

CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 43, Number 2

APRIL 1979

Wellhausenism Evaluated After A
Century Of Influence..... Raymond F. Surburg 78

Sing a New SongArmand J. Boehme 96

God's Here and
Is Not Silent..... Philip M. Bickel 120

Theological Observer 121

Homiletical Studies..... 124

Book Reviews 157

Books Received..... 177



CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

ISSN 0038-8610

CTQ

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.

DAVID P. SCAER, *Editor*, DOUGLAS JUDISCH, *Assistant Editor*, GERHARD AHO, *Homiletical Editor*, RAYMOND F. SURBURG, *Book Review Editor*, HEINO KADAI, ROBERT D. PREUS, *Associate Editors*.

The Faculty: GERHARD AHO, HAROLD BULS, ROBERT H. COLLINS, G. WALDEMAR DEGNER, HENRY J. EGGOLD, JR., C. GEORGE FRY, WILLIAM G. HOUSER, HARRY A. HUTH, DOUGLAS JUDISCH, HEINO KADAI, EUGENE F. KLUG, MARTIN F. LUEBKE, WALTER A. MAIER, KURT MARQUART, NORBERT MUELLER, ROBERT D. PREUS, DANIEL G. REUNING, JOHN SALESKA, DAVID P. SCAER, ALVIN J. SCHMIDT, HERBERT SIMS, OTTO F. STAHLKE, BARBARA STEEGE, MARK J. STEEGE, RAYMOND F. SURBURG, HOWARD W. TEPKER, JAMES VOELZ, MICHAEL WARNER, WILLIAM WEINRICH, WARREN WILBERT, MELVIN ZILZ, and ROGER HUMANN (St. Catharines, Ontario campus).

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: \$5.00.

© Concordia Theological Seminary Press
1979

Wellhausenism Evaluated After A Century Of Influence

By Raymond F. Surburg

Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) was a famous German Lutheran higher critic who influenced Biblical and Oriental studies for many generations during the second half of the nineteenth and the early decades of the twentieth centuries. Hans Joachim Kraus wrote of Wellhausen:

With his philological, literary-critical, and historical investigations Wellhausen founded a school which has determined for decades the picture of Old Testament science. However all work performed outside his school and beyond it is inconceivable apart from the solid foundation on which Old Testament science in numerous, and till the present unchangeable, accomplishments was founded.¹

In describing the importance of Wellhausen Hahn wrote:

His position in Old Testament criticism is somewhat analogous to that of Darwin in the intellectual history of modern times. The central idea which he made common property had already been broached by others before him, but he gave the theory its classical formulation and applied it with assurance to a wide range of data, assembled in a comprehensive synthesis and unified by a dominant theme. What was new and original in Wellhausen's presentation was the way in which he combined the various lines of argument by his professors and drew the conclusions toward which the literary and historical criticism of a century had been tending.²

According to William Neil, Biblical criticism on the European Continent achieved a considerable measure of stability in the nineteenth century. Two men were responsible for this in Old and New Testament studies, respectively, namely, Julius Wellhausen and Adolf Harnack.³ Ronald E. Clemens in his recent *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation* has no less than forty-one references to the work and influence of Wellhausen when he discusses the contributions of various scholars to the field of Old Testament studies.⁴ Hermann Gunkel, by comparison, is mentioned only twenty-six times by Clemens in connection with his contributions to twentieth-century Old Testament studies.⁵

It will be the purpose of this essay to set forth Wellhausen's views and their influence on his contemporaries as well as on

those following him during the last one hundred years and also to evaluate Wellhausen's views and influence.

I. Wellhausen's Life and Academic Activities⁶

Wellhausen was born at Hameln, the son of a Protestant pastor. He was raised by his father in an orthodox Christian environment. He went to Goettingen in 1862 to study theology, to prepare himself for the pastorate in the denomination of which his father was a member. He threw himself with enthusiasm into his theological studies, but before long he abandoned the orthodox Christianity of his youth and simultaneously began to experience a time of great despair. At first he had no interest in critical studies. He devoted his energies to a study of the church chorals and to the reading of medieval sermons. At Goettingen Wellhausen met Albrecht Ritschl, with whom he struck up a warm friendship; but inasmuch as he could not understand the former's theology, Wellhausen was unaffected by Ritschl's thought. In 1870 he received his licentiate and for the two years following acted as a private tutor.

It was Heinrich Ewald (1805-75), eminent Hebrew scholar and Orientalist, who changed Wellhausen's despair and created in the latter a love for studying the manner in which the history of Israel developed. By chance Wellhausen came to read Ewald's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Ewald's presentation of the history of Israel fascinated Wellhausen, because the former was no dry historian, but a lecturer who depicted historical relationships in glowing colors. In the estimation of Wellhausen, Ewald portrayed the religious content of the Old Testament as an entity that had developed and occurred in history. It was this procedure which sparked him to undertake the project of setting forth the history of the Old Testament as an historical process within which Biblical religion had grown and ripened. Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* endeavored to do just that. The dedication of this book reads: "To my never-to-be-forgotten teacher Heinrich Ewald in thanks and honor." However, between the years 1866-70 there came a sharp parting of the ways between the two.

In 1871 Wellhausen published his first book, a study devoted to the text of 1 and 2 Samuel,⁷ which is of importance because in it he dealt with the structure of the Pentateuch. At the age of 28, in 1872, he was called to the University of Greifswald, to a professorship in theology. In 1878, a hundred years ago, Wellhausen published his pioneer work, *Geschichte Israels*, I.⁸ Later on this book was renamed *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. The book caused a great stir in orthodox circles and within four years time he resigned his professorship at Greifswald.

In 1882 he became associate professor of Oriental languages at Halle, and in 1885 was promoted to full professorship at Marburg. In 1892 Wellhausen transferred to Goettingen where he assumed a similar professorship. After giving up Old Testament studies he devoted his time and effort to Arabic studies, in which he had become interested during his stay at Halle. With his transference to Goettingen and contacts with Juelicher, Wellhausen entered the last phase of interest of his stormy career—studies in the New Testament area. With Juelicher, Adolph Harnack, and others, he wrote *Die Christliche Religion, mit Einschluss der Israelitischen-Juedischen Religion*. Wellhausen's views were applied by Johannes Weiss to New Testament criticism.⁹

Wellhausen died on January 7, 1918, surrounded by numerous scholars and admirers. Hans Joachim Kraus concluded his story of Wellhausen's life and influence with this evaluation:

He brought historical-critical investigation to an unsurpassable highpoint and helped to awaken scientific motives and tendencies that had slumbered since the time of De Wette and helped them to a breakthrough.¹⁰

II. The Contribution of the *Prolegomena* from a Critical Viewpoint

Ideas presented in this volume had, to be sure, already appeared in print elsewhere. But Hahn claims:

What was new and original in Wellhausen's presentation was the way in which he combined the various lines of argument developed by his predecessors and drew conclusions toward which the literary and historical criticism of a century had been tending.¹¹

An earlier work than the *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* was Wellhausen's *Die Komposition des Hexateuch*, 1876-71, and in the latter he popularized what was to become known as the Final Documentary Hypothesis. It took about one hundred years until the speculations and theories jelled into what became the Four-Source Documentary Hypothesis in its final form. This latter theory is often known as the Reuss-Graf-Wellhausen Theory. Eduard Reuss in a lecture given in the summer semester of 1834 had expressed the opinion that the basic Elohist document (E), rather than being the earliest of the documents out of which the Pentateuch or Hexateuch had been woven together, was the latest. Again in 1850 Reuss defended this view, but the Old Testament scholarly world ignored it.

The year 1866 may be said to be the turning point in Pentateuchal criticism because of Karl Heinrich Graf's work on the historical books. Both George and Vatke had proposed that the Levitical legislation was later than Deuteronomy and that the

materials found in Leviticus could not be earlier than the time of the exile. As early as 1862, Dr. J. Popper, a rabbi, had assigned Exodus 35-40 and Leviticus 8-10 to scribes who had lived after the time of Ezra. The effect of Graf's work was to bring to a climax ideas previously advanced by others. Graf taught that Deuteronomy was composed during Josiah's reign, and Graf's view presupposed that legislation was found in the Jahwist document. The Levitical laws found in Leviticus 18-26 were ascribed to Ezekiel. As far as the remainder of the Pentateuch was concerned, Graf followed the Supplementary Theory, maintaining that the basic document of the Pentateuch was the Elohist (E), which had been supplemented from the Jahwistic document (J), and the resultant work had been edited and redacted by the Deuteronomist.

