catholic, truly reformed, and truly evangelical." Each church was to appoint a committee of nine to "negotiate a plan of union." Within half a year the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church accepted this invitation. In September 1961 it responded favorably, with the proviso, however, that its Joint Commission on Approaches to Unity was "to conduct these conversations on the basis of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral . . ." The Lambeth Quadrilateral was the traditional Anglican basis for Church Union—agreement on the role of the Holy Scriptures, the Ecumenical Creeds, the Dominical Sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate. The favorable reply of the Episcopalians made possible the start of the Consultation on Church Union. There were several significant meetings in the 1960's:

(1.) Washington. In October of 1961 a planning committee met and prepared the way for the constituting plenary meeting with representatives of the United Presbyterian Church, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Methodist Church, and the United Church of Christ. The Consultation on Church Union met in Washington April 9-10, 1962. Since the UCC was engaged in unity talks with the Disciples of Christ (the International Convention of Christian Churches) and the Methodist Church was in merger negotiations with the Evangelical United Brethren Church (which has since resulted in the United Methodist Church), invitations were issued to those two bodies to become part of the process. The invitations were accepted in the autumn of 1962. The Washington meeting created an Executive Committee with an Executive Secretary and scheduled the next meeting for Oberlin, Ohio, in March 1963.

(2.) Oberlin. The second plenary meeting was held in Oberlin,

Ohio, on March 19-21, 1963. Yielding a consensus on Scripture, Tradition, and the Guardians of Tradition.

(3.) Princeton. The third plenary meeting was held at Princeton, New Jersey, on April 13-16, 1964, resulting in a consensus on Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

(4.) Lexington. The fourth plenary meeting was held at Lexington, Kentucky, on April 4-8, 1965, with the African Methodist Episcopal Church becoming the seventh participating body. This was the first time an all-black denomination had been included in the negotiations. Consensus was reached on the ministry.

(5.) Dallas. The fifth plenary meeting was held at Dallas, Texas, on May 2-5, 1966, resulting in the approval of the Principles of Church Union. Two more denominations affiliated with the Consultation, the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. and the African Methodist Episcopal Church—Zion, which meant that a Southern or sectional church, as well as a Wesleyan Church, of predominantly black membership was now included.

(6.) Cambridge. The sixth plenary meeting was held at Cambridge, Massachusetts, from May 1 to 4, 1967, approved "Guidelines for the Structure of the Church," and decided to begin to develop a plan of union. In January 1967, the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church had become the tenth participating body.

(7.) Dayton. The seventh plenary meeting was held at Dayton, Ohio on March 25-28, 1968, producing *An Order of Worship for the Proclamation of the Word of God and the Celebration of the Lord's Supper,* provision for a permanent Secretariat (Paul A. Crow, Jr., was the first General Secretary), and the authorization of a Plan of Union Commission to present a draft for merger by 1970.

(8.) Atlanta. The eighth plenary meeting was held at Atlanta, Georgia, on March 17-20, 1969, to consider three reports: "An Outline of a Plan of Union," "An Interim Report for the Unification (Mingling) of Ministries," and "Guidelines for Local Interchurch Action."

(9.) St. Louis. The ninth plenary meeting was held at St. Louis, Missouri, on March 9-13, 1970, with discussion of a ten-chapter, 104-page document of *A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting.* After revision the text was submitted to the member Churches and the general public.

By the end of the decade of the sixties COCU had a specific plan. Let us look at that consensus briefly in terms of theology, liturgy, and polity:

(1.) Theology. The United Church would recognize the Holy Scriptures as having "a unique authority" within the Christian

community as "witnesses to God's revelation and to man's response." "In, with, and under, around, over, and beside" the Scriptures was the Tradition of the Community, by which was understood "the whole life of the Church ever guided and nourished by the Holy Spirit. . . ." The Bible was regarded as part of the Tradition, to be understood in light of it, and also as the supreme "guardian and expression" of it. Besides Canon and Custom, the Church ought to receive the Ecumenical Creeds (the Apostles' and Nicene) "as a corporate act of praise and allegiance. . . ." In all matters, however, the Church would not "permit the use of any single confession as an exclusive requirement for all. . . ."

(2.) Liturgy. The United Church would accept two primary sacraments: Baptism, as the act of incorporation into the Christian Community, to be administered in any mode, either at infancy or in adulthood; and the Lord's Supper, as "an act of remembrance, an act of present communion, an act of proclamation . . . and an act of hope anticipating the future consummation." While a diversity of worship forms was to be permitted, the United Church would continue to be seeking creative new liturgies.

(3.) Polity. The United Church would receive through the Anglican Church the historic episcopate and the three-fold office of ministry - deacon, priest (or presbyter), and bishop. Experimental ministries, new offices, and non-neighborhood parishes were envisioned.

Yet the Church of Christ Uniting has not produced a union of churches. This most ambitious of all plans for church union has run into difficulty for at least four reasons:

(1.) There was the unpredictability of the 1960's. None of the movers of the original Consultation on Church Union could have foreseen the kind of questions and accusations they would have to face by 1969, for they had not planned on Women's Liberation, the Civil Rights Movement, Black Theology, the Anti-War Protests, the Ecological Crisis, Watergate, and Social Activism. To the *avant garde* in many of the COCU member churches, the issue of union seemed increasingly irrelevant.

(2.) There was the amazing durability of denominationalism. A small sign of this is found in the fact that *The Christian Century* has started a series on the major American denominations. Historian Martin E. Marty, writing in an essay entitled "Denominations: Surviving the 70's," confessed

> . . . denominationalism outlasts all the theologies designed to replace it. The relative decline in status and power of national, regional, state and local councils of churches occurred for many reasons, not the least of them being a "new denominationalism' that found

> people scurrying back to and huddling in their denominational homes in a time when senses of identity were hard to come by.[33]

Conservative Churches, such as the Southern Baptist Convention, continued to experience consistent growth, the SBC adding more than two million members in the 1970's. This meant that Church Union had not caught the imagination of America's masses.

(3.) Indeed, there was the striking absence of any popularity for the COCU scheme among the general church-going public. If Episcopalians and Presbyterians, Methodists and Disciples were excited about anything, it was either Evangelicalism (as with Charles Colson and President Gerald Ford) or Pentecostalism (in the case of Methodist evangelist-educator Oral Roberts).

(4.) There was the unexpected crisis of ecumenicity - or at least of the ecumenical movement. The ecumenical spirit was alive and well, but institutional ecumenism was in deep trouble. For example, in October 1977 the Massachuesetts Council of Churches "reported that the ecumenical movement in that state is suffering significant declines in funding, programs and public acclaim."[34] Meanwhile, the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, established in 1907 for a variety of reasons, including "efforts to develop a greater understanding of the confessional differences among the denominations," was in financial woes. In 1962 the Chicago businessman George Sisler, a Vice President of the First National Bank, had lead a drive to raise $600,000 for the Federation to purchase a sixteen-story building on Michigan Avenue. Though the Federation had a hefty mortage, the edifice was to be "the symbol of the visible presence of Chicago's Protestantism and an indication of a unified approach to the city's many problems." By the late 1960's problems developed—the annual budget falling from $500,000 in 1967 to $90,000 in 1977; the Federation was forced to sell its building, which is now the home of the American Conservatory of Music. Now the Federation "rents a comparatively small suite of offices in the structure it once owned. . . ."[35]

Though COCU continues, with revisions of its Plan of Union to extend until 1983, its future is hardly bright.

D. Evangelization of the World

A final area of concern for the Protestant Churches has been the evangelization of the world. This missionary emphasis has been a source of confessional activity in the twentieth century in two ways:

(1.) Evangelical Christians have begun to prepare "statements," "covenants," and "affirmations" at great global assemblies on world evangelization, such as those held in Berlin and at Lausanne. I suspect that these confessions of "Core Christianity" will take on a role of increasing importance as we enter an age of "Evangelical Resurgence."

(2.) Third World Christians have begun to prepare their own confessions. These, I believe, will generally and increasingly be Conservative and Evangelical. One fine example is the "Confession of Faith of the Huria Kristen Batak Protestant," drawn up in 1951 by Indonesian Christian theologians without the advice and consent of any Western scholars. It has strong sections on the Trinity, the Scriptures, Original Sin, Redemption, the Church, the Sacraments, and the Last Things.[36] In comparison with many Occidental Creeds prepared in the identical time period, it is extremely Orthodox.

II. Roman Catholicism in the Twentieth Century

This essay has dealt primarily with Protestant confessional activity in the twentieth century, with its concern for the reconstruction of theology, the reformation of society, the reunification of the churches, and the evangelization of the world. Much of this activity was conducted without any direct reference to the Roman Catholic Church. That Communion had its own difficulties and pursued a separate path of development until relatively recently. We can describe that pilgrimage in terms of a conversion from the rejection of modern thought to its reception.

A. The Rejection of Modern Thought

The Roman Catholic Church, the predominant form of Christianity in Mediterranean Europe and Latin America, entered the twentieth century fairly committed to the rejection of modern thought, which meant primarily Protestantism and Secularism. This attitude had been clearly enunciated during the pontificate of Pius IX (1846-1878) by means of three significant acts: (1) the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary in December 1854, a step that was inflammatory of Protestant opinion; (2) the preparation of the Syllabus of Errors in 1864, which condemned many of the popular practices and cherished principles of the nineteenth century, such as the separation of church and state, the existence of non-sectarian schools, and the toleration of religious pluarlism; and (3) the convocation of the First Vatican Council on December 8, 1869, which, on July 18, of the following year, issued an affirmation of Papal Infallibility, maintaining that when the Pope speaks *ex*

cathedra as Doctor and Pastor of the Ecumenical Church, as the Vicar of Christ, on matters of faith and morals, he is inerrant. The completion of the Papal Monarchy seemed at hand, and the insulation of the Roman Church from both Evangelicalism and Modernism seemed total. The only exception to this position of isolation was in the area of social action. Roman Catholics, following the lead of Pope Leo XIII and his famous encyclical, *Rerum Novarum,* demonstrated a strong interest in industrial justice. In most other respects, the Roman Community was the Church Militant—very Militant—in its opposition to the twin movements that had produced modern times—the Reformation and the French Revolution.

B. The Reception of Modern Thought

As a First Vatican Council seemed to mark the self-imposed exile of the Roman Church from the contemporary world, a Second Vatican Council announced its emergence into modernity with a mad passion. As one wit observed, suddenly Roman Catholics seemed intent on making all the mistakes Protestants had made in four and a half centuries within ten years! On October 2, 1962, some 2,540 bishops from all four corners of the earth met in Rome at the invitation of Pope John XXIII in order to "enable the Church to bring herself up to date" and in that manner to hasten the hour "of the reunion of Christendom." By December 8, 1965, the Pope, in his closing address, could call the Council "one of the greatest events in the history of the Church." Within three short years the Roman Church had undergone a Revolution.[37] Basically, the changes wrought by Vatican II fall into three categories. *Leitourgia,* or worship, the adoration of God by the Church was one major area of reform. *Koinonia,* or fellowship, the unification of the Church was a second item of attention. And *Diakonia,* or service, the ministration of the Church to the world was a third topic on the agenda. The result of Vatican II has yet to be fully measured, for the rest of the world had four hundred—not fifteen—years in which to experience the Reformation, the Enlightenment, the French, British, and Industrial Revolutions, and Secularization. But two things, I think, are obvious:

(1.) There is the proliferation within the Roman Catholic Church of alternative systems of thought and styles of living. Among them are the Traditionalists, who seek a restoration of the Old Order; the Evangelicals, who long for a genuine Reformation of the Church; the Pentecostals, who quest for a manifestation of apostolic gifts in the present age; the Radicals, who mix Jesus and Marx in order to plot the Liberation of the oppressed; and the confused, who wonder what has happened to "Eternal Rome." This polarization within the Roman Com-

munity has caused it to resemble both the Jewish Church at the time of Jesus - with its distinct and divergent parties - and the Anglican Church today - with its various schools of opinion and practice. It will be increasingly important to differentiate *which* Roman Church we are talking about.