Two German scholars, Riehm and Noeldeke; attacked this scheme at two principal points.¹² In opposition to the Supplementary Theory they held that the Jahwist was the main document and the Elohist the supplementer and that the Levitical legislation could not be separated from the Jahwist document. Graf accepted these criticisms and proceeded to modify his original position to the extent that the basic document was postulated as not the earliest but the latest portion of the Pentateuch. Prior to this reversal of position, the order of composition of the various documents of the Pentateuch had been PEJD; but now according to Graf the order was EJDP or JEDP. The appearance of Abraham Kuenen's *De Godsdiens van Israel* (1869-70) helped to strengthen and give further impetus to the acceptance of Graf's views. In 1874 August Kayser in his *Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels* had expressed views similar to those of Graf and Kuenen. For Kayser the Jahwistic document was the foundational document of the Pentateuch into which part of the Elohist document supposedly had been incorporated. Deuteronomy, originating in Josianic (seventh century B.C.) times, was bound up with the Jahwistic document. After this came Ezekiel's legislation, including Leviticus 17-26. The "Elohim" document (P) was from the time of Ezra. The last step was the incorporation of all these documents into the Pentateuch.

Julius Wellhausen in his epoch-making work, *Die Komposition des Hexateuch* (1876-77), must be credited with bringing this new theory to dominance and especially for its popularization. Edward Young, in describing this view put forth a century ago, wrote:

According to Wellhausen, the earliest parts of the Pentateuch came from two originally independent docu-

ments, the Jehovist and the Elohist. From these two the Jehovist compiled a work that was principally narrative. In Josiah's time came Deuteronomy, and the Deuteronomist incorporated this in the Jehovistic work and revised the whole, principally Joshua. The priestly legislation of the Elohim document was largely the work of Ezra. A later redactor then worked over the whole. Leviticus 17-26, while coming from Ezekiel's time, was nevertheless not the work of Ezekiel.¹³

Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels (Berlin, 1883) came to have a great influence on Old Testament studies and came to be regarded as one of the most important contributions to Old Testament study of the nineteenth century. In this book Wellhausen endeavored to show that the Mosaic legislation was not the starting point of Israel's religious institutions, but that the Mosaic legislation was a product of priestly thinking originating in the Hebrew community after the Exile. Hahn described the method employed in this work as follows:

By combining Graf's method of arranging the ritual laws in logical sequence with Vatke's program for studying the religious institutions of successive historical periods, he was able to show not only that there was an intimate connection between the succession of the law codes and the evolution of religious practices, but also that these parallel developments were intelligible only in the sequence which placed the Priestly Code and the priestly institutions at the end.¹⁴

In this work Wellhausen, therefore, seemed to confirm the views of Graf and on their foundation erected a detailed history of the cultus which endeavored to incorporate divergent data in a coherent and rational scheme.

A detailed analysis of the contents of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* may be found in Hans Joachim Kraus' *Geschichte der Historisch — Kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*,¹⁵ and in Hahn's *The Old Testament In Modern Research*.¹⁶ Wellhausen's *Prolegomena* represents an interpretation of Israel's history which Hahn states is "an example of the liberal approach to exegesis."¹⁷ Hahn claims: "Wellhausen omitted the theological interpretation entirely and emphasized the factor of historical causation instead."^{17a}

Emil Kraeling, in *The Old Testament Since the Reformation*, pointed out that Wellhausen was influenced by the reigning philosophical influence in Germany as it manifested itself during

the nineteenth century in terms of Hegelianism. In the area of theological interpretation Hegelianism was the order of the day. In describing the milieu in which Wellhausen pursued his studies and researches, Kraeling wrote:

Notably the evolutionistic approach that Hegel had applied was having its effect on all historical thinking. Biblical studies now took on a fresh hue, and particularly all efforts to deal with the story of religious development of Israel and early Christianity. Utilizing the results of the criticism pioneered by Eichorn and De Wette but proceeding evolutionistically in the spirit of Hegel, Vatke gave a brilliant presentation of the development of the Old Testament religion, on which Wellhausen fifty years later still bestowed the praise that it was the most important contribution ever made to the historical understanding of ancient Israel.¹⁸

One of the distinctive features of Wellhausen's position was his application of evolution to the literature and history of the Old Testament. His *Geschichte Israels I* (1878) marked the beginning, according to Kraeling, "of a completely secular and evolutionistic study of Old Testament sources."¹⁹ In the Wellhausen interpretation the prophets assumed much greater importance than had previously been accorded them. This prepared the way for the school of Comparative Religion (*Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule*), which depicted the development of Old Testament religion as beginning with totemism and animism, followed by polytheism, henotheism, and finally monotheism. Lothar Peritt, however, contends that Wellhausen himself rejected the idea that he was influenced by Hegelianism and evolutionism.^{19a}

The scheme of Wellhausen found wide acceptance. The new Old Testament science inaugurated by the movement symbolized by Wellhausen sought to be and was scientifically respectable. "It applied methods that had been productive of great results in the study of classical and other literatures to the Old Testament literature."²⁰ Wellhausen's scheme was embraced in Germany by Kautsch, Smend, Giesebrecht, Budde, Stade, Cornill, and others. It was brought to the attention of the English-speaking world by a Presbyterian minister, William Robertson Smith, in the lectures which were later published as *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (1881). S. R. Driver in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* popularized Wellhausenism in England and in America. Native American scholars who showed the influence of Wellhausen were Benjamin Wisner Bacon of Yale in *The Genesis of Genesis* (1893) and *The Triple Tradition of Exodus* (1894) and C. A. Briggs in *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*. (1893).

The reconstruction of the Old Testament history as set forth by Wellhausen is generally spoken of as the Graf-Keunen-Wellhausen Hypothesis. It needs to be distinguished from the Documentary Hypothesis, which forms its basis and without which the Wellhausian position could not stand. Young prefers to call Wellhausen's theory the developmental hypothesis.²¹ The developmental hypothesis is advocated in such volumes as W.O.E. Oesterley and Theodore H. Robinson, *An Introduction to the Book of the Old Testament* (London, 1934) and Robert H. Pfeiffer, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1941).

The influence of Wellhausen on the younger scholars was profound and far-reaching. Hahn claims that for "a full generation he dominated Old Testament scholarship not only in his own country but in France, England, and America. All the more important histories of Israel, Hebrew literature, and of Old Testament religion, as well as a host of commentaries and introductions, were based more or less directly on the Wellhausen system of Old Testament criticism."²²

The commentaries, especially, in the series edited by Wilhelm Nowack and Karl Marti and in *The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, represented this liberal Protestant type of exegesis at its best; neither theological nor homiletical in their emphasis, they were strictly critical and historical.²² The achievements of critical scholarship, spearheaded by Wellhausen and his followers was so great that Clemens claims: "that the Church was not ready for this may be seen readily conceded and is simply shown by the heresy trials to which Smith was subjected. Nevertheless the achievement of critical scholarship was in the interpretation of the Old Testament immense, so that by the turn of the century virtually all the major centres of theological learning in Europe had embraced its methods and its basic conclusions."²³

III. Evaluation and Criticism of Wellhausenism by Critical Scholars

1. Criticism by Critical Scholars in the Late Nineteenth Century

In the one hundred years which have elapsed since the publication of Wellhausen's Old Testament writings, various criticisms of his reconstruction of Old Testament history and Old Testament theology have appeared. Scholars committed to the historical-critical approach, as well as those opposed to the naturalism and nihilism associated with the liberal approach to the Old Testament, have subjected Wellhausen's views to criticism.

W. W. Graf Baudissin argued against Wellhausen that the essential basis of P was earlier than Deuteronomy, as did also Rudolf Kittel. In 1872 Eduard Riehm wrote convincingly against the stance that the P document is the latest part of the Hebrew Torah. In 1877 Franz Delitzsch attacked the idea of the lateness of the P document. The eminent Orientalist Noeldecke also refused to accept Wellhausen's dating of P.

Among Jewish scholars C. G. Montefiore in his Hibbert Lectures of 1892 accepted most of the Wellhausian views, but David Hoffman wrote against Wellhausen, basing his rejection on a study of the Halachah (i.e., the legal part of Jewish tradition) and endeavored to show the impossibility of the lateness of P.