(2.) There is the increased manifestation of the importance of the Papacy in maintaining the unity of the Roman Church. In the absence of a common theology (as in the days of Scholasticism), or a shared territory (as in Medieval Europe), or recognized hegemony (as in the Age of the Baroque), or a universal Latin liturgy (as before the Reformation), or effective episcopal collegiality (as in the Eastern Orthodox Churches), or genuine conciliarity (as in the Ancient and Undivided Church of the Seven Ecumenical Councils), the Roman Community must discover some acceptable source of unity. Without a common confession, the Church must turn to a unique person, the Pope. Rome, in my opinion, must increasingly become a Papal, not a confessional Church, if it is to survive. Otherwise fragmentation, as occurred in the Reformation in Northern Europe, will overtake the Latin Church.

Thus, if there is to be a confessional resurgence to match that of the Ancient Church with its Ecumenical Councils or the Reformation Fellowship with its Evangelical Affirmations, it will have to come from Protestantism. Divided and distracted, distressed and distraught, it, nevertheless, derives in part from the Reformation effected by our Lutheran forebears, and it still professes, at least in part, the precious truths of the Gospel. This situation offers to Evangelical and Confessional Lutherans a unique opportunity for service.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Religious Population of the World," *The World Almanac and Book of Facts, 1975* (New York: NEA, 1975) p. 322.
2. Peter Davies, editor, *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1973), p. 568.
3. J. Leslie Dunstan, editor, *Protestantism* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1969), p. ix.
4. Imagine with what emphasis Solomon would have written these lines if he had lived in our age: ". . . of making many books there is no end. . . ." (Eccl. 12:12). A few of the classic titles dealing with Protestant Theology in this century are as follows: Edwin Ewart Aubrey, *Present Theological Tendencies* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1936), I. M. Bochenski, *Contemporary European Philosophy* (translated from the German by Donald Nicholl and Karl Aschenbrenner; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956), Colin Brown, *Philosophy and the Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Main Thinkers and Schools of Thought from the Middle Ages to the Present Day* (Chicago: Intervarsity Press, 1969), Gabriel Fackre, *Humiliation and Celebration: Post-Radical Themes in*

Doctrine, Morals, and Mission (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969), Gregory K. Fiechtner and C. George Fry, editors, *Protestant Theology, 1914-1975, A Basic Bibliography* (Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary, 1976), C. George Fry, editor, *European Theology, 1648-1914* (Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary, 1976), C. George Fry and Ralph Hall, editors, *Ten Contemporary Theologians: A Basic Bibliography* (Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary, 1976), Washington Gladden, *Present Day Theology* (Columbus: McClelland and Company, 1918), Stanley N. Gundry and Alan F. Johnson, editors, *Tensions in Contemporary Theology* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1976), Marvin Halverson, editor, *A Handbook of Christian Theology: Essays on Concepts and Movements of Thought in Contemporary Protestantism* (New York: Living Age Books, 1958), Walter Marshall Horton, *Theism and Modern Mood* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1930), *Realistic Theology* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1935), *Contemporary English Theology: An American Interpretation* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1936), *Contemporary Continental Theology: An Interpretation for Anglo-Saxons* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1938), H. Stuart Hughes, *Consciousness and Society: The Reorientation of European Social Thought, 1890-1930* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), Thomas A. Langford, *In Search of Foundations: English Theology: 1900-1920* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), Hugh Ross Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology: Schleiermacher to Barth* (London: Nisbet and Company, Ltd., 1937), John Macquarrie, *Twentieth Century Religious Thought: The Frontiers of Philosophy and Theology, 1900-1970* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1971), Dagobert Runes, editor, *Twentieth Century Philosophy: Living Schools of Thought* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947), Wilbur M. Smith, *Therefore, Stand: A Plea for a Vigorous Apologetic in the Present Crisis of Evangelical Christianity* (Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1945), Ralph W. Sockman, *Recoveries in Religion* (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1938), John R. W. Stott, *Basic Christianity* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1975), *Christian Mission in the Modern World* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1975), Roland N. Stromberg, *After Everything: Western Intellectual History Since 1945* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975), William Irwin Thompson, *At the Edge of History* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971), Paul Tillich, *Theology of Culture* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), *A History of Christian Thought: From its Judaic and Hellenistic Origins to Existentialism,* edited by Carl E. Braaten (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967), *Systematic Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951-1963, 3 volumes in one), Alec R. Vidler, *Essays in Liberality* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1957), David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, editors, *The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), J. S. Whale, *Christian Doctrine: Eight Lectures Delivered in the University of Cambridge to Undergraduates of All Faculties* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966) and, for background, Reinhold Seeburg, *The History of Doctrines,* translated by Charles E. Hay (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977, 2 volumes in one).

5. Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill, editors, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), p. 320.

6. Horton, *Contemporary English Theology*, pp. 1 ff. develops this typology.
7. *The Book of Worship for Church and Home* (The Methodist Publishing House, 1944), p. 11.
8. *The Iliff School of Theology, 1977-78 Catalog*, p. 95.
9. Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1953), p. 1421.
10. These were the verbal inerrancy of Scripture, the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, and the physical resurrection and bodily return of Jesus.
11. John C. Bennett, *Christian Realism* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941), pp. 12.
12. See John H. Leith, editor, *Creeds of the Churches* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday-Anchor, 1963), pp. 517-522.
13. There was a voluminous literature on this subject; see "Dissent on a New Creed," *Time* LXXXVI (August 6, 1965), pp. 70-71; "New Look: Confession of 1967, Change in Presbyterian Doctrine," *Newsweek* LXVII (June 6, 1966), pp. 67-68; Martin E. Marty, "Script-Writers Take Over: Presbyterian Confession of Faith," *The Christian Century* LXXXII (June 9, 1965), pp. 733-735.
14. See "Ecumenical Theology at the Crossroads: Appeal for Theological Affirmation Issued at Hartford Conference," *America* CXXII (February 15, 1975) p. 103; Avery Dulles, "Finding God and the Hartford Appeal," *America* CXXXII (May 3, 1975), pp. 334-337; "God Invented Us: Appeal for Theological Affirmation Issued at Hartford Ecumenical Conference," *Commonweal* CI (February 14, 1975), pp. 379-380; E. Wright, "Hartford Affirmation: Limiting Liberal Theology," *Christianity Today* XIX (February 15, 1975), pp. 53-55; "Hartford Heresies: Warning that American Theology Has Strayed Far Afield," *Time* CV (February 10, 1975), p. 47; "More Questions Than Answers: Appeal for Theological Affirmation," *Christianity Today* XIX (February 28, 1975), p. 32; B. Thompson, "Neuhaus, Coffin, Cox: SRO at 475: The Hartford Appeal for Theological Affirmation," *The Christian Century* XCII (June 4, 1975), pp. 563-564; S. C. Cowley and L. Lisle, "New Heretics: Second Hartford Conference," *Newsweek* LXXXVI (September 29, 1975), p. 64; and Martin E. Marty, "The Relevance of Attacking Relevance: Reaction to the Hartford Theological Conference, *The Christian Century* XCII (February 19, 1975), p. 183.
15. Little has been written about Radical Christianity in the form of analysis rather than either advocacy or polemic. Helpful are the following: John Charles Cooper, *Radical Christianity and its Sources* (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1968), *The New Mentality* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969), *The Turn Right* (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1970), *A New Kind of Man* (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1972), and *The Recovery of America* (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1973).
16. Charles A. Reich, *The Greening of America* (New York: Bantam Books, 1970).
17. *Ibid.*, p. ix.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 166-170.
19. "The Evangelicals: New Empire of Faith," *Time* CX (December 26, 1977), p. 53.
20. *Ibid.*

21. See Robert K. Johnston, "Of Tidy Doctrine and Truncated Experience," *Christianity Today* XXI (February 18, 1977), pp. 10-14.
22. "Religion in Transit," *Christianity Today* XXII (October 21, 1977), p. 114; see Donald Tinder, "Why the Evangelical Upswing?" *Christianity Today* XXII (October 21, 1977), pp. 76-78; H. Dermott McDonald, "The Lusts of Modern Theology," *Christianity Today* XXII (October 21, 1977), pp. 84-86; and David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, *The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They are Changing,* revised edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977).
23. I have tentatively explored this topic in my paper, "An Historian Looks at Three Trends in Popular American Religion in the 1970's," delivered at Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana, on February 21, 1977.
24. William Pierson Merrill, "Rise Up, O Men of God."
25. Quoted in Charles S. MacFarland, *Christian Unity in the Making: The First Twenty-Five Years of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1905-1930* (New York: Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1948), pp. 45, 46.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
27. See Leith, *Creeds of the Churches,* pp. 522-554.
28. "West Indian to Succeed Blake," *Christianity Today* XVI (September 15, 1972), p. 46.
29. For the story of the Ecumenical Movement, see Rouse and Neill, editors, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948,* Gaius Jackson Slosser, *Christian Unity: Its History and Challenge in all Communions in all Lands* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1929), and David P. Gaines, *The World Council of Churches: A Study of Its Background and History* (Peterborough, New Hampshire: Richard R. Smith, 1966).
30. Quoted by Rouse and Neill, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement,* p. 455.
31. There is a prolific literature on the Church of South India. See *The Book of Common Worship* (authorized by the Synod of 1962; London: Oxford University Press, 1963), *The Sacraments: The Meeting of the Joint Theological Commission of the Church of South India and the Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in India, March, 1955* (Madras: Christian Literature Society, 1956), A. Dammers, *Great Venture: The Church of South India in Action* (London: Highway Press, 1958), S. M. Gibbard, *Unity is Not Enough: Reflections After a Visit to the Church of South India* (London: Mowbray, 1965), Michael Hollis, *The Significance of South India* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1966), James E. Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church: A Defence of the South India Scheme* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1948), Douglas Webster, *What is the Church of South India?,* rev. ed. (London: Highway Press, 1959), Bengt Gustaf Sundkler, *Church of South India: The Movement Towards Union, 1900-1947* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1954), and Hermann Sasse, *Church Union in South India: Some Considerations for Lutheran Theologians* (n.p., n.p., 1963).
32. The sermon is in David H. Scott, *The Challenge to Reunion: The Blake-Pike Proposal Under Scrutiny* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1963). There is much literature on COCU. Some of the following is especially helpful: Paul A. Crow, editor, *A Bibliography of the Consultation on Church Union* (Lexington, Kentucky: Consultation on Church

Union, 1967); COCU, *Principles of Church Union, Guidelines for Structure, and a Study Guide* (Cincinnati: Forward Publications, 1967), *A Plan of Union for the Churches of Christ Uniting Commended to the Churches for Study and Response by the Consultation on Church Union, March 9-13, 1970, at St. Louis, Missouri* (Princeton, New Jersey: COCU, 1971), *A Catholic Perspective* (Washington, D.C.: USCC Publications Office, 1970). See also George L. Hunt, *Where We Are in Church Union: A Report on the Present Accomplishments of the Consultation on Church Union* (New York: Association Press, 1965), Paul A. Crow, Jr., and William J. Boney, editors, *Church Union at Midpoint* (New York: Association Press, 1972), Ronald E. Osborn, *A Church for These Times* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), Bela Vasady, *Christ's Church—Evangelical, Catholic, and Reformed* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), Robert McAfee Brown and David H. Scott, editors, *The Challenge to Reunion* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1963), Lewis S. Mudge, *One Church: Catholic and Reformed* (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1963), William J. Wolf, *A Plan of Church Union: Catholic, Evangelical, Reformed* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Episcopal Theological Seminary, 1965), J. Robert Nelson, *Church Union in Focus* (Boston: United Church Press, 1967), as well as these primary sources: *Digest of the Proceedings of the Consultation on Church Union for 1962 (Washington, DC) and 1963 (Oberlin, Ohio)*, Volumes I and II combined; *Digest of the Proceedings of the Consultation on Church Union (Princeton, New Jersey), April, 1964,* Volume III; *Digest of the Proceedings of the Fourth Meeting on the Consultation on Church Union (Lexington, Kentucky), April 5-8, 1965*; Volume IV; *Digest of the Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the Consultation on Church Union (Dallas, Texas), May 2-5, 1966,* Volume V; *Digest of the Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the Consultation on Church Union (Cambridge, Massachusetts), May 1-4, 1967,* Volume VI; these are printed by the Executive Secretary, Consultation on Church Union, Fanwood, New Jersey; see also Consultation on Church Union, *COCU: The Official Reports of the Four Meetings of the Consultation* (Cincinnati: Forward Publications, 1966) and *A Preliminary Outline of a Plan of Union, Discussed at the Eighth Meeting of the Consultation of Church Union, Atlanta, Georgia, March 17-20, 1969* (Princeton, New Jersey: COCU, 1969).

33. Martin E. Marty, "Denominations: Surviving the 70's," *The Christian Century* XCIV (December 21, 1977), p. 1187.
34. "Melting Pot or Salad Bowl?" *The Christian Century* XCIV (December 21, 1977), p. 1179.
35. *Ibid.*
36. It can be read in Leith, *Creeds of the Churches,* pp. 555-566.
37. A few of the basic books are: Geddes MacGregor, *The Vatican Revolution* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957), Walter M. Abbott, general editor, *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild Press, 1966), Hans Kung, Yves Congar, and Daniel O'Hanlon, editors, *Council Speeches of Vatican II* (Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1964), Richard Baumann, *Ein Lutheraner im Vatikan: Oekumenische Gesprache* [Essen: H. Dreiewer, 1962), Basil Christopher Butler, *The Theology of Vatican II* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1967), Oscar Cullman, *Vatican Council II: The New Direction* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), Christopher Hollis, *The Achievements of Vatican II* (New York: Hawthorne Books, 1967),

George A. Lindbeck, *The Future of Roman Catholic Theology: Vatican II: Catalyst for Change* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), Warren A. Quanbeck, editor, *Challenge and Response: A Protestant Perspective on the Vatican Council* (Minneapolis. Augsburg Publishing House, 1966), Edmund Schlink, *After the Council* (translated from the German by J. C. Bouman, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968).

Theological Observer

The recently proffered report of the "Special Hymnal Review Committee" (SHRC) indicates that further work is required to reach acceptable liturgical goals. On the one hand, every page of the critique makes it clear that the members of the Committee do not really like the new *Lutheran Book of Worship* (LBW). Yet the nature and scope of the critique appear to indicate that evidently the Committee members believe that, even though the LBW is *not quite* what we had in mind, it certainly is on the right track— and given a modest number of specific deletions and insertions the Lutheran Church —Missouri Synod can and will have something very much like the LWB in short order! The reviewer assumes that this is what the Committee members are saying, for the only obvious alternatives would have been for them to state clearly either that (1) the whole project must be junked (what has been produced is not at all what we have had in mind); or (2) we really do not like the LBW but given the material and financial investment, we have no alternative but to make some superficial corrections to a production which is fundamentally unsound. Since the members of SHRC make neither of these statements, we must in charity assume that they are fundamentally in sympathy with the *LBW*.

This writer remains unimpressed by either the forthcoming *LBW* (in both the corrected and uncorrected versions) or the superficial and yet overly specific and detailed critique offered by the Review Committee. The foundation of a valuable and valid criticism of the LBW really ought to begin with an examination and evaluation of the destination sought and the goal proposed. What, after all, have our liturgical commissions been up to all this time? Independent scholars and commissions in past ages proposed two rather clearly defined goals of new books of Lutheran worship: (1) to salvage and reclaim the heritage of a rich liturgical tradition in Evangelical Lutheranism, and (2) to present the congregations with reasonably workable documents for public worship and private devotion. (The *Common Service Book* of 1888, for instance, gives evidence of the thinking of those who "retrieved" our Common Service for us.)

Until well into the seventeenth century, Lutheran Christianity seems to have understood herself to be standing within what might be called the "catholic" worship tradition. Excepting where the inroads of Reformed influences were already evident, no narrow dogmaticism was permitted to deprive Lutheran congregations of rich and meaningful worship forms, ceremonial, or hymnody. Lutheran theologians made no attempt to proscribe or prohibit the singing of the *Stabat Mater* (so abhored by SHRC) or the *Lauda Sion Salvatorem* (written by Thomas Aquinas for Corpus Christi Day). In point of fact, Lutheran theologians warmly commended these and other medieval and even post-Reformation hymns from non-Lutheran sources. An examination of Calvoer's monumental *Ritualis Ecclesiastica* (Jena, 1704) and older Lutheran hymnals from Germany and Scandinavia bear eloquent witness to a warmly catholic evangelicalism. Nor did our theologians narrowly insist upon a specific biblical warrant for every poetic or ceremonial allusion, for they understood that only what mitigates, obliterates, and obfuscates the *tenor* of Scripture must be eliminated. The requirement of specific and particular biblical warrant for words and actions was well understood as a requirement peculiar to Reformed theologians, rulers, and congregations, and an evidence of Calvinistic chauvinism.

Neither the compilers of the *LBW* nor the members of SHRC seem to share the Lutheran mentality of catholic evangelicalism. In fact, those who think in such terms today might well expect to be analysed and diagnosed as suffering from an obscure and harmful syndrome which renders them theologically

impotent and evangelistically sterile. They clearly are not "with it" in an age in which being "with it" is everything. "Our people want something new and different!" is a statement heard with alarming frequency. It is difficult to escape the impression that what it means is "Our people don't know much about worship, and we are either ill-informed or disinclined to teach them—so let's give them what they want!" There has never—so we are being told—*ever* been a generation anything like our own since the dawn of creation. We use electricity; therefore, we must develop an electric worship. We live in a technological age; so let us develop our worship techniques. We think differently and speak differently, and certainly we behave differently from any previous age; so we must, of necessity, worship differently as well. We cannot so much as say the same prayers our fathers and their fathers said—at least not until we have managed to render them unrecognizable! Henry Ford put it succintly: "History is bunk!"

Before a new and worthy book of worship can be produced, we must come to the clear realization that our age negates the real significance of worship and the redeemed man as a worshipping creature. The purpose of worship is, after all, not to create moods or sacramentalize concerns, but to fear, love, and trust in God above all things else. The purpose of theology, David Hollazius put it two and half centuries ago, is to teach us *how* God in Christ is to be worshipped. At the same time, we must recognize both our debt to and our continuity with the past. It is precisely the contemporary abrupt break with the catholic past which has created such great confusion throughout the modern Christian world.

The writer does not gainsay the need for a new and more comprehensive book of Christian worship. But before it can be produced, we will have to recognize that what is needed is not something completely *new* and in tune with the secular mentality. Nor do we require a comprehensive dogmatic theology in song and verse! We do need to rediscover and clean up our heritage, which is solidly liturgical, sacramental, and theologically sound. We need further a book of worship which is suitable for use in private and family devotions, for preparation for private or public absolution, for the remembrance of Holy Baptism and the approach to the Table of the Lord. The Small Catechism and Augsburg Confession ought once again to be included, along with the occasional services in which the Congregation participates. We must begin with the first and second generation reformers (Luther, Chemnitz, Chytraeus) and move back to the great patristic authors whom they knew well enough to quote copiously (Irenaeus, Basileus, Chrysostomus, Gregory), the Apostolic Fathers, and the Apostles themselves. This would represent a return to (more than just the past) a fuller understanding of the place of worship in the life of the Church. Who knows, even the Eucharistic Prayer may yet prove to be not altogether objectionable. What will be needed is study, education, effort, and a little willingness to learn.

Charles J. Evanson

Book Reviews

I. Biblical Studies

ARCHAEOLOGY IN BIBLE LANDS. By Howard F. Vos. Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 399 pages. Cloth $9.95.

Howard Vos with two earned doctorates, who at present is professor of history and archaeology at the King's College, Briarcliffe Manor, New York has written a book which is long overdue. Heretofore, full-length works have appeared which have dealt with individual countries, but there has been no recent treatment that makes available to students information about archaeological discoveries and efforts in Bible lands. Vos' volume has a similar plan of organization as the volume published by Owen, *Archaeology and the Bible.*

A Bible land in this work is defined by Vos in his preface as follows:

> A Bible land is defined here as an area in which a part of the biblical narrative actually occurred. Thus, although such places as Ethiopia and Cyrene (Modern Libya) are mentioned in the Bible in connection with the Ethiopian eunuch and Simon of Cyrene (who bore the cross of Christ), they do not enjoy separate treatment here because no biblical events actually occurred on their soil.

The author has organized his book around three major topics. Part I has five chapters which treat of "Nature and Techniques of Biblical Archaeology." Part II deals with "Archaeology and the Text of the Bible." Part III contains three-fourths of the contents of the book and treats "Excavations in the Bible Lands."

The narratives of the Old and New Testaments relate to areas currently encompassed by twelve sovereign states. Vos presents the Bible lands in the order in which they appear in Holy Scripture, which are as follows: Mesopotamia (Iraq), Palestine (Israel and Jordan), Egypt, Phoenecia (Lebanon) Syria, Iran (Persia), Cyprus, Asia Minor (Turkey), Greece (including Crete), Malta and Italy. Malta is treated in one of the appendixes, because no archaeological work has been done on this island. There are also brief appendixes on Sheba and Tarshish, added because of interest on these on the part of Biblical readers.

Each chapter is supplied with a good bibliography, in most cases the books listed are the most recently published. The bibliographies the author tells his readers are not intended to incorporate all the thousands of bibliographical items consulted by him in the writing of this highly useful volume.

Since Vos' theological orientation is conservative, the reviewer was somewhat surprised when he failed to include in his bibliographies books by Unger, Thompson, Owen, Ch. Pfeiffer and Free, all conservative scholars who have books at present in print on Biblical archaeology.

There is no doubt about it, *Archaeology in Bible Lands* will give laymen and clergy a better understanding of Christianity and archaeology. The ordinary lay person will find that Vos explains in layman's language the purpose and process of archaeology and the importance of recent archaeological discoveries. Seminarians will find the volume especially useful.

Raymond F. Surburg

ROCKS, RELICS AND BIBLICAL RELIABILITY. By Clifford A. Wilson. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, and Probe Ministeries International, Richardson, Texas, 1977. 141 Pages. Paper. $3.95.

Probe Ministeries claims to be "a nonprofit corporation organized to provide perspective on the integration of the academic disciplines and historic Christianity. The members and associates of the Probe team are actively engaged in research as well as lecturing and interacting in thousands of university classrooms throughout the United States and Canada on topics and issues vital to the university student."

The book by Clifford Wilson is one of the volumes in the "Religion Series." As the title indicates this monograph has as its purpose to show the reliability of the Bible. Are the Biblical documents historically reliable? While Wilson agrees that it is not the purpose of archaeology to prove the Bible true, he still contends that the last hundred years have produced and made available much archaeological data from the different countries of the Fertile Crescent, data which both have validated and enlarged our view of Bible life and times. In eleven chapters Wilson surveys the major periods of Biblical history by selecting data from different archaeological digs and shows the interlacings of secular and Biblical history. A chapter is devoted to the Dead Sea Scrolls and one to New Testament archaeology. Included in his discussions are a number of pages which treat of the sensational discoveries at Tell Mardikh-Ebla, where Paola Matthiae and Giovanni Pettinato of the University of Rome have unearthed tablets employing a language, called Paleo-Hebrew or Eblaic (texts from 2400- to 2250 B.C.) which has much in common with Biblical Hebrew.