In 1892 Klostermann rejected the Four-Source Documentary Hypothesis and replaced it with a new theory which, in the history of Pentateuchal Criticism, has come to be known as the crystallization hypothesis. He claimed what is given as the Mosaic Law in the Pentateuch experienced constant expansion as it was used in public worship. The laws regarding the tabernacle were expanded during the age of Solomon; again, during the reign of Josiah, expansions were made of which Deuteronomy was supposed to provide evidence.

2. Twentieth-Century Critical Evaluations of Wellhausenism

The twentieth century has likewise witnessed many attacks upon the views of Wellhausen and his school and followers. Hermann Gunkel (1862-1932) was one of these scholars. In describing the interpretations of Israel's religious development against which Gunkel reacted, Clemens writes:

For Wellhausen, the interpretation of the Hexateuch, when understood critically, provided a key to the understanding of the whole development of Israel's religion. Nevertheless it offered, in his estimation, only a very limited guide towards a knowledge of the real beginning of Israel in the days of Moses and the patriarchs. In his scheme even the earliest of the Hexateuchal sources had not been composed before the middle of the ninth century B.C., and so it could tell us nothing of the nature of the oldest religion of Israel. Rather, as Wellhausen believed, it reflected the situation that had developed by the time of its composition. It was this conclusion that was challenged, and replaced by a more convincing alternative, in the work of Hermann Gunkel (1862-1932).²⁴

Hermann Gunkel, now known as the father of form criticism (*Gattungsgeschichte*), became convinced that there was a relationship between the Old Testament literature and that of the

non-Hebrew religions of the Near East. The claim of Gunkel that the Bible could have received influences from other peoples of the Near East was rejected by Wellhausen in an article entitled, "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur."²⁵

Gunkel did not completely reject the Wellhausen position, but he did believe that behind each of the major documents (J-E-D-P) there was a long literary history and that views reflected in these four sources of the Documentary Hypothesis were not merely those of the times at which the documents were composed. Thus, the composition of these documents was only the last phase in the history of the material they contained. The documents were preceded by an earlier stage when the materials were independent and were handed down by word of mouth. The documents were composed of different types of literary genre, called by Gunkel *Gattungen*, and the difference in the *Gattungen* was determined by the life situation that gave birth to the (*Sitz im Leben*). In assessing the contribution of Gunkel, Clemens claims that "by examining the narratives and laws separately as individual units, Gunkel believed that it was possible to recover a knowledge of a much earlier period of Israel's life than that in which the final composition of the source documents had taken place." In comparing their respective achievements Clemens continues:

Thus whereas Wellhausen's brilliant source criticism had brought to light four main layers, or stages, in the growth of the Hexateuch, each with its own reflection of Israel's religious institutions, Gunkel was able to carry this much further into obtaining a picture of greater depth than Wellhausen had achieved.²⁶

Another critical scholar to disagree with Wellhausen's understanding of the development of Hebrew history was Martin Noth, who utilized the methods and insights of Albrecht Alt. Noth incorporated his conclusions into a *History of Israel*,²⁷ a book which Clemens claimed became one of the most widely used textbooks in Europe. Noth used geographical and archaeological data and also drew information from rediscovered chronicles of Near Eastern nations. Noth presented a picture of Israel's history which differed considerably from that given by Wellhausen in his writings. In setting forth the differences between the two men Clemens says:

Whereas Wellhausen had concentrated almost exclusively upon Old Testament source material, and had aimed chiefly at offering a convincing and credible picture of the history of Israel's religious institutions, Noth strove for something that approaches very much closer to a 'secular' history of the people. Hence he considered much more extensively the

problems of Israel's political structure and development.²⁸

When Wellhausen was at the height of his influence, source analysis was the primary concern of Old Testament scholarship. The twentieth century has witnessed the development of form criticism, tradition criticism, redaction criticism, and structural exegesis, approaches which rejected many of the basic assumptions and conclusions of Wellhausen. Various aspects of the Four-Source Documentary Hypothesis have been under attack by many scholars.

The article on "Biblical Criticism" in *The Pictorial Biblical Encyclopedia* states the following about the Graf-Wellhausen theory:

Recent research has questioned the extremes of the documentary analysis, rejecting many of the disconnected strands into which the biblical books are splintered, although a majority of modern scholars still make use of the classical theory. This, therefore, deserves to be understood side by side with the new schools and theories of research.²⁹

Again this article observes:

As archaeological discoveries provided a whole range of extra-biblical sources against which to assess the biblical narratives, a reaction set in against the too-neat, but unsupported theories of "documentary analysis" and its splitting of the Old Testament text into different disconnected strands.³⁰

Writing in 1955, Flack in his article on the Pentateuch stated:

In the past four decades the changes produced into Pentateuchal criticism have tended toward a distrust and even disintegration of the documentary hypothesis. Critics have posited not only divisions and alternations in the four principal sources, J, E, D, and P, but also numerous additional documents.³¹

Cyrus Gordon made one of the most important repudiations of the Graf-Wellhausen theory in an article in *Christianity Today*.³² In this article Gordon, a veteran Near Eastern archaeologist and an outstanding linguist, gave reasons why he as a one-time proponent of the JEDP theory came to see the theory's inadequacies. Gordon warned that the critical methodology was failing to take seriously the facts of the ancient Near Eastern *Sitz im Leben*, a failure which could only result in negating the truly authentic material in the Old Testament.³³

Yehezkel Kaufmann, eminent scholar of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, has asserted:

Wellhausen's arguments complemented each other nicely, and offered what seemed to be a solid foundation upon

which to build the house of biblical criticism. Since then, however, both the evidence and the arguments supporting the structure have been called into question and to some extent, even rejected. Yet biblical scholarship, while admitting that the grounds have crumbled away, nevertheless continues to adhere to the conclusions. The critique of Wellhausen's theory which began some forty years ago has not been consistently carried through to its end. Equally unable to accept the theory in its classical formulation and to return to the precritical views of tradition, biblical scholarship has entered upon a period of search for new foundations.³⁴

IV. Attacks by Conservative Scholars on Wellhausenism in the 19th and 20th Centuries

The strongest attacks against Wellhausen were made by those who subscribed to the supernatural character of the Old Testament. It is not too difficult to see why Wellhausen in his day was called "der Umstürzler" (the overthrower), "Glaubensfeind" (enemy of the faith), and "Leugner der Offenbarung" (denier of revelation)³⁵ because his views were radically different from what the Old Testament taught and what also was believed by Christ and His apostles, as is clear from a number of New Testament passages.

Among conservative scholars who attacked Wellhausenism were Edwin Cone Bissel, who in *The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure* dealt with the weaknesses of Wellhausen's theory; and the Lutheran scholar Wilhelm Moeller, in 1889, published his *Historisch-Kritische Bedenken gegen die Graf-Wellhausenden Hypothese von einem frueheren Anhaenger*. Gerhardus Vos of Princeton Theological Seminary issued in 1886 *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes*, in which he refuted the views of Wellhausen. Another professor of Princeton Seminary who attacked the views of Wellhausen was W. H. Green, professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature. Following in the spiritual footsteps of men like Hengstenberg, Haevernick, and Keil, Green carried on the tradition of defending the Old Testament against its detractors. Green showed his analytical ability in dealing with Biblical issues in his earliest writing, *The Pentateuch Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Calenso* (1863). Twenty years later Green replied to Kuenen and William Robertson Smith in his *Moses and the Prophets*. In the Newton Lectures of 1885 Green attacked the developmental hypothesis and published them as *The Hebrew Feasts*. In the opinion of Archer the most thoroughgoing refutation of Wellhausenism was made by Green. Thus Archer wrote:

The most thoroughgoing refutation of Wellhausen

hypothesis to appear at the end of the nineteenth century in America was furnished by William Henry Green of Princeton in his *Unity of the Book of Genesis* (1895) and *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* (1896). With great erudition and skill he showed how inadequately the hypothesis explained the actual data of the Biblical text, and upon what illogical and self-contradictory bases the critical criteria rested.³⁶

The most recent thoroughgoing critique of Wellhausenism has appeared in Gleason L. Archer's *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Chapter 11 is entitled: "Wellhausen's Reconstruction of Hebrew History in the Pre-Prophetic and Prophetic Periods" and chapter 12 treats of "Wellhausen's Reconstruction of Hebrew History in the Priestly Period."³⁷ Edward Young has given a brief critique of the developmental hypothesis in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*.³⁸ Roland Kenneth Harrison likewise has given his own evaluation as well as a history of those scholarly efforts of the critics that have discredited basic Wellausian positions.³⁹