Clifford Wilson defends the historicity of Genesis 1-11, the historicity of the Pentateuch as well as the historicity of the contents of Joshua and Judges, books questioned by many critical scholars. He has no problems whatsoever with the Mosaic authorship.

Wilson holds a high view of the Holy Scriptures. The concluding paragraph reads:

> The marks of the Bible's high integrity and superhuman foresight and wisdom are impressive when seen together with its claim that "holy men of God spoke as they were inspired by God's Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. 1:21). The Bible is also a human book, penned by ordinary mortals; the Old Testament is a national history of Israel, researched and written by representatives of that nation; the New Testament is a product of its times, yet transcends it times as it presents the timeless Son of God who came to die on a cross for humanity's sin, and then to rise again.
>
> It is the studied conviction of this writer that the Bible is not only the ancient world's most reliable history textbook; it is God's revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ.

In his response to Wilson's book, R. K. Harrison briefly summarized the important issues stressed by Wilson and concluded his two-page response by asserting: "God has used man's skill in this way to preserve a written record of His revelation and His salvation in Christ, and Wilson demonstrates clearly that these literary sources are authentic and reliable both for history and faith" (p. 129).

Raymond F. Surburg

FALLACIES OF EVOLUTION. THE CASE FOR CREATIONISM. By Arlie J. Hoover, Baker Book House, 1977. 85 pages. Paper. $2.50.

Dr. Arlie J. Hoover, Dean of Columbia Christian College of Portland, Oregon and the author of a recent book, entitled, *Dear Agnos: A Defense of Christianity,* has written a book for teachers, students and parents who are in quest of a volume which shows the fallacies of the Evolutionary theory, so

influential in the world today. The purpose of the volume is to show that evolutionists are far from employing logical arguments in their support for and promotion of evolution to the complete ignoring and rejection of Biblical creationism. Specialists in the areas of the sciences who advocate evolution frequently say: "Let the scientist settle the question."

Hoover believes it is wrong to teach that evolution is "the only scientific theory of origins." In this relatively short presentation he claims that evolutionists commit several fallacies, errors in logic which rational men ought not to make. "Evolution should move over and allow creation to be considered as a possible theory of origins" (p. 13).

One of the misconceptions corrected by the author is the claim that scientists are constantly by means of laboratory work establishing incontrovertible proof for evolution. Even after one hundred years the situation which obtained in Darwin's day, still holds today: evolution is a theory for which laboratory proof is lacking. So far no scientist has delivered a knockout blow to creationism.

Hoover proposes that both evolution and creationism be presented to the pupils of the public schools. Evolution should not be set forth as the *only* explanation for origins. Certainly, if the subject of origins is still an open question, then it would be unjust to teach only one theory of origins.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE GOSPEL OF ISAIAH. By Allan A. MacRae. Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 192 pages. Paper. $2.95.

This study of Isaiah is limited to chapters 40:1-56:8. Its purpose is to examine the great themes of this portion of the prophet's book and also especially to show their interrelations. The volume is intended for pastors, theological students and for Bible students among the laity, whether they have or do not have a knowledge of Hebrew.

MacRae states in his preface:

> The book is not intended to be a commentary on this section of Isaiah. There are a number of good commentaries, written from various viewpoints, that contain helpful discussions of particular words and phrases. The main purpose of this writing is open to open up the treasures of this section of the book by showing the interrelation of the thoughts and the general progress of the ideas presented (p. 9).

Among Old Testament prophetical books none is better known than the book of Isaiah. Literary critics are agreed that in Isaiah 40-66 some of the grandest literature that has ever been produced is to be found. The author is convinced that the section beginning with 40:1 and concluding with the middle of Chapter 56 contains materials which a Christian especially will appreciate, because this section contains more verses which are quoted in the New Testament than any other Old Testament section of similar length.

In this section of Isaiah there are found the four famous servant passages: 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; and 52:13-53:12. The New Testament clearly shows that Isaiah 52:13-53:12 predicts the vicarious and substitutionary suffering of Christ, the promised Messiah of the Old Testament Scriptures. While this section of Isaiah, 40:1-56:8 contains these wonderful Gospel passages, it is, however, also true that there are long passages in these seventeen chapters consisting of isolated verses, most of which mean very little to the average reader. In commenting on this the author states: "It is as if one were walking through a dark tunnel, and only occasionally passing a small opening through which he might obtain a glimpse of a beautiful distant panorama, as the prophets looks forward to some thrilling aspect of the life of Christ."

The section of the book beginning with 56:7-66:24 has little in common with 40:1-56:8, but has a greater affinity with earlier parts of Isaiah. After

presenting the major thoughts and interrelationships MacRae claims Isaiah's book truly can be called "The Gospel of Isaiah."

In an introduction by Francis A. Schaeffer the reader is informed that Allan A. MacRae, President and Professor of Old Testament at Biblical School of Theology at Hatfield, Pennsylvania, was the recognized outstanding student of Dr. Robert Dick Wilson of old Princeton. Wilson, reputed by some to be the greatest Semitic scholar in the world of his day, imbued MacRae with a love for Biblical and Semitic studies as well as for the truth.

Raymond F. Surburg

EXODUS, A STUDY GUIDE COMMENTARY. By F. B. Huey. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 142 Pages. Paper. $2.50

This volume by Professor Huey, Professor of Old Testament at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, is the latest in the "Study Guide" Series, of which Genesis, Job, Isaiah, Daniel, Hosea, and Amos in the Old Testament have thus far appeared. This study guide will help Old Testament students better understand and appreciate this Biblical book, considered by the author as one of the three or four most important books of the Old Testament. In writing about the importance of this second book of the Torah, Huey wrote:

> The Exodus experience is to the Old Testament and Judaism what the Cross in the New Testament is to the Christian faith. The Exodus is the climatic event of Hebrew history, when God acted to deliver his people from bondage, just as the Cross is the central event of Christian history, when God acted to deliver mankind from the bondage of sin (p. 7).

The following are some of the important theological themes treated by the book: redemption, salvation, election, worship, law, covenant, and priesthood.

The author seems to favor the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, claiming that Jesus Himself affirmed the Mosaic authorship of the First five books of the Hebrew Scriptures. Throughout his entire presentation the sources of J, E, and P. are not referred to nor are the contents of the books discussed in terms of these sources, as is done in the critical commentaries which Huey lists in his bibliography on page 141. However, he weakens his testimony by stating "If we affirm, or any other book of the Bible, was written under the inspiration of the Spirit of God, then disputes among scholars as to the exact nature of the author become largely academic and of secondary importance" (pp. 8-9). The controversy relative to the date of the Exodus, whether it occurred in the fifteenth or thirteenth centuries, is answered like this: "It seems that for every argument supporting either date there is a counterargument of equal merit. Therefore, the final determination of the actual date must wait for further evidence that will shed more light on the problem" (p. 9). Huey rejects the idea that the events of the Exodus are fiction and not historical.

Structurally Huey has divided the organization of Exodus into four parts: Part One: Israel in Egypt (chs. 1-11); Part Two: Deliverance from Egypt (chs. 12-18); Part Three: A New Relationship (chs. 19-31); Part Four: Rebellion and Renewal (chs. 32-40). These four major divisions are further subdivided. In these four sections by exegetical treatment the author has developed the following theological themes: redemption, salvation, election, worship, law, covenant and priesthood. For Huey the supernatural is no problem as it is for many critical scholars. The use of this study guide should help theological students, pastors and concerned laymen grasp and apply the teachings of Exodus.

Raymond F. Surburg

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF OLD TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION. By Ronald E. Clements. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1976. 152 pages. $4.95.

R. E. Clements, Fellow, Tutor, and Director of Studies in Theology and Director of Oriental Studies at Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge and previously Lecturer in Hebrew and Semitic Studies has given an overview of the Pentateuch, the historical books, the prophets, the psalms and wisdom literature and the theology of the Old Testament in terms of what leading scholars, beginning with Wellhausen to the present have taught. The period covered is about one hundred years. The purpose of this book is to analyze and clarify for present-day students the methods of interpretation used by a host of scholars interested in the Old Testament.

Committed to the use of the historical-critical method, Clements consistently defends the need for the employment of the various methods developed in the last century by the proponents of the historical-critical method. Clements concludes that the major efforts of Old Testament scholars who developed such research methods as literary criticism, form criticism, tradition-history criticism, and redaction criticism, all which show a degree of interdependence and are used often simultaneously in the interpretation of the literature of the Old Testament, are valid and necessary.

In the survey of the major areas of Old Testament study it is obvious to any intelligent reader that the whole area has been one of flux and uncertainty. Clements preceptively points out the presuppositions of the various schools of interpretation and raises question after question as to what exactly can be held with certainty. Yet he believes that the critical approach employed in the last one hundred years can be an instrument of faith. In the eight chapters of his book Clements refers to the views of 128 different scholars. Julius Wellhausen and Herman Gunkel are frequently discussed and referred to.

On page 143 Clements makes the following significant assertion:

> Once the goal of a critical approach to the literature of the Old Testament has been embraced it becomes a leaven which transforms everything. No part of the literature can be left unexamined, and everything becomes subject to review. That this has resulted in the emergence of a picture of the origins of the literature, and the course of the Israelite Jewish history in which it was produced, which differs greatly from that which has previously been upheld by Jewish and Christian tradition is incontrovertible. It was inevitable that this should have proved disconcerting to the faith of many, and it is not unreasonable to claim that at first many in the Christian church felt that such a critical attitude could be tolerated more readily in respect of the Old Testament than the New. This, if it were true of some, was a misplaced attitude of complacency, for the rigours of historical and literary criticism do not, and cannot cease at the last page of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, such a historical-critical approach is not an end in itself, but merely a means by which some further end can be achieved (pp. 143-144).

On page 147 Clements makes the thought-provoking assertion:

> On the other side it is also unsatisfactory to try to find in the Old Testament a body of timeless doctrines which can be easily and smoothly set apart from the connection with particular people, events, and institutions.

As a result of the utilization of the historical-critical method there is no timeless truth in either the Old or New Testaments. Theology is always moving and those reading the Bible never can be certain of where man came from, why he is living and whither he ultimately is going. This book is good at raising questions but not in giving ultimate answers upon which Christian theologians and Christian people can build on a solid foundation.

Raymond F. Surburg

FROM SABBATH TO SUNDAY. By Samuele Bacchiocchi. The Pontifical Gregorian University Press, Rome, 1977. 372 pages. Paper. $6.00. Distributed in the USA by the author, 230 Lisa Lane, Berrien Springs, Michigan, 49103.

The purpose of this doctoral dissertation, accepted as fulfillment toward his doctorate at The Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, was to investigate the rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity. Dr. Bacchiocchi was the first non-Catholic to graduate from the Pontifical Gregorian University and was also the recipient of a gold medal from Pope Paul VI for graduating with academic distinction of summa cum laude. Presently he teaches theology and church history at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, a Seventh-day Adventist University.

Major questions proposed for investigation in this study were: What are the Biblical and historical reasons for Sunday-keeping? Can the Sabbath commandment be rightly used in having Christians attend church on Sundays as a divine command? How can the widespread profanation of the Lord's day be solved?

These questions Bacchiocchi answers first of all by an investigation of the Biblical basis and the historical genesis of Sunday observance. He then endeavors to ascribe a Messianic typology to the Old Testament Sabbath and find its fulfillment in the redemptive mission of Christ. The author further examines passages in the Gospels that speak of the Sabbath and again endeavors to show that they were a fitting symbol of Christ's redemptive work. The Sabbath, therefore, according to the author is a fitting day to recall and commemorate the divine blessings of salvation as well as a day for showing kindness and mercy toward other people.

After dealing with the Biblical data, Bacchiocchi proceeds to examine the historical records of post New Testament times to show that Sunday was observed by Rome as a day of worship, but that there is no New Testament or apostolic warrant for the weekly observance of Sunday in place of the Sabbath. "The fact that Sunday became a day of rest and worship not by Biblical-apostolic authority rather as a result of political, social, pagan and Christian factors makes it virtually impossible to construct a valid theology for Sunday observance." The Andrews University professor contends that it is a paradox when Christians endeavor to demand Sunday observance by appealing to the Fourth Commandment which specifically says: "Remember the sabbath to keep it holy!"

At the very end of his acknowledgements the author expresses the hope: "I hope that my readers will be stimulated not only to reconsider which is God's holy day but especially to experience fellowship with their Saviour as a result of a better understanding and observance of Holy Sabbath" (p. 6).

While Bacchiocchi admits that on certain interpretations he is in disagreement with the Seventh-day Advent theological position and has interpreted certain historical data differently from the traditional position of his Church, he is still vigorously defending one of the main tenets for which Seventh-day Adventism is known, namely its insistence on the importance and necessity of keeping the Old Testament Sabbath.

The New Testament does not support the view of Seventh-day Adventism that the Sabbath commandment is still in force. The Gentile Christians of the Apostles' day did not observe the Sabbath (Col. 2:16, 17; Acts 15). In the New Testament Christians have not been commanded by God to observe any particular day; and the New Testament declares that for Christians one day is in itself no holier than another, that all days are alike, and that all days are holy days (Rom. 14:5, 6; Gal. 4:10; Col. 2:16, 17; Acts 2:46).

The Christian Sunday is not a New Testament substitute for the Old Testament Sabbath. The two are entirely different from each other. The Sabbath was instituted for the Israel of the Old Testament, it was a part of the ceremonial law and as Paul states the sabbath together with new moons

and other ceremonial laws has been abrogated by Jesus (Col. 2:16, 17). The Lord's Day was voluntarily set apart by the Church in the exercise of her Christian liberty. It was in honor of the Lord's resurrection from the dead that the early apostolic Church chose the first day of the week as a time to come together to worship and hear God's Word as well as to celebrate the breaking of bread.

Raymond F. Surburg

II. Theological - Historical Studies

THE ESSENCE OF HUMAN NATURE. By Mark P. Cosgrove. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1977. Paperback. 75 pages. $2.95.

There are three questions the author addresses: "First, Is man just material? second, Is man's behavior determined? third, Is man just an animal?" His answer, in sum, is that man "is uniquely more. He is truly human" (p. 21). That may appear at first glance to be an utterly simplistic conclusion in view of what everybody already knows about man. A moment's reflection, in a day that is dominated by an often arrogant and conceited pyschology, will give one pause, however; and the reader will find that Cosgrove presents a cogent case for himself: Man has a brain like an animal in many ways, sometimes even a smaller bundle of grey matter, but he is definitely more than an amazing "neurological computer"; the mind indicates the presence of a wonderfully unique *person*; and some modern psychologists are beginning to recognize that, while the immaterial mind lies considerably beyond their powers or potentials for research, there is every reason to support the fact that the human mind is there. Sir John Eccles, noted Australian brain physiologist and Nobel prize winner, concurs: "I can explain my body and my brain, but there's something more; I can't explain my own existence. What makes me a unique being?"

Cosgrove dismisses B. F. Skinner's views as totally out of touch with reality, that man is only a machine who reacts with a determined sort of behavior in response to the rewarding and punishing features in his environment. Such behavioral determinism strips away truth and human responsibility, skinning man of his very nature, Cosgrove contends. From there it is not far to go to bring in the obvious evidence that man is more than an animal. Chimpanzees are fairly willing trainees (for a handout!) and can be trained by various techniques to respond and express themselves, but to the chagrin of their optimistic trainers, the expectant psychologists, the *trainees had nothing to say*!! How different man, whom God made to communicate not only with others but with Himself! The best view of man, therefore, is not his own, but God's. It is recorded in sacred revelation, the Bible. This little book has classroom possibilities as an adjunct text on the doctrine of man.

E. F. Klug

GOD WHO SPEAKS AND SHOWS. By Carl F. H. Henry. Word Books, Waco, Texas, 1976. 373 pages. $12.95.

It is an ambitious project, to say the least, when an author devotes four volumes to the overall subject of GOD, REVELATION AND AUTHORITY. The present volume is the second in this proposed series. Quite rightly Dr. Henry, erstwhile editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, has expressed exasperation over the wretched treatment accorded the Word of God during the past two centuries, noting that "divine revelation has been stretched into everything, stripped into nothing, or modeled into innumerable compromises of such outrageous extremes," stretching from Hegelianism to existentialism with numerous in-between philosophical meanderings and distortions.

Dr. Henry's proposal includes discussion of the concept of revelation around 15 basic theses. Seven are covered in this volume. In brief these treat the fact of the divine initiative behind revelation, given for man's benefit, by the transcendent God graciously drawing the curtain back for man's sake, to give cognitive, coherent disclosure of Himself and His saving purposes towards man, utilizing an amazing variety of forms of delivery of His Word, and knowledge of His own wondrous person, right in the midst of human history.

Certainly not least in value is Dr. Henry's perceptive, insightful, helpful grasp of the various schools of thought and the respective proponents of theological stance on the subject of revelation during the last century particularly. The reader thus may expect to discover careful delineation, as well as critique, running all the way down to contemporary figures like Barth, Bultmann, Bonhoeffer, Pannenberg, among greater and lesser lights. The philosophical thought systems and their influence upon theology are likewise descriptively traced, thus demonstrating the impact of natural theology upon what ought to have been Christian, Biblical thought. This in itself makes the book eminently worthwhile, since Henry is not content to speak in generalities but to hitch specific names to the various aberrations that have cluttered the field on the subject of revelation. Ritschl's influence lurks in the background of Herrmann's thinking on revelation, and Barth did not rise far above Herrmann in setting arbitrary limits for God's revelatory activity. With justice Henry observes that "as for Herrmann, so for Barth, God reveals only himself and not information, propositions, truths," and as a result "God's revelation must here necessarily mean something very different from the biblical understanding" (p. 159). For Bultmann the situation, of course, is even worse, for here the objectivity of God's self-revelation collapsed entirely. "Loss of the intellective dimension of God's self-disclosure," Henry argues, "has therefore had shattering implications for theology, cosmology, history and anthropology. Not only has it issued in exiling God from nature and history, not only has it led to serious doubt over the very reality of God, but it has also fostered an inability to preserve the significance and worth of man himself as more than a passing speck of inanimate cosmic dust. An impersonal external world has cast its flattening shadow over all reality and in reducing all existence-claims to one dimension has overtaken and veiled both God and man."(p. 166)

The chapters devoted to God's person and God's names are especially good, for Henry demonstrates decisively how all of naturalistic and supernaturalistic philosophy, or theology, ends with a depotentiation to a nameless sort of "It" while the Biblical revelation alone conveys God's own intended self-disclosure of His person, His attributes, His totally unique (in Him) names. Both Old Testament and New Testament designations are expertly treated, affording the serious student with excellent summaries.

The concluding chapters which put revelation and history into evangelical perspective probably show Henry at his brilliant best, as he argues that Biblically conservative theology "has nothing in common with a faith that sacrifices either sound historical method or intellectual honesty." His apologetics is carried on against the likes of Barth, Brunner, Bultmann, and, with some appreciation, Moltmann, Pannenberg. States Henry: "The issue is whether in view of his methodology the historian must always explain the past in nonmiraculous terms. Shall we accept historical evidence for miracles or rule them a priori impossible on mechanistic or naturalistic grounds? The objection against miracles is hardly ever directed against one particular miracle (except by some candidates for ordination) but is part of a general view of nature" (p. 315). To Henry, as to every genuinely Biblical theologian, "divine revelation is the epistemic source and Scripture the methodological principle of the Christian interpretation of history," (p. 320) and this includes unquestioning acceptance of what the prophets and apostles report as historical fact. But wisely, at least to this reviewer, Henry expresses the limitations which apologetics poses for the defender of the Christian faith, since finally there is no line of argument which is going to convince the gainsayer of the

historical truth of Christ's resurrection when his presuppositions simply rule out any happening that transcends his own experience. Thus the great sore, neuralgic point in modern historical-critical methodology is that the practitioner "claims the right not only to establish the credibility of past witnesses but also to declare them genuine on the basis of conformity to a contemporary philosophy of history" (p. 326).

Aside from a few strictures, such as rejection of objective justification as the necessary ground for the precious Gospel (p. 40), a strange omission of reference to Eph. 4, 22-24 and Col. 3, 10 in treating of the image of God in man (124), and espousal of continuing creation (p. 332), Henry's efforts here deserve more than just passing attention. The book has obvious textbook possibilities as well in the study of theology.

E. F. Klug

THE DEBATE ABOUT THE BIBLE. INERRANCY VERSUS INFALLIBILITY. By Stephen T. Davis. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1977. 159 Pages. Paper. $5.40.

Stephen Davis is Associate Professor of Philosophy and Religion, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, California. He claims that he is an evangelical Christian who is not in favor of theological liberalism. The writing of this book was prompted by Harold Linsell's *The Battle for The Bible,* who took a hard line against those who promote and defend an errant and fallible Bible. Other scholars like Montgomery and Schaeffer are also criticized for their positions on inerrancy. Other writers like Harrison and F. Henry are mildly taken to task.

Davis contends that despite the fact that he believes the Bible does contain theological, historical and scientific mistakes and errors, his views of the Bible is a high one. He prefers to speak about the infallibility of the Holy Scriptures in preference to inerrancy. He defines the term "infallible" as follows when applied to the Bible: "This notion says that the Bible is fully trustworthy and never misleads us on matters that are crucially relevant to Christian faith and practice" (P. 118). Again: "The Bible is infallible if and only if it makes no false or misleading statements on any matter of faith and practice. In these senses, I personally hold that the Bible is infallible but not errant." (P. 23). Davis is redefining the word "infallible," because according to the standard dictionaries "infallible" means without error or without inaccuracy. According to Davis, because Jesus humbled himself (Philippians 2:6), Jesus could and did make mistakes. For instance he was guilty of an error when he said that the mustard seed was "the smallest of seeds," which botanists today claim is not true.

While according to Davis the Bible does contain geographical, scientific and theological mistakes, he still claims this fact does not interfere with the general trustworthiness of the Bible. How can a person know when the Bible is speaking in a trustworthy manner? Davis says that individuals will have to examine each case and determine by the use of reason what is true and factual and what can be questioned and what is authoritative. The words of the text by proper interpretation do not decide the issue. It is the Bible plus reason. Thus he writes: "I know of few persons who are prepared to admit that they have warrant to believe irrational claims, and so it is apparent that reason has a critical function to play in *all* beliefs, religious as well as nonreligious. Reason must help determine what the Bible says and ultimately whether or not what it says is acceptable."

Those who want to have certainty for their theological beliefs are told by Davis that this is not possible. Only in mathematics and logic is there Cartesian certainty: this is not possible in religion. On page 109 he states; "presumably there are difficulties for *all* positions on all theological subjects. What one should do, I suppose, is adopt the position that is beset with the least difficulties." While he claims to believe in the sinfulness of man, that man needs divine redemption, that Christ arose from the dead, and that men need to commit their lives on faith to

Christ, yet he admits that he cannot rule out the possibility that people might come along and show that these are not true and necessary.

The problem with Davis is that he approaches the Scriptures as a philosopher and not as a humble Christian who is willing to place himself under the total authority of Christ. With St. Paul he needs to say: "For I pull down imaginations and every crag that lifts itself against the knowledge of God. And I carry every thought away into captivity and subjection to Christ; and I am fully prepared to punish every act of disobedience, when once your submission has been put beyond question" (2 Cor. 10:5-6).