Critical scholars claim that there are at least four different criteria by means of which the JEDP documents can be separated from each other in the present text of the Pentateuch or even, as some contend, in the Hexateuch (the first six books of Old Testament).⁴⁰ These alleged criteria are the use of different divine names, the existence of contradictory accounts called doublets, differences in literary style, and differences in theological outlook.⁴¹

A number of conservative Christian and Jewish scholars have examined the arguments for these criteria and have refuted them. G. Ch. Aalders, formerly professor of Old Testament at the Free University of Amsterdam, dealt with these arguments in his book, *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch*.⁴² Oswald T. Allis, professor at Princeton and Westminster seminaries, examined these four criteria and thoroughly refuted them in *The Five Books of Moses* (1943). Allis rejected the modern view that the Pentateuch is a late compilation from diverse and conflicting sources by the authors and editors whose identity was completely unknown.⁴³ Merrill F. Unger, former professor of Old Testament and Semitic Studies at Dallas Theological Seminary, in his *Introductory Guide to the Old Testament* subjected the views of critical scholarship to a thoroughgoing critique and analysis from within the context of Scriptural supernaturalism. He has shown from the viewpoint of an inspired and infallible Scripture the untenability of adhering to the Final Documentary Hypothesis.⁴⁴

A number of Jewish scholars challenged the Wellhausen approach in this century. Umberto Cassuto made a frontal attack

upon the Documentary Hypothesis in eight lectures published in Hebrew in 1941, of which an English translation appeared in 1961.⁴⁵ Another scholar of the University of Jerusalem, M.H. Segal, has shown the weakness of certain aspects of the Documentary Hypothesis in a lengthy article.⁴⁶

The developmental hypothesis, as taught and advocated by the Wellhausen school, is essentially anti-supernaturalistic in character. The intervention of Yahweh-Elohim in the affairs of His chosen people is completely eliminated. Wellhausen presents the development of Israel's religion on purely naturalistic grounds. This means that there is no essential difference between the religions of the Near Eastern world — that the differences between the Old Testament religion and other religions is one of degree and not of kind. On the basis of powers allegedly found within the Hebrew faith, its religious conceptions developed without Yahweh having anything to do with them. The religion of Israel is to be dealt with as a researcher would handle and investigate any other body of religious data in the world. The uniqueness of the Hebraeo-Christian faith is repudiated as unacceptable. The traditional stance of orthodox Judaism that the Old Testament is the Word of God; the belief of historic Roman Catholicism and of historic Protestantism that the Old Testament was inspired by the Holy Spirit and therefore is unique has been totally surrendered. The gulf between the historical-critical approach to the Old Testament and that of Christ and His apostles, as reflected in the New Testament, is unbridgeable. The two approaches are diametrically opposed to each other.

If the position of Wellhausen and his followers is correct, then we may ask with Young:

If this is so, why did Israel alone develop such sublime doctrines? There were deep thinkers elsewhere, and philosophers of ability also, but no other nation produced conceptions of God such as those contained in the Old Testament. For this the Christian Church, of course, has the answer. It is that God intervened in a special way in Israel's history. This is also the plain teaching of the Bible itself.⁴⁷

If the Final Four-Source Documentary Hypothesis is correct, then two of the legal documents of the Pentateuch are a fraud. Both the priestly legislation found in Leviticus and the Deuteronomic code, which are specifically attributed to Moses, are not written by him. The Biblical text states many times that Moses was given these laws by God and that he was the mediator of these law codes. Critics, however, claim that ascription of these law codes to Moses was simply a device employed by later writers to gain a hearing for these law codes and cultic practices. Such a

view undermines the moral character of the Bible and causes people to lose faith in the Scriptures as a reliable guide in matters of religion and ethics. Concerning this matter Young observed: "And the shocking nature of this assumption becomes particularly clear when we remember that it was none other than the Lord of truth who repelled the temptation of the evil one by quoting from the book of Deuteronomy."⁴⁸

V. Archaeology and Wellhausenism

When Wellhausen was erecting his hypothesis he based some of his arguments and conclusions concerning the historicity of the Old Testament upon the data archaeology had made available in the nineteenth century. For instance, it was assumed that writing was unknown at Moses' time and that therefore the Pentateuch could not have been written by him. However, since the days of Hupfeld, Graf, and Wellhausen, archaeological discovery has confirmed the use of alphabetic writing in Canaanite-speaking cultures of 1500 B.C. In fact, it is now known that there were in existence five different types of alphabetic writings which Moses could have used in writing the Pentateuch. Many of the assumptions and conclusions of the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis have been discredited by archaeology. Nations and individuals whose historicity was once questioned have been shown by archaeology to have existed as taught by the Old Testament. W. F. Albright wrote in 1941:

Archaeological and inscriptional data have established the historicity of innumerable passages and statements of the Old Testament; the number of such cases is many times greater than those where the reverse has been proved or has been made probable.⁴⁹

In the same article Albright asserted: "Wellhausen still ranks in our eyes as the greatest Biblical scholar of the nineteenth century. *But his standpoint is antiquated and his picture of the early evolution of Israel is sadly distorted.*"⁵⁰

Archaeological discoveries from Rash Shamra, ancient Ugarit, and now from Tell Mardikh, ancient Ebla, provide evidence favoring the conservative interpretation of the Old Testament.⁵¹ For example, Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities of the plain were considered to be mythical, but now tablets from Ebla show that these cities existed before Abraham's time, during the period between 2400 and 2250 B.C. The people of Ebla seem to have known a god Yah in addition to Il or El. The separation of portions of Genesis from each other because of the use of Yahweh or Elohim seems out of order in the light of the inscriptional data from Ebla. A creation tablet has been found which is much closer

to Genesis 1, with its creation of nothing, than to the Enuma Elish Epic.⁵²

According to Bright⁵³ and Mendenhall,⁵⁴ Wellhausenism in its classic form has ceased to exist. Thus Mendenhall asserted: "Perhaps the most important gap in the field of Old Testament history is the lack of an adequate hypothesis to replace that of Wellhausen."⁵⁵ In the place of the regnant Wellhausian theory, new views have been proposed such as those of the Form-Critical School and the Traditio-historical or Uppsala School.⁵⁶ Although these new schools differ in some respects, they have one feature in common: they all reject the Mosaic dating and the full trust worthiness of the Pentateuch.

VI. The Effects of Wellhausenism on the Christian Church

For the last one hundred years the theological position of many Christian churches has been weakened through the use of negative Biblical criticism. In 1961 Bright wrote:

. . . . it is impossible to make general statements regarding any phase of Biblical criticism today without running the risk of oversimplification. The whole field is in a state of flux. It is moving, certainly, but it is not always easy to say in what direction. Sometimes it gives the impression that it is moving in several mutually cancelling directions at once. Even upon major points there is often little unanimity to be observed. As a result, scarcely a single statement can be made about the field that would not be subject to qualification. Indeed, perhaps the only safe generalization possible is that the critical orthodoxy of a generation ago, with its apparent certainties and assured results, has gone, but that no new consensus has taken its place.⁵⁷

In 1963 Hans Wolff complained that the Old Testament was dead and was no longer preached from the pulpit.⁵⁸ Walter Wink claimed that "the historical criticism is bankrupt."⁵⁹ Thus he wrote:

Biblical criticism is not bankrupt because it has run out of things to say or new ground to explore. It is bankrupt solely because it is incapable of achieving what most of its practitioners considered its purpose to be: so to interpret the Scriptures that the past becomes alive and illumines our present with new possibilities for personal and social transformation.⁶⁰

Wink claims to be an ally of a group of scholars who have spoken out against a form of scholarship found in liberal Protestant seminaries which has "gone to seed but which, by sheer abundance of seeds, flourishes everywhere in the land."⁶¹

From a historical Lutheran stance Wellhausen's theological position is totally unacceptable because of its rationalism and its

denigration of the Bible, demoting the latter from its status as the Word of God to a collection of human writings. Wellhausen himself, whom we must respect for his integrity, recognized this fact. When he wrote to the Secretary of Cultural Affairs while he was professor of theology at the University of Greifswald asking for a transfer to another faculty, he stated:

Your Excellency will perhaps remember that I asked you at Easter-time 1880 to transfer me, if possible, to the philosophical faculty and that I tried to give you my reasons at that time: I became a theologian because I was interested in scientific work with the Bible; only gradually I realized that a professor of theology has the practical duty of preparing students for service in the Evangelical Church, and that I could not meet this requirement, but in spite of my discretion and reserve *made them unfit for the ministry*. Since that time my theological professorship has been a burden on my conscience.⁶²

FOOTNOTES

1. Hans Joachim Kraus, *Geschichte der Historischen-Kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1956), p. 239.
2. Herbert F. Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern Research with a Survey of Recent Literature by Horace Hummel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 11.
3. W. Neil, "The Criticism and Theological Use of the Bible, 1700-1950," *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, edited by S. L. Greenslade (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), III, p. 284.
4. Ronald Clemens, *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press), p. 152.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 151.
6. Based on materials found in H. F. Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. 235-239; Clemens, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-11.
7. J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Buecher Samuelis* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1871).
8. J. Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, I (Marburg, 1878); second edition, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (Marburg, 1883). An English translation of the second edition made by J. S. Black and A. Menzies entitled *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* was published in 1885. A reprint of this book with a further change in the title to *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* was made in 1957 (Harper Torch-books, New York).
9. "Julius Wellhausen," in Elgin S. Mayer, *Who Was Who in Church History* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1962), pp. 430-431.
10. Kraus, *op. cit.*, p. 237.
11. Hahn, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
12. Edward J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1964), pp. 136-138.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
14. Hahn, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
15. Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. 240-248.
16. Hahn, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-17.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- 17a. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
18. Kraeling, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
- 19a. Lothar Perlitt, *Vatke und Wellhausen* (Berlin: Verlag Von Topelmann, 1965) pp. 159-164.
20. Kraeling, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
21. Young, *op. cit.*, pp. 136-137.
22. Hahn, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
23. Clemens, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
25. J. Wellhausen, "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur," reprinted in *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI, 1899, pp. 215-249.
26. Clemens, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
27. Martin Noth, *The History of Israel* (London: A.S.C. Black 1958), p. 479.
28. Clemens, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
29. Gaalyahu Cornfeld *et al.*, *Pictorial Biblical Encyclopedia* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1964), . 172.
30. *Ibid.*
31. Elmer E. Flack, "Pentateuch," in *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia*, Lefferts A. Loetscher, editor-in-chief (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), II, 863.
32. Cyrus Gordon, "Forbidden Fruit," *Christianity Today*, IV (Nov. 26, 1956), pp. 131-134.
33. Roland Kenneth Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969), p. 79.
34. Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel*, translated and abridged by Moshe Greenberg (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 1.
35. Kraus, *op. cit.*, p. 236.
36. Archer, *op. cit.*, p. 82.
37. Archer, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-146; 147-154.
38. Young, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-140.
39. Roland Kenneth Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdsman's Publishing Company, 1969, pp. 19-61.
40. L. A. Bushinski-A. van Born, "Pentateuch," in Louis. F. Hartman, ed., *Encyclopedia Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: McGraw-Hill book Company, 1963), pp. 1790-1793.
41. Gleason Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1963), p. 84.
42. G. Ch. Aalders, *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch* (Chicago and Toronto: Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, no date), pp. 30-71.
43. Oswald T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1943), pp. 21-126.
44. Merrill F. Unger, *Introductory Guide to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1950), pp. 213-276.
45. U. Cassuto, *The Documentary Hypothesis* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1961), pp. 5-110.
46. M. H. Segal, *The Pentateuch-Its Composition and Its Authorship*. (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1967).
47. Young, *op. cit.*, pp. 136-138.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
49. W. F. Albright, *The American Scholar*, 1941, p. 181.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 185. Italics supplied.
51. "Rash Shamra," *Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia*, edited by Charles F. Pfeiffer, H. Vos, and John Rea (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), II, p. 1444. Clifford

-
- Wilson, *Ebla Tablets: Secrets of a Forgotten City* (San Diego: Master Books, Division of GLP), 1977.
52. Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49.
53. John Bright, "Modern Study of the Old Testament Literature," in G. Ernst Wright, editor, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1961), p. 18.
54. George E. Mendenhall, "Biblical History in Transition," in E. G. Wright, ed., *The Bible and Ancient Near East*, p. 34.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
56. Bright, "Modern Study of Old Testament Literature." *op. cit.*, p. 21.
57. *Ibid.*
58. Hans Wolff, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1963), p. 35.
59. Walter Wink, *The Bible in Human Transformation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), p. 2.
60. *Ibid.*
61. *Ibid.*
62. As given in Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-237; italics supplied. Cf. also Manfred Roensch, "A Critical Investigation of the So-Called Historical-Critical Method in the Interpretation of Holy Scripture," *The Springfielder*, XXVII, (Spring, 1964), pp. 32-42.

Sing A New Song:

The Doctrine of Justification and the
Lutheran Book of Worship Sacramental Liturgies
 Armand J. Boehme

Martin Luther discovered a new song for the church to sing — the song of justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. This was really the old song of God's church that had been drowned out by work righteousness. Luther rediscovered the song of justification, and it is the article of faith by which the church stands or falls (*articulis stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*).¹ All of Christian doctrine stands or falls with this article.² This clear doctrine is the only hope for lost and sinful mankind.

However, in the past several decades, a number of Lutheran theologians have felt that the Lutheran Church has moved away from this song of justification by grace to the cacophany of work righteousness. The means by which this shift has been accomplished in Lutheran circles, is the Liturgical movement³ and its products — The *Service Book and Hymnal* with its Eucharistic Prayer;⁴ The Lutheran Hymnal's *Worship Supplement* and its Eucharistic Prayers;⁵ and the *Lutheran Book of Worship* with its Eucharistic Prayers and its whole theology of worship.⁶

The Eucharistic Prayer is not just any prayer used in a Communion service. It is a prayer which encloses or includes the Words of Institution. The Words of Institution are thus changed from Gospel proclamation to the people into a prayer offered to God. This transforms the nature of the Sacrament into something we offer to God, rather than God coming to us in grace. Eucharistic Prayers are traditionally found in the Roman Catholic Mass Canon. This fact caused Werner Elert to write in 1953, "I'm gravely concerned about the future of the American Lutherans . . . They are going back to the canon of the mass."⁷ He and other Lutheran theologians in the 1950's were concerned about the doctrinal changes evident with the inclusion of Eucharistic Prayers in Lutheran worship services. William Nagel wrote of the damage to the doctrine of justification:

It is well known that efforts are being made to restore the so-called "high prayer" to the Lutheran "mass" . . . yet any-

body whom the *sola fide* of the Reformation has made mistrustful of any and every form of pious activism in the appropriation of salvation will look very critically upon this embedding of the *verba testamenti* in which the Lord himself bestows the Supper's gift of grace upon us, in a profusion of human prayer-action.⁸

The article of justification must be the critical principle of all liturgical work, for this alone will help to give God's action first place in the liturgy, and will safeguard the Word and Sacraments as means of grace.⁹ Ragnar Bring noted this emphasis in 1950:

The Sacrament, then, is a gift of God. If the Gospel is to be expressed through the Sacraments, we must wholeheartedly adopt the conception of God as giver. If there is the slightest thought that Communion is an offering to God, a sacred act in God's direction, then the Gospel is rendered null and void at once.¹⁰

Though there was a struggle over the adoption of the Eucharistic Prayer in the *Service Book and Hymnal*,¹¹ the real theological struggle concerning Eucharistic Prayers did not begin in American Lutheranism until the work of the Inter-Lutheran Commission of Worship (ILCW), which produced the *Lutheran Book of Worship* (LBW). Arguments began in earnest in 1970 after Contemporary Worship II, the provisional celebration of the Eucharist was issued by the ILCW.¹² From 1970 to 1975 only ALC and LCA theologians seemed concerned about the dangers to grace and justification brought about by the liturgical innovations of the ILCW.¹³ In 1973, three LCA/ALC seminary faculties formally objected to the doctrinal changes present in the ILCW Communion liturgy.¹⁴ Since 1975, LCMS theologians have also begun to write about the ILCW/LBW liturgies.¹⁵

This paper concentrates on the baptism and communion liturgies of the LBW.¹⁶ What is the basic problem with these liturgies? They confuse Sacrament and sacrifice.¹⁷ The Confessions clearly separate the two.