Davis admits that both positions, that of inerrancy versus errancy have problems. His stance makes the whole theological interprise uncertain, because he concedes the possibility that his beliefs on basic Christian doctrines might be overthrown. He makes impossible a theology of certainty, one on which a Christian can base his hopes not only for this life, but especially for the life to come. The inerrancy position begins with the assertion that God would not mislead and that the Holy Spirit would not deliberately allow men to record truths that were erroneous and factually untrue. Such a deduction flowing from the very nature of God is the only one that can give true heartfelt and intellectual satisfaction.

Raymond F. Surburg

JEROME. HIS LIFE, WRITINGS, AND CONTROVERSIES. By J. N. D. Kelly. Harper and Row Publishers, New York/London, 1975. Pages xi + 353.

At least since the time of Pope Boniface VIII in the late thirteenth century Jerome, along with Ambrose, Augustine, and Gregory the Great, has been regarded in the Western Church as one of the four eminent Fathers of the Church. It is a wonder, therefore, that until this study by Professor Kelly Jerome has never been the subject of a comprehensive study in English. It is the intention of Kelly to fill this gap, and he has filled it admirably. J. N. D. Kelly, a professor at Oxford University, has authored several well-known and highly respected works in the field of early Christian history and thought, including *Early Christian Creeds, Early Christian Doctrines,* and *The Athanasian Creed.* He has honored himself as well as a commentator of the Scriptures in his commentaries on the Petrine and Pastoral Epistles. In *Jerome* Kelly once again shows himself to be a master of his material and a convincing and insightful scholar.

As the title implies, the book is organized around the writings of St. Jerome which reflect the immediate concerns of his life and the passions of controversies in which he was engaged. With utmost skill and with that intuitive insight which any great historian must have Kelly reconstructs the life and thought of a man in whom intellectual greatness and personal weakness combined to produce as complex a personality as has ever graced the Church. No more apt description can be made of Jerome than that of Kelly himself:

> As a man Jerome presents a fascinating puzzle. None of the famous figures of Christian antiquity known to us had such a complex, curiously ambivalent personality. Far cleaverer and more versatile than Rufinus, more learned and acute than Augustine, he lacked the balance and solidity of the one, the nobility and generosity of the other. His affection for his friends, while they were his friends, was unstinted though possessive; once they ceased to be his friends, he could pursue them with a rancour and spitefulness which still dismay. Warm-hearted, kind to the poor and the distressed, easily reduced to tears by their sufferings, he was also inordinately vain and petty, jealous of rivals, morbidly sensitive and irascible, hag-ridden by imaginary fears. There can be no doubt of the reality of his conversion, or of his passionate devotion to Christ and the world-renouncing asceticism he believed to be inculcated by the gospel; but if this burning commitment was the driving-force of his life, the forms

in which it found an outlet were often strange, sometimes repellent." (pp. 335-6)

Such a man was Jerome, who lived in one of the truly pivotal periods of the Church's history. Nothing left Jerome untouched, or unscathed. No one epitomizes more than Jerome the struggle of the Christian intelligentsia to make the classical heritage of Greece and Rome a hand-maiden for the Gospel; no one was more personally immersed in the doctrinal and ecclesiastical controversies of his day; no one was more intellectually and emotionally scandalized by the rapid disintegration of Roman society brought on by its own internal inertia and the onrush of the barbarians. No one was more instrumental than Jerome in giving shape to what Western Christendom was to be for the next 1000 years. Here is the devotee to Roman Christianity; here is the author of the Vulgate, the Bible of the Western Church until the time of the Reformation; here is the great apologist and propagandist for the monastic and ascetic life; here is the great protagonist for the role of the Virgin Mary in Christian piety and the cult of the saints. The man and his passions come into vivid focus in this treatment by Kelly.

Jerome is a work of great erudition, suitable, indeed, indispensable for the scholar. However, the direct, clear style of Kelly and the simplicity of his presentation makes this book profitable for the novice as well.

In a book which has few, if any, weaknesses, it is difficult to discover any strengths. However, if this reviewer were to point to features which deserve especial honorable mention, three would stand out. First of all, Kelly treats with consummate skill Jerome's relationship with the three Roman noble women, Marcella, Paula, and Eustochium. With keen psychological insight and a most humane balance Kelly traces the life-long companionship Jerome had with these three extraordinary women who exemplified both Jerome's need for female fellowship and his strict ideal of virginity. Secondly, the author clearly delineates the growth of Jerome's appreciation for the superiority of the Hebrew Old Testament over the Septuagint and the corresponding, although halting, appreciation for the literal meaning of the Biblical text. Finally, the short controversy Jerome had with Jovinian concerning the superiority of the ascetic Christian over the "normal" baptized Christian is delineated in an excellent fashion (pp. 180-189).

Jerome includes an Appendix concerning the controverted dating of Jerome's birth and an Index. The one great weakness of the book is its lack of a bibliography. Given the fact that this is the first major treatment of Jerome in English, a bibliography would seem to have been desirable. Nevertheless, the footnotes provide many useful references to pertinent books and articles. I could not recommend a book more highly.

William C. Weinrich

WHO'S WHO IN CHURCH HISTORY. By William P. Barker. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 319 pages. Paper. $2.95.

Originally published as a hardback in 1969, this book is a popular reference work in which more than 1500 men and women who influenced Church History are listed. Each entry gives birth and death dates (if known) and a short summary of the person's life and work. The book does not purport to give extensive treatment, yet there is here a veritable wealth of information for a most reasonable price. For what the book intends to be - a popular reference book for quick and concise identification of Church History figures - it is a job well done.

It is not an easy task to compile such a Who's Who. To determine what names to include the author used three criteria: the persons must have consciously regarded themselves as members of the Christian community, they must have had some effect on the ministry of the Church, and they must no longer be living. For the most part the author has succeeded admirably in his choice of entries.

However, one may wonder why Lady Godiva and Wat Tyler are included while Fulgentius, Prudentius, Prosper of Aquitaine, Gregory of Tours, Valentinus, Aphraat, and Gregory Palamas are omitted. At times there is also an unevenness of treatment relative to the importance of the entries. For example, Clovis, King of the Franks, receives as much treatment as does Cyprian; St. George, about whom virtually nothing is known, is allotted more space than John Gerhardt; St. Blandina and Charles Martel receive about the same space as do Gregory of Nyssa and Caesarius of Arles; Joan of Arc receives equal time with Jerome and Leo I. One has to wonder why Peter Waldo deserves as much space as does Augustine.

Some entries would be strengthened by concentrating more on their contributions to Church History than to the details of their lives. For example, we learn of Ignatius of Antioch's trip through Asia Minor and of his being torn apart by wild beasts, but there is no word of his emphasis on Church unity or on the monepiscopate. Tertullian's conversion to Montanism is related, but his importance for the Latin theological vocabulary is left in silence. The theological characteristics of Augustine and Luther are similarly given too scant attention. On the other hand, some entries are very good in this regard, the entry of Teilhard de Chardin for example.

The volume is remarkably free of factual or of printing errors. However, one error must be mentioned. John Scotus Erigena and Duns Scotus are treated as one and the same person. They, of course, were not. Erigena was a 9th century philosopher of Neo-Platonist leanings, while Duns Scotus was a scholastic theologian of the 14th century.

William C. Weinrich

BEGINNINGS IN CHURCH HISTORY. By Howard F. Vos. Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 191 Pages. Paper. $2.95.

This volume is one of a series of introductions, hence the word "beginnings". Other works in the series discuss Biblical archaeology, Biblical geography, the life of Christ, the Old Testament, the New Testament. This reviewer has not seen these other volumes, but hopefully they are superior to this one. Dr. Vos engages in the impossible task of attempting to trace the history of the Church through its two-thousand year existence in 182 pages. Not surprisingly the result is poor history, even as a summary.

The treatment given important men, events, and movements is preposterously uneven. A few examples from the early and medieval periods of the Church's history may be cited. The doctrinal developments concerning the Trinity, Christology, the Holy Spirit, and anthropology (Pelagianism) receive a mere five pages, while the growth of the canon is allotted four pages. The entire discussion of Scholasticism receives less than a page, and medieval monasticism is similarly short shrifted, also less than a page. Yet, Peter Waldo and the Waldensians receive a full page and a half! Hardly any treatment is given to the missionary enterprises of these early centuries, and an important development such as conciliarism is passed by in silence. The Emperor Justinian is likewise ignored, and the entire Eastern Church is ignored as well (there is scant notice given iconoclasm, the Filioque, and the East-West schism). Certainly the novice, who would be reading this book, would receive a badly distorted image of the Church during these centuries.

The period from the Reformation until the present fares just as badly. The Reformation, although certainly of importance, is nevertheless given exaggerated attention for the length of the book (24 pages). Separate treatment is given to the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, France, Scotland, England, The Netherlands, and Scandanavia. By contrast, the three hundred years from 1600-1900 receive a total of fourteen pages. Apparently they weren't important. The chapter on the Church in America is the best, but again sketchy. The last chapter,

"The Present Situation", is little more than a series of notices about twentieth-century religious phenomena, from the Marxist threat to the Campus Crusade for Christ.

This book suffers from beginning to end by a lack of coherence. Church history is a story with movement. It has a theme (or themes). However, Vos introduces men and events haphazardly, placing them together like pearls on a string, side by side but without any organic connection. A good example of this is the discussion of Islam which, after a discussion of Pope Gregory I and the struggle between Celtic and Roman Christianity in Britain, is introduced with the words, "Meanwhile far to the east . . ." (p. 60). What relation does the rise of Islam have with the Synod of Whitby? None, but apparently that is not important to Vos's method of telling history.

Perhaps one could attribute many of the shortcomings of this book to its brevity. Certainly the more succinct one is the better organized one must be. Here Vos fails. But to this reviewer something more fundamental appears to be amiss. What is one to think of a Church History which makes mention of David Wilkerson and Pat Boone but not of John of Damascus? What merit is there in a Church History which mentions the *Living Bible* and *The Late Great Planet Earth* but not St. Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*? What is one to think of a Church History which gives virtually more discussion to the Campus Crusade for Christ than to the whole of Scholasticism? What worth is there in a Church History which gives as much treatment to a Jesus '75 rally in eastern Pennsylvania as it does to the Council of Chalcedon? I fear the answer is given on the back cover where it states that Dr. Vos covers "most significant people, events, and movements of interest to evangelicals." Hopefully it is a false impression, but the impression nevertheless persists that this volume is a monument of an "evangelicalism" which is fundamentally uncatholic.

There is a whole list of details, historical and theological, with which one could argue. But never mind these; the whole book is not worth the price. If you desire a one-volume history of the Church, you still cannot go wrong with Martin Marty's *A Short History of Christianity*.

William C. Weinrich

THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. By Reinhold Seeburg. Translated from the German by Charles E. Hay. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1977, 2 vols. in one, 413 pp. and 492 pp., $9.95.

Baker Book House of Grand Rapids, Michigan, is to be commended for having republished this classic text in the history of Christian thought and for having done so in a relatively inexpensive format. The first volume, initially published in 1895, provides a survey of the development of Catholic theology from Clemens Romanus and the Apostolic Fathers to Vincent of Lerinum and the major Latin Divines of Late Antiquity. The second volume, which appeared in 1898, traces the growth of Christian theology in the West from the era of Gregory the Great to Age of the Protestant Reformation, with succinct sections on each of the major Reformers. A concluding section on the "Completion of Doctrinal Construction in the Roman Catholic Church" offers a treatment of Latin theology from The Council of Trent to the first Vatican Council. Readers will find this work to be thorough and almost encyclopedic in coverage, conservative in interpretation, and orderly in its presentation. If supplemented by more recent research in the field, Seeburg's HISTORY OF DOCTRINES can be a useful tool on the shelf of the Lutheran pastor and teacher.

C. George Fry

MUHAMMAD: THE MESSENGER OF GOD. By Betty Kelen. Pocket Books, New York, 1977. 277 pages. Paper. $1.95.