A Sacrament is a ceremony or work in which God presents to us that which the promise annexed to the ceremony offers . . . A sacrifice, on the contrary, is a ceremony or work we render God in order to afford Him honor.¹⁸

The Sacraments are not the work of man, but the work of God Himself.¹⁹ We are to respond with thanks and praise (sacrifice) to God for what He has given us in the Sacrament. The Apology clearly shows that this occurs properly *after* the reception of the grace in the Sacrament:

After conscience encouraged by faith has perceived from what terrors it has been freed, then indeed it fervently gives

thanks for the benefit and passion of Christ, and uses the ceremony itself to the praise of God, in order by this obedience to show its gratitude; and testifies that it holds in high esteem the gifts of God.²⁰

The comfort of conscience through the forgiveness of sins belongs to the nature (*ad sacramenti rationem pertinet*) of the Sacrament. The thanksgiving belongs to the sacrifice.²¹ The Confessions clearly deny that our sacrifice belongs to the *nature* of a Sacrament.²²

Luther himself excluded *all* thought or word of sacrifice from his final work on the liturgy, the German Mass.²³ Why? Luther speaks eloquently to this point in Article II of the Smalcald Articles. Luther writes of the abomination of the Mass Canon and its sacrifice:

The Mass should by right be relinquished, if for no other purpose than to prevent abuses, even though in itself it had something advantageous and good. How much more ought we to relinquish it, so as to prevent forever these horrible abuses, since it is altogether unnecessary, useless, and dangerous, and we can obtain everything by a more necessary, profitable, and certain way without the Mass.

. . . But since the Mass is nothing else, and can be nothing else (as the Canon and all books declare) than a work of men . . . by which one attempts to reconcile himself and others to God . . . for this very reason it must and should be condemned and rejected. For this directly conflicts with the chief article . . . [i.e., justification].²⁴

If we are bound to the Lutheran Confessions, then we are confessionally bound to avoid mixing our sacrifices with the Sacrament in order to safeguard the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Christ. Some might say that this was necessary only in Luther's time. However, today it is still necessary to separate clearly our sacrifice from God's Sacraments. This was shown by some disturbing statistics from *A Study of Generations*, an analysis of Lutherans and their beliefs:

. . . the LCA has more members, about three out of five, who agree with rather obvious statements of a belief in salvation by works. The smallest proportion, about two out of five, is found in the LCMS . . . Pastors of the LCMS are the lowest scoring group on Salvation by Works . . . significantly more clergymen of the LCA believe in salvation by works . . .²⁵

Salvation by grace alone through faith alone should be believed by one hundred percent of all Lutherans! Since this central doctrine of justification is not believed or understood by all, should

new worship forms confuse and even contradict the Gospel by turning God's gift in the Sacraments into *our* work and sacrifice?

Many of the criticisms levelled against LBW Sacramental liturgies center on just this point: that the liturgies exalt man's action, work, and sacrifice — and in so doing, they “endanger the doctrine of justification.”²⁶ This danger centers in the LBW's Eucharistic Prayers, which occur in both the baptism and communion liturgies. The “Flood Prayer” in the Baptism liturgy “parallels the eucharistic prayer in the Holy Communion . . .”²⁷

The inclusion of Eucharistic Prayers in the LBW has turned the character of the Lutheran Sacramental worship service upside down. The Words of Institution in the Communion service are no longer proclamation of God's grace to the people, but a prayer man offers to God.²⁸ The Eucharistic Prayer reintroduces into Lutheran worship the very sacrifice of the Canon of the Mass so vehemently rejected by Luther, because it attacked the doctrine of justification.²⁹

In the Eucharistic Prayer, we call to God's remembrance (*anamnesis*, “recalling, memorial”)³⁰ all that Christ has done for our salvation. For the LBW, our prayer calling for God's remembrance becomes one of the constitutive factors of the Sacrament.³¹ The character of the Sacrament is thus turned from God's gift to us, to our act of remembrance directed towards God.³² This was the emphasis of Karlstadt and the Sacramentarians.³³ The ILCW remembrance seems based on the faulty exegetical study of *anamnesis* in the Words of Institution by Joachim Jeremias.³⁴ For the ILCW/LBW or *anamnesis* must call to God's remembrance what Christ has done, before God will forgive.³⁵ Forgiveness depends on our cultic act of worship.³⁶ Here we are again placed squarely back into the *quid pro quo* theology of the medieval mass.³⁷

Tied with the *anamnesis* is our memorializing thanksgiving.³⁸ For the ILCW/LBW our act of thanksgiving is the most important part of the Sacrament: “as something we are to do, the Lord's Supper is an act of thanksgiving . . .”³⁹ Another ILCW author puts it this way: “the Lutherans discarded what was most primitive in the Eucharistic tradition, namely, the act of thanksgiving, and retained what was secondary [i.e., the Words of Institution].”⁴⁰ In defining the Sacrament as our act of thanksgiving, the LBW/ILCW as joined hands with Zwingli who said, “The Eucharist is never the bread or the body of Christ but the act of giving thanks.”⁴¹ He titled his Eucharistic liturgy “A Memorial or Thanksgiving of Christ.”⁴² The LBW, then, has changed the character of the Lord's Supper, as Krodell observes:

. . . the Lord's Supper as our memorializing thanksgiving

is not the Lord's Supper but the Christians' supper. . . . Thus the Lord's Supper is debased to being an identification tag of Christians. A long time ago Luther had strongly rejected this distortion of the Lord's Supper as Zwinglian heresy, since for Zwingli, too, the Lord's Supper is a memorializing thanksgiving.⁴³

Since man's act of thanksgiving and *anamnesis* are "consecrative" for the Eucharist of the LBW,⁴⁴ the Words of Institution undergo a change as well. For the LBW/ILCW the Words of Institution have been changed to a "Narrative of Institution."⁴⁵ Instead of the words of Christ, the ILCW authors give us their story about the words — "it is our telling the story now."⁴⁶ The authors have replaced the words of Christ with their own! The Narrative of Institution has no other purpose for the LBW/ILCW than to serve as "a recital of the particular event which justifies our present act of praise."⁴⁷ The unimportance of the Narrative of Institution is reflected in these words by one of the LBW authors who helped write the eucharistic prayer section of the liturgy:

We suppose, for example, that the one thing which must always be done in celebration of the Lord's Supper is that the narrative of institution be recited. But that is clearly the one thing in all heaven and earth that cannot possibly belong to the necessary structure of the Lord's Supper . . .⁴⁸

Luther and the Confessions hold that the Word consecrates the Sacrament, and without it, there can be no Sacrament. But for the LBW/ILCW the Word no longer consecrates the Sacrament.⁴⁹ For this reason an *epiclesis* (prayer invoking the Holy Spirit) is added to both of the sacramental liturgies.⁵⁰ This addition raises some theological problems.

In the LBW Baptism liturgy, the *epiclesis* follows the actual Baptism and gives the impression that the Holy Spirit has not come to the person through the Word in Baptism, but arrives only after the *epiclesis* is prayed.⁵¹ The *epiclesis* has also led to a great deal of emphasis on the water rather than the Word in Baptism.⁵²

The introduction of the *epiclesis* in the Communion liturgy reflects a theory of consecration that is not in accord with the Lutheran Confessions.⁵³ The invocation of the Holy Spirit has traditionally been used by the Reformed to deny or avoid the Real Presence.⁵⁴ With an *epiclesis*, the character of Communion changes from the Lord's Supper into a meal of the Spirit.⁵⁵

There is also much use of the word "covenant" in the LBW liturgies.⁵⁶ Since "covenant" is also the name of a certain form of Reformed theology (Federalist-Covenant Theology),⁵⁷ the use of this word (along with the *anamnesis* and *epiclesis* as described

earlier) seems to indicate a shift toward Reformed theology by the LBW.⁵⁸

The Lutheran Confessions show exactly what is to be central in the Lord's Supper. The Lord gives us His gifts — forgiveness of sins, His true Body and Blood, the assurance of eternal life. These benefits are placed in the Sacraments solely by the power of the Word — the very words of Christ. For it is the Word which consecrates the Sacraments.⁵⁹

The great emphasis on man's action in the LBW's sacramental liturgies has, in conjunction with other ingredients, led to a confusion of law and Gospel. This confusion is also a result of the faulty method of biblical exegesis used by the ILCW/LBW. One ILCW author writes, ". . . the Confession's exegetical procedure is exactly like that of the ILCW . . ." (This assertion is, of course, false, since we have earlier seen that the ILCW is committed to a historical-critical method which was unknown to the Confessors — see footnote 46.) This combination of man's action and historical-critical method has led ILCW authors to see "the word which constitutes the sacrament as *both* law and gospel, not as gospel only . . ."⁶⁰