No one can deny that news about the Middle East has moved from the financial section to the front page of most of our daily papers. The day I prepared this review the majority of page one of the Ft. Wayne *Journal-Gazette* was devoted to promised peace talks along the Suez, an earthquake in southern Iran, a kidnapping on Cyprus, and petroleum prices on the Persian Gulf. That morning much of the NBC "Today" show was given over to an interview of M. Begin by John Chancellor, while the talk of the other networks was the planned Christmas Day meeting of the Muslim President and the Jewish Prime Minister. Mid-east events are now "hot copy."

This sudden popularity of the Middle East has prompted all sorts of people to rush into print with "something about the region" - ranging from speculations about oil prices to the alleged fulfillment of some obscure biblical prophecy. During the Winter of 1977 Middle East books seem about as plentiful and profitable as a set of "Star Wars" toys. And with about as much relation to reality.

It is an unfortunate development, for the discriminating reader will have to sort through a lot of trash in order to find a few treasures. In the garbage pail of Middle East books there are, hopefully, a few pearls of wisdom.

This is not one of them.

Betty Kelen is part of the problem, not the solution. While the cover of this paperback from Pocket Books assures us it is "an extra-ordinary biography," I am at a total loss to know why. It is not extra-ordinary in its research and for its uncovering of original sources. The author confesses that "my account of Muhammad's life is based mainly on W. Montgomery Watt's *Muhammad at Mecca* and *Muhammad at Medina,* and on John Bagot Glubb's biography of the Prophet." This is a study composed on the basis of secondary, not primary materials, from English-language, not Arabic texts. Neither is the book extra-ordinary in its reporting, for I failed to detect any fastidious concern for accuracy. The extended speeches, conversations, and dialogues that we are offered and which purport to be from the lips of Muhammad, Abu Bakr, Ali, and other early Muslim worthies (and heavies) are, by the author's own admission, not quotations, because "direct speech is mostly paraphrased. - that is, abridged and simplified . . . except the direct speech of God, which is paraphrased as little as possible . . ." Neither is the book extra-ordinary for its revealing of penetrating new interpretations of the prophet, his proclamation, and his phenomenal success. I looked in vain for any edifying or challenging explanation of the engimatic character and career of Muhammad. Neither is the book extraordinary for its theology—which is best described as "Deism warmed over." On the one hand there is a concern for secular detachment (smiling at the supernaturalists), yet a kind of ecumenical mingling, placing Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, and Zoroaster on a parity as the recipients of messages from the Inscrutable Deity. On the one hand we are informed that "Muhammad was a man God had cracked so that His love might shine through on the world; and people recognize the reflected light," and, on the other, we are told that Muhammad is best understood in historical-naturalistic terms as "a world genius."

The book is extra-ordinarily readable. Originally a hardback published by Nelson in 1975, now, in its soft-cover format it will reach thousands of readers. But I wonder how many, after 277 pages, 24 chapters, and three sections ("Mecca," "Medina," and "Islam") will have any historical, theological, or critical appreciation of Muhammad and the rise of Islam?

C. George Fry

THE EVANGELICALS: WHAT THEY BELIEVE, WHO THEY ARE, WHERE THEY ARE CHANGING. Revised Edition. Edited by David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1977. 325 pages. Paper. $4.95.

David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge are both Professors in The Department of Church History at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. In 1975 they edited the hardback edition of this work which was published by Abingdon Press, which was reviewed by me in this Journal in June, 1976, and which has been received well by the ecclesiastical and academic community in the English speaking world. The response of the public warranted a popular paperback edition, which Baker Book House has graciously provided. Certain areas needed more emphasis, and this has been provided in the revised edition through the inclusion of a chapter by Vinson Synan on "The Armenian Tradition" and through some alterations in other chapters. The result is a handy anthology of articles by men of the caliber of Kenneth S. Kantzer (new editor of *Christianity Today*), Paul L. Holmer (of Yale), William Pannell (Black Evangelical Leader), Robert D. Linder (of the Conference on Faith and History), Sydney E. Ahlstrom (Yale) and nine other equally noted scholars, discussing "What Evangelicals Believe," "Who Evangelicals Are," and "Where Evangelicals are Changing." Donald Tinder, Associate Editor of *Christianity Today*, has provided a helpful "Guide to Further Reading." Again this year as last, I highly recommend this readable and reliable volume to all those interested in American Evangelism in the 1970's, a movement that has become the dominant force in contemporary Protestantism in this nation.

C. George Fry

SNAKE TEMPLE, AN INDIA DIARY. By H. Earl Miller. Carlton Press, Inc., New York, 1977. 193 pages. Hardcover. $6.95.

The Rev. H. Earl Miller, a minister of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, celebrated his seventy-fourth birthday on Christmas Eve, 1976, at Concordia Home, Cabot, Pennsylvania, where he is the chaplain. Prior to accepting that position (in 1968), and that of the Eastern District editor of the Lutheran Witness (in 1958), Miller was a missionary of the LC-MS in India for more than twenty-six years. While on the subcontinent, Miller served as an evangelist, pastor, and educator. A native of Hagerstown, Maryland, with degrees from Concordia-St. Louis and the Hartford Seminary Foundation, Miller writes well - with a passion for accuracy and with an eye for history in the making. This book grew out of his habit of keeping a diary, which he cultivated faithfully during his several decades in India. What we have, therefore, is not a set of recollections, but instead excerpts from a chronicle that was compiled conscientiously through the years. Those acquainted with Missouri Synod personalities will find many familiar figures on these pages - "Dad" Baepler teaching Systematics at the Springfield sem. Mark Steege serving a parish in Cedar Rapids, Walter "Punk" Reuning ministering in the ALPB (American Lutheran Publicity Bureau), Henry and Mary Ester Otten, witnessing in India, and "Doc" Behnken enjoying "true to life" missionary stories. I was moved when I read Miller's account of his first hearing a Lutheran Hour broadcast while on furlough. He noted: "It was the first time Anne and I had heard this program, and we were both moved to tears. 'A mighty Fortress Is our God,' sung by the seminary chorus, WAM's inspiring message . . . it was all a spiritual treat." This diary is also a valuable survey of missionary life, with all of its trials and tribulations, in a period of rapid transition - from the "Roaring Twenties" through "the Great Depression" and World War II to the coming of independence and the Cold War to India. Named for Nagercoil, the town in which the Miller's spent the greater portion of their life in India, and which means "Snake Temple," this diary of the ministry of just one

member of the St. Louis class of 1927 (that sent over 30 men to the field, or more than one third of the graduating class!) is an inspiration to the young ("Go thou and do likewise"), an invitation to the old (how much of our history is lost because it is not recorded), and an introduction for all of us to a critical era in the ongoing saga of Lutheran world missions.

C. George Fry

LIBERTY TO THE CAPTIVES: THE STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPRESSION IN SOUTH KOREA. By George E. Ogle. John Knox Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1977. 189 pages. Paper. $5.95.

George E. Ogle is now teaching at the Candler School of Theology, Atlanta. For twenty years he was a Methodist missionary in South Korea, with a particular concern for the urban-industrial mission. This brief book written in the "Autobiography-Theology" style, is Mr. Ogle's account of his missionary career in South Korea, from his arrival in Seoul, through his increasing involvement in the industrial mission of the Korean Christian churches in Inchun (1961 to 1971), to his sabbatical spent in the United States, his return to Asia in 1973 to be a professor at Seoul National University, his much publicized confrontation with the regime of Park Hung Hee, and his expulsion and deportation from the country in 1974. This is one man's commentary on the Korean situation in the mid-1970's as it affected the social ministry of the churches.

C. George Fry

UNDERSTANDING ORIENTAL PHILOSOPHY: A POPULAR ACCOUNT FOR THE WESTERN WORLD. By James K. Feibleman. New American Library, New York, 1976. 239 pages Paperback. $1.95.

James K. Feibleman was hailed by the *American Scholar* as "America's leading philosopher." The author of many works, including *Understanding Philosophy, Understanding Civililizations,* annd his autobiography, *The Way of a Man,* in this volume Feibleman has turned his attention to a topic in which he is both deeply interested and highly competent - Asian thought. Divided into three parts - "The Philosophy of India, "The Philosophy of China," and "The Philosophy of Japan" - *Understanding Oriental Philosophy* is a swift, succinct, and insightful survey of religious and philosophical activity in East Asia from the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads* to the contributions of Mohandas Gandhi and Mao Tse Tung. It is all there - Jainism, Buddhism, (in its many, many forms), Hinduism, Yoga, Confucianism, Taoism, Shintoism, Japanese Empiricism, and much more. The presentation is remarkably lucid, popular, yet profound, both sympathetic and critical, and one that is very valuable to any pastor or teacher interested in the mission context of the Christian Churches in Further Asia. Perhaps *Publishers Weekly* best characterized this excellent text when it reported that it was "well organized . . . it illuminates Eastern schools and sects . . . examines sacred writings, deities and principal leaders . . . draws significant parallels between East and West while at the same time underscoring the vast gulf that separates them." I can only add my "Amen" and commend this useful book to you.

C. George Fry

III. Practical Studies

THE ETHICS OF FREEDOM. By Jacques Ellul. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids, 1976. Cloth.

The prolific, thought-provoking writer, Jacques Ellul, has produced another noteworthy work in his *The Ethics of Freedom.* Ellul argues that freedom in Christ is the underlying principle of all Christian ethics.

The understanding and practice of freedom is not an easy matter. The author's discussion of birth control illustrates this very well. Speaking, for example, about the use of the birth-control pill, he says: "That Christians, being free, can use them aright I do not dispute. But they should realize that in so doing they are falling behind rather than making headway in personal freedom and fulfilment" (p. 486). The use of the pill even in marital sex relations can easily "confuse freedom with autonomy and independence" (p. 486) in that love and responsibility may be replaced by selfishness and promiscuity. When this occurs, man is closer to enslavement than to freedom. But Christian husbands and wives, who understand their freedom in Christ can use the pill if it will help them become better parents and foster greater sexual harmony between them (p. 494).

The book is loaded with valuable insights for Christians. Many Christians, who are affected by false understandings of freedom and love as it pertains to married life, could be helped by some of the insightful comments. For example: "It is not just the family that ties us down. Love itself does so" (p. 206). Again, "In Christ there is no freedom without love, for without love freedom would be incoherent and a turning back upon itself" (p. 207).

Concerning freedom and vocation, Ellul says the "Bible never speaks of it [works] as a vocation" (p. 496). Work is a simple necessity. "It has no specific value (p. 496). By making these statements, it seems to me, that Ellul is, without directly saying so, criticizing the so-called Protestant (Puritan) Ethic ushered into Western society by the Reformers, expecially Calvin. According to the German sociologist, Max Weber, work in the Protestant Ethic had a very specific value. It was in fact a virtue.

Much of Ellul's thinking concerning the ethics of freedom revolve about the means-ends relationship. This is, of course, a key concern of ethics. To Ellul ethics and freedom are violated when acts are conducted as ends in themselves.

As a sociologist, I appreciated Ellul's frequent reminder that ethical thought is "dependent on the structures in which it is formulated" (p. 32). Here is how he sees it:

> A man's cultural setting not only furnishes him with a certain life-style, mode of behavior, and morality. It also furnishes him with the instruments of his intellectual life and the structures of his emotional life It gives him his language and consequently the images, stereotypes, and interpretations by which he apprends the totality of phenomena. He has no direct contact with the facts (p. 33).

These words are important and need to be remembered. Pastors and ecclesiastical leaders would do well to ponder these words. It might make them more effective servants of Christ.