The above statement is contrary to both Scripture and the Confessions. The Confessions clearly distinguish between the Gospel and the Law: ". . . the Gospel is properly the promise of the forgiveness of sins and of justification through Christ, . . . the Law is a doctrine which reproves sins and condemns."⁶¹ The Confessions describe the Sacraments, and the Word which consecrates the Sacraments, only in terms of the Gospel (promise, grace, forgiveness, remission, etc.):

The Sacraments are signs of God's will toward us, and not merely signs of men among each other; and they are right in defining that Sacraments in the New Testament are signs of grace. And because in a sacrament there are two things, a sign and the Word, the Word, in the New Testament, is the promise of grace added. The promise of the New Testament is the promise of the remission of sins . . . Therefore the Word offers the remission of sins. And a ceremony is, as it were, a picture or a *seal* . . . of the Word, making known the promise . . . so a ceremony is useless unless such faith is added as it truly confident that the remission of sins is here offered.⁶²

The Confessions clearly show that the Sacramental Word and the Sacraments are Gospel — "Means of Grace" — and not law. Scripture also teaches the same thing. Baptism takes place "for the remission of sins," or "to wash away thy sins" (Acts 2:38; 22:16). "Baptism doth also now save us" (1 Peter 3:21). Holy

Communion was instituted by Christ “for the remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28) Scripture and the Confessions clearly show that the sacraments are Gospel, not law or a mixture of law and Gospel.⁶³

The LBW liturgies also allow for infant communion.⁶⁴ The Lutheran Church opposes infant communion, because of the words of St. Paul: “But let a man examine himself . . .” (1 Cor. 11:28).⁶⁵ Because an infant lacks the ability to examine himself properly previous to reception of the Lord’s Supper, it is obvious that communion should take place only after proper catechetical instruction concerning the Lord’s Supper has been completed.

The LBW Sacramental liturgies contain some of the very worship practices rejected in the Confessions (FCSD X was a refutation of Roman Catholic worship practices forced on the Lutherans).⁶⁶ In fact, the work of the ILCW/LBW is based on a theological principle contrary to the Confessions (AC VII states that common rites and ceremonies are *not* necessary for true unity in the church).⁶⁷

Both Roman Catholic and Reformed influence, then, is evident in the LBW liturgies. Such a hodgepodge of theologies will surely cause confusion among the people in the pew, and a loss of the beautiful doctrinal heritage of the Lutheran Church. Lutheran’s glorious “new song” of justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ must remain central to Lutherans — in both belief and worship. If we desire to sing that “new song” with a new melody or a new form, that is all well and good. But we must be careful lest the new melody or form change the substance of the song itself. For we want to continue to sing that song of justification loud and strong. It identifies and sustains us as biblical Christians and Confessional Lutherans who want to proclaim clearly the Gospel which alone forgives our sins!

FOOTNOTES

1. The first and chief article is this,

That Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, died for our sins, and was raised again for our justification, Rom. 4:25 Of this article nothing can be yielded or surrendered, even though heaven and earth, and whatever will not abide, should sink to ruin And upon this article all things depend which we teach and practice in opposition to the Pope, the devil, and the world. [Smalcald Articles, Part II, 1-5.]

See also, Augsburg Confession IV. Apology IV. Formula of Concord, Epitome III, Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration III. Bengt Hägglund, *History of Theology*, trans. G.J. Lund (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), pp. 225-232. E.H. Klotsche and J. T. Mueller, *The History of Christian Doctrine* (Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1945), pp. 176-178. P. Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. R.C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 224-250.

2. This does not mean that the specific *locus* “De iustificatione” considered by itself, is all that the Lutherans consider indispensable. Rather they regard

the entire *corpus doctrinae* as bound up inextricably with justification. All doctrines have their place in this doctrine. All doctrines stand or fall with the doctrine of justification. [H.J.A. Bouman, "The Doctrine of Justification in the Lutheran Confessions," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XXVI, 11 (November, 1955), p. 804]

See also, F.E. Mayer, *Religious Bodies in America*, 3rd Ed. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958), pp. 144ff. F. Pieper, "Dr. C.F.W. Walther as Theologian," trans. J.T. Mueller, *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XXVI, 12, (December, 1955), pp. 913-920. "Theology of Fellowship," (CTCR Document, n.d.), p. 18. F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, II, committee trans. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954), pp. 503-557. H. Schmid, *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, trans. H. Jacobs and C.A. Hay (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), pp. 424-441. Wm. Arndt, "The Doctrine of Justification," in Theo. Laetsch, ed., *The Abiding Word*, II (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1947), pp. 235-257.

3. Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945). Yngve Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic* (London: SPCK, 1930). Charles Davis, *Liturgy and Doctrine: The Doctrinal Basis of the Liturgical Movement* (N.Y.: Sheed and Ward, 1960); this book is a must for understanding the theological framework of the ILCW. Chapters 4-7 read like a handbook to the theology of the ILCW. E. Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966); this book is a good primer for understanding the theology of Odo Casel, whose *mysterientheologie* appears in ILCW liturgies, pp. 104-124. Odo Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship and Other Writings* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1962). H. Leitzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy*, trans. Dorothea Reeve (Leiden: Brill, 1954). Peter Brunner, *Worship In the Name of Jesus*, trans. M.H. Bertram (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968).
4. The Appeal for the inclusion of the Eucharistic Prayer in the *Service Book and Hymnal* was made on the grounds of "deepened scholarship." *Service Book and Hymnal* (Minneapolis: APH; Philadelphia: Bd. of Publication: LCA, 1958), p. vii.
5. The *Worship-Supplement* was designed to fill the gap until the new pan-Lutheran Hymnal (The *Lutheran Book of Worship*) could be produced. The "new items" brought forth for LCMS use were "the singing of the Offertory as the offerings [including bread and wine] are brought forth . . . and the Prayer of Thanksgiving" (p.9). The 3 "Prayers of Thanksgiving" (pp. 45-47) are Eucharistic prayers. *Worship Supplement* (St. Louis: CPH, 1969). The LCMS Committee established to revise *The Lutheran Hymnal* had already decided before 1966 to approve "the principle of the Eucharistic Prayer . . . in any subsequent Order of the Holy Communion a Eucharistic Prayer will be included." H.F. Lindemann, "Progress Reports, Synodical Conference: Committee on Liturgical Texts," in E.S. Brown, Jr., ed. *Liturgical Reconnaissance: Papers Presented at the Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship* (Philadelphia: FP, 1968), p. 125.
6. Theodore Tappert is reported to have said that were the ILCW theology of worship adopted by the Lutheran Church, "one would have to fight the Reformation all over again." O.K. Olson, "Liturgy as 'Action,'" *Dialog*, 14, 2 (Spring, 1975), p. 113. E.S. Brown, *Reconnaissance, op. cit.* This book is must reading for understanding the theological and liturgical ground that gave rise to the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship and the *Lutheran Book of Worship*. The papers in this book were presented at the meeting

that formed the ILCW. Reasons given for the new hymnal include the promotion of Lutheran unity (pp. 113-114, 118, 131-133), the desire for a common "Christian hymnal for all the major denominations" (pp. 114, 126, 128), and the need for the revision of worship forms brought on by "advances in historical-liturgical studies" (pp. 114, 32). On this last point, see D.M. Granskou, "Historical Critical Exegesis and the Renewal of the Liturgy," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, XIX, 1 (February, 1967), pp. 74-86, esp. 74 and 80. See also C. Davis, *Liturgy and Doctrine*, *op. cit.*

7. L. Green, "Between Luther the 'Now' Generation: Some Thoughts About 'Contemporary Worship' as Advanced by the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship," *The Springfielder*, XXXIX, 3 (December 1975), p. 81.
8. Wm. Nagel, "Justification and the Discipline of Liturgics," trans. Wm. Doberstein, *The Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, (1956), pp. 48-49.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
10. Ragner Bring, "On the Lutheran Concept of the Sacrament," *World Lutheranism of Today: A Tribute to Anders Nygren* (Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Book Concern, 1950), p. 87.
11. *Minutes of the Sixteenth Biennial Convention — ULC* (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948), p. 444. See also, *Minutes of the Central Pennsylvania Synod* for May 25, 1949.
12. *Contemporary Worship 2: The Holy Communion* (Minneapolis: APH; Phila.: FP; St. Louis: CPH, 1970).
13. 1970 — O.K. Olson, "Luther's 'Catholic' Minimum," *Response*, XI, 1-2 (1970), pp. 17-31. "The ILCW order requires the use of a eucharistic prayer (the mass canon), something specifically rejected by the Reformers . . .," p. 19.
 1971 — "The New Holy Communion," *Lutheran Forum* (April, 1971), pp. 64ff. Three reactions to *Contemporary Worship 2* occur.
 1972 — O.K. Olson, "The Mix Makes a Muddle," *The Lutheran Standard*, 12 (June 20, 1972), pp. 11-12. ". . . mixing God's gift to us with our sacrifices to him results in nothing but a muddle."
 1974 — O.K. Olson, "Contemporary Trends in Liturgy Viewed from the Perspective of Classical Lutheran Theology," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, XXVI, 2 (May, 1974), pp. 110-157. "In its adoption of novel theological insights the ILCW has failed to safeguard the biblical doctrine of Grace Alone," p. 110.
 1975 — O.K. Olson, "Liturgy as 'Action,'" *op. cit.*, pp. 108-113. "That an explicit rejection of the theology of the Lutheran Confessions occurs in a discussion of 'reactualization' may serve to make us wary of the theology of 'action'; and suspect that in the end 'action' implies something a good deal more sinister than the recent talk about an 'evangelical doctrine of sacrifice' leads one to expect. In fact, 'action' is a synonym for 'Works'," p. 111.
 Paul Rorem, "Luther's Objections to a Eucharistic Prayer," *The Cresset* (March, 1975), pp. 12ff. L. Green, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-87. For a listing of many other articles on this subject — pro and con — see O.K. Olson and A.J. Boehme, "An Annotated Bibliography on Some Materials Pertaining to the Present Controversy on the Use of a 'Eucharistic Prayer'" (In Concordia Seminary Library, Ft. Wayne, Ind.).
14. The three seminaries were Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. (ALC), whose faculty wrote the formal objections; Southern Theological Seminary (LCA), Columbia, S.C.; and Lutheran Theological Seminary (Mt. Airy — LCA), Philadelphia, Pa.

An excerpt reads: ". . .there are departures from traditional Lutheran worship practices . . . such items as the epiclesis, the 'four-action' shape (with obligatory fraction, offertory procession, and prayer context of the

Words of Institution) and the seeming lack of balance between the sacrificial/sacramental elements of the service to the detriment of the latter." O.K. Olson, "Luther's . . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113.

15. That LCMS theologians did not write about the ILCW liturgies before 1975 seems to stem from the internal problems of the LCMS, and the lack of availability of some ILCW material in LCMS circles. The following list includes the works of LCMS theologians (indicated by *) and non-LCMS theologians.

1975 — Gotthilf Doehler, "The Descent into Hell," *The Springfielder*, XXXIX, 1 (June, 1975), pp. 2-19. This is a refutation of the faculty translation of the Apostles Creed by ICET ("he went to the dead") contained in the *Worship Supplement* and optional in *Lutheran Book of Worship*. *Carl Bornmann, "The Twenty-Seventh Institute of Liturgical Studies," *Ibid.*, pp. 40-43, reports that Eugene Brand (project director for ILCW) said that the Great Commission "can hardly be the actual words of Jesus." He also stated that we must treat the Scriptures critically, and should commune infants.

1976 — *R. Klann, "Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship," *Concordia Journal*, II, 2 (March, 1976), pp. 41-42. *R. Klann, "Christ's Descent into Hell," *Ibid.*, pp. 43-47. *Arnold F. Krugler, "The Words of Institution: Proclamation or Prayer?" *Ibid.*, pp. 53-60. "For Roman Catholicism the Eucharistic Prayer has always concentrated in it the essential elements of the so-called Sacrifice of the Mass, which Luther saw as devastatingly legalistic and work-righteous." (p. 56). *M.H. Scharlemann, "Some Remarks Regarding the Celebration of the Lord's Supper," *Concordia Journal*, II, 3 (May, 1976), pp. 91-93. *J. Nickel, "Whither the New Hymnal?" *Ibid.*, pp. 110-113. *H. Wangerin, "Thoughts on the New 'Worship Book,'" *Ibid.*, pp. 113-116. *David P. Scaer, "The Great Thanksgiving of the ILCW," *The Springfielder*, XL, 1 (June, 1976), pp. 36-41. R.G. Hughes, "C.W. 7. A Critique . . . To Be Continued," *The Mt. Airy Parish Practice Notebook*, No. 10 (June, 1976), pp. 1-5, criticizes the ILCW Baptism liturgy for liturgically blunting God's gracious approach in Baptism. Clarence L. Lee, "The Great Thanksgiving: A Critical Review," *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7, notes that the ILCW Thanksgiving Prayers make the supper more ours than Christ's. Gottfried Krodell, "The Great Thanksgiving of the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship: It is the Christians' Supper and Not the Lord's Supper," *The Cresset: Occasional Paper #1* (Valparaiso University Press, 1976).

1977 — *D. Judisch, "The Deepening Liturgical Crisis," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, XLI, 1 (January, 1977), pp. 50-52. *D. Judisch, "Delaney's Defense of the ILCW," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, XLI, 3 (July, 1977), pp. 46-50. *W.E. Schmidt, "Lutheran Book of Worship — A Perspective," *Concordia Journal*, III, 3 (May, 1977), pp. 99-106. *P.F. Foelber, "Lutheran Book of Worship," *Ibid.*, pp. 107-109 — a defense of ILCW. "Editorial: Whatever Became of Common Sense?" *The Bride of Christ*, I, 2 (May, 1977). "Issues at Dallas: The Proposed New Hymnal," *The Lutheran Witness* (May 22, 1977), pp. 6-9.

1978 — "Report and Recommendations of the Special Hymnal Review Committee" (n.p.: n.n., n.d.). Special report by an LCMS committee on the *Lutheran Book of Worship* material. *C.J. Evanson, "Theological Observer," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 42, 3 (July, 1978), pp. 305-306 — critique of above LCMS report. *M.W. Bangert, "The LCMS Should Accept The Lutheran Book of Worship," *Christian News*, II, 39 (September 25, 1978), pp. 12-13 — defense of LBW. *T.F. Nickel, "A Brief Evaluation of the Reformation Affirmations," Part II, *Doctrinal Concerns*, I, 8 (September-October, 1978), pp. 1-4. This is a summary of LCA/ALC

Objections to LBW (see also the reprint in *Christian News*, II, 47, (Nov. 20, 1978), pp 1, 16.) *K. Marquart, "Liturgical Commonplaces," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 42, 4 (October, 1978), pp. 330-346. *C.J. Evanson, "Worship and Sacrifice," *Ibid.*, pp. 347-377.

1979 — Glenn N. Schram, "A shift deplored: One man's 'nay' to LBW," *Christian News*, 12, 1 (Jan. 1, 1979), p. 13. *H.D. Hummel, "The 'Great Thanksgiving' in the 'Lutheran Book of Worship,'" *Christian News*, 12, 4 (Jan. 22, 1979), pp. 7-8 — defense of Eucharistic Prayer by a professor at the St. Louis Seminary of the LCMS.

16. The Communion liturgies are found on pp. 57-120 and the Baptism liturgy on pp. 121-125 of the *Lutheran Book of Worship: Pew Edition* (Minneapolis: APH; Phila.: Bd. of Pub., LCA, 1978). Most important to read are the rubrics to the sacramental services in *Lutheran Book of Worship: Ministers Desk Edition* (Minneapolis: APH; Phila.: Bd. of Pub., LCA, 1978), pp. 25-32. The rubrics show that the thanksgivings of the Baptism service are equivalent to the Eucharistic prayers of the communion services. An intensive study of these rubrics should be made. This edition also has 4 Eucharistic Prayers, three of which are not contained in *LBW: Pew Edition* (pp. 221-227, *LBW: Ministers Desk Edition*).
17. "My sacrifice is shared in that what we offer together will be returned to us as heavenly food for our sustenance and joy. In this cultic motion from sacrifice to sacrament the mystery of God's action among men is demonstrated: what we surrender [offer/sacrifice] to him he gives to us and through us to others." Eugene Brand, "Luther's Liturgical Surgery: Twentieth Century Diagnosis