Finally, I have one criticism to make. This is the frequent confusion the book makes by using the term "sociological" when the word "social" is meant. This occurs throughout the entire book. Today it seems that writers and speakers feel they sound more sophisticated by saying "sociological" rather than "social." Such individuals either have forgotten, or they never knew, that a social phenomenon *only* becomes sociological after it has been analyzed from some theoretical perspective(s). Personally, I hope that the term "sociological" does not become a synonym of the word "social." Why? Simply because the two are so vastly different.

Alvin Schmidt

PRESERVING THE PERSON. By C. Stephen Evans. Inter Varsity Press, 1977. Paper. 175 pages. $4.95.

C. Stephen Evans, an assistant professor of philosophy at Wheaton College, Illinois, strongly believes that the human sciences (psychology, psychiatry, and sociology) are undermining, what he calls, the "personalistic" understanding of man. Behavioral scientists are replacing the personalistic with the environmental framework, which basically sees man's behavior being the result of conditioning.

Evans attacks the behavioristic model by zeroing in on B. F. Skinner and J. B. Watson. While these psychologists are not identical in their theorizing, they do agree that statements about man's consciousness are simply oblique statements about his behavior. The consciousness of man is essentially denied. Man is an animal, subject to environmental conditioning.

Another behavioral scientist's influence that Evans criticizes strongly is that of Sigmund Freud. The Austrian psychoanalyst saw "man as *homo natura,* a natural creature whose behavior is to be explained by purely naturalistic principles" (p. 43).

This reviewer basically agrees with Evans' analyzes of Skinner, Watson, and Freud. However, in his fifth chapter, "The Loss of the Person in Sociology," the author overlooks (or he does not know) that the French sociologist, Emile Durkheim, never intended to destroy the personalistic framework of understanding man. Durkheim's theories and research were not directed at destroying the personalistic view of man, but to show that numerous human activities, e.g. suicide rates, could be explained better by social variables rather than by personality traits. Durkheim's data quite clearly showed that inadequate social integration, upheaval of social structures, and egoistic values, etc. explained and predicted suicide rates far better than did the arguments that resorted to idiosyncratic qualities of given persons. Durkheim was dissatisfied with psychological reductionism.

Can one really fault sociology for "loss of the person" because it focuses on social structure, values, norms, and groups? Could one not also blame other sciences, e.g. physics, chemistry, biology in a similar manner? After all, these do not focus on the person either!

In spite of this reviewer's disagreement with Evans regarding his understanding of sociology, the book makes some very good points. One, of these is the criticism of the so-called "humanitarian" approach to punishment. According to this theory, punishment or imprisonment is no longer meted out on the basis of desert or justice, but whether the penalty will be effective. The latter, of course is increasingly becoming the accepted mode of thought and practice. Evans argues that this view undermines the personalistic model of man in that the person no longer is responsible for the lawless acts he commits. Society or the environment is to blame.

Knowingly or unknowingly, one might say, many Christians also fall prey to the "humanitarian" understanding of punishment. If some Christian readers are helped by Evans' discussion regarding the "humanitarian" theory, it would not only bring them to his side, but also to the side of Scripture.

Alvin Schmidt

FATHER'S INFLUENCE ON CHILDREN. By Marshall L. Hamilton. Nelson-Hall, Chicago, 1977. Paper. $5.95.

In recent years a very welcome and highly necessary thing has been happening in the scientific study of family life: an examination of the father's role in the life of children. Prior to 1970 there were very few studies that considered the father in the numerous empirical analyzes of marriage and the family. Hamilton is quite right in saying: "The omission of fathers from studies about parents' influence on children seems to involve the assumption either that the father does not play a

significant part in the family, or that the father's attitudes and behavior are adequately represented by the mother" (p. 2). Hamilton's book (which mostly summarizes the relatively recent studies of the paternal role) is an attempt to fill the void.

By surveying some 260 studies, most of them empirical, Hamilton shows that the role of the father in the family is very significant and vital to the proper development of children, especially for boys. He documents the negative effects of father-absence, whether it is due to death, divorce, separation, or prolonged absence resulting out of occupational necessity.

Some negative results that are highly correlated to father-absence are as follows: Boys who experience father-absence show higher delinquency rates. Father-absent boys have been found to have lower scores pertaining to guilt, moral values, conformity to rules, and higher overt aggression scores. Being separated from the father prevents proper masculine identification and often has a dysfunctional effect on learning masculine sex-roles. Father-absence is associated with lower I.Q. scores on the part of boys and girls.

Hamilton correctly draws attention to the possible effects that father's role has in the development of male homosexuality. Generally, the studies indicate that "The influence of the father may well be the greatest factor in the development of homosexuality in males. . . ." (p. 67). In this context Hamilton has some extremely timely words: "Perhaps these well-meaning parents [those who today try to abolish sex-role differences] have not yet detected the distinction between equal opportunity for both sexes and both sexes becoming identical" (p. 69).

The father's influence is not only important to his son(s) but also to his daughter(s). Summarizing a 1966 study, Hamilton notes that "the daughter's experiences with the father from early infancy are related to the daughter's later ability to trust other males, and the ease with which the father and daughter can accept her fuller sexual development in adolescence" (p. 81). Also, the femininity of women is directly related to the closeness they had with their fathers. In the advent that this meaning is not quite clear, the following words by the author are noteworthy, namely, "a healthy father identification for a daughter involves understanding and empathizing with him and accepting some of his values and attitudes, rather than wanting to be masculine like him" (p. 87).

While reading this book, I was reminded of some of Urie Bronfenbrenner's (Cornell University) many excellent studies in child rearing and development. Bronfenbrenner has argued very persuasively that our society needs to give its children greater contact and involvement with adults rather than forcing them to be more and more with peers. He has shown that the more children are with their peers the more they manifest undesirable social and personality traits. In other words, if we want our children to become a "chip off the old block," they need to knock around with the "old block."

I hope pastors and parents would read Hamilton's book. It will make pastors better counselors and better fathers. It may even move them to be less absent from their children!

Alvin Schmidt

Books Received

THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY PULPIT. Edited by James W. Cox. Abingdon Press. Nashville, 1978. 301 pages. Paper. $8.95.

McGUFFEY AND HIS READERS: Piety, Morality, and Education in Nineteenth-Century. By John H. Westerhoff, III. Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1978. 206 pages. Cloth. $9.95.

VITAL CHURCH MANAGEMENT. By Philip M. Larson, Jr. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 120 pages. Cloth. $7.95.

THE GOSPELS: A FIRST COMMENTARY. By F. G. Herod. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 110 pages. Paper. $2.95.

THE APOSTLE PAUL. By Alexander Whyte. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 231 pages. Paper. $3.95.

PAUL AND THE SALVATION OF MANKIND. By Johannes Munck. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 351 pages. Paper. $6.95.

ERNST TROELTSCH: Writings on Theology and Religion. Translators/Editors: Robert Morgan and Michael Pye. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1978. 260 pages. Cloth. $17.50.

TRADITION AND DESIGN IN LUKE'S GOSPEL. By John Drury. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 208 pages. Cloth. $7.95.

THE CHRISTIAN COUNSELOR'S NEW TESTAMENT. By Jay E. Adams. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 770 pages. Cloth. $14.95.

BIBLICAL PREACHING FOR CONTEMPORARY MAN. Neil B. Wiseman, compiler. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 160 pages. Paper. $3.95.

GOD HAS NOT REJECTED HIS PEOPLE. By Richard R. De Ridder. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 88 pages. Paper. $2.95.

LEGACY OF EVE. By Nancy M. Tischler. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 127 pages. Paper. $3.95.

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD. By Herman Bavinck. Translated by William Hendriksen. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 407 pages. Paper. $5.95.

CALVIN'S DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION. By Fred H. Klooster. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 98 pages. Paper. $3.95.

GETTING INTO THE STORY OF CONCORD. By David P. Scaer. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1977. 100 pages. Paper.

GETTING INTO THE THEOLOGY OF CONCORD. By Robert D. Preus. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1977. 94 pages. Paper.

ARMAGEDDON NOW! By Dwight Wilson. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 258 pages. Paper. $4.95.

THE LIBERATED GOSPEL. A Comparison of the Gospel of Mark and Greek Tragedy. By Gilbert G. Bilezikian. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 159 pages. Paper. $6.95.

EVANGELICALS AND JEWS IN CONVERSATION. Edited by Marc H. Tanenbaum, Marvin R. Wilson and A. James Rudin. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 326 pages. Cloth. $7.95.

TWILIGHT OF THE SAINTS: Bbilical Christianity & Civil Religion in America. By Robert D. Linder & Richard V. Pierard. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1978. 212 pages. Paper. $4.25.

THE JOURNAL OF PASTORAL PRACTICE. By Jay E. Adams, Editor-in-Chief. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 161 pages. Paper. $3.50.

THE BETRAYAL OF THE WEST. By Jacques Ellul. A Continuum Book, The Seabury Press, New York, 1978. 207 pages. Cloth. $9.95.

THE DYNAMICS OF DISCIPLESHIP TRAINING. By Gary W. Kuhne. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 162 pages. Paper. $3.95.

THE PANTHEISM OF ALAN WATTS. By David K. Clark. InverVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1978. 118 pages. Paper. $2.95.

THE REFORMATION. Hans J. Hillerbrand, Editor. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 499 pages. Paper. $6.95.

THEOLOGY AND MISSION. Edited by David J. Hesselgrave. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 338 pages. Paper. $7.95.

EVANGELICALS & LIBERATION. Edited by Carl E. Armerding. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 136 pages. Paper. $4.50.

THE RETURNS OF LOVE: A Christian View of Homosexuality. By Alex Davidson. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1970. 93 pages. Paper. $2.50.

A HANDBOOK FOR ENGAGED COUPLES. By Robert & Alice Fryling. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1978. 72 pages. Paper. $1.95.

FIRE IN THE FIREPLACE: Contemporary Charismatic Renewal. By Charles E. Hummel. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1978. 275 pages. Paper. $4.95.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS: The Gospel of Matthew, Vol. 1. By Herschel H. Hobbs. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1965. 422 pages. Paper. $19.95 (4 vols.)

AN EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS: The Gospel of Mark, Vol. 2. By Herschel H. Hobbs. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1970. 261 pages. Paper. $19.95 (4 vols.)

AN EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS: The Gospel of Luke, Vol. 3. By Herschel H. Hobbs. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1966. 355 pages. Paper. $19.95 (4 vols.)

AN EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS: The Gospel of John, Vol. 4. By Herschel H. Hobbs. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1968. 297 pages. Paper. $19.95 (4 vols.)

COMMITMENT TO CARE. By Dean Turner. The Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, 1978. 415 pages. Cloth. $12.50.

AN ASSESSMENT OF MASS MEETINGS AS A METHOD OF EVANGELISM. By William Thomas. Humanities Press, Inc., Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1978. 294 pages. Paper. $18.75.

PLAIN TALK ON THE EPISTLES OF JOHN. By Manford George Gutzke. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1977. 122 pages. Paper. $3.95.

THE SEPHARDIC JEWS OF BORDEAUX. By Frances Malino. The University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1978. 166 pages. Cloth. $11.50.

JESUS ON TRIAL: A Study in the Fourth Gospel. By A. E. Harvey. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 140 pages. Cloth. $6.95.

THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR. By F. W. Krummacher. Moody Press, Chicago, 1947. 444 pages. Paper. $7.95.

PLAIN TALK ON FIRST AND SECOND CORINTHIANS. By Manford George Gutzke. Zondervan Publishing House, 1978. 283 pages. Paper. $3.95.

THE CLERGYMAN AND THE PSYCHIATRIST: When to Refer. By Robert L. Mason, Ed. D., Carol S. Currier, Ph.D. and John R. Curtis, M.D. Nelson-Hall Publishers, Chicago, 1978. 230 pages. Cloth. $11.95.

DIE HEILIGEN BEI LUTHER. By Lennart Pinomaa. Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft A 16, Helsinki, 1977. 170 pages. Paper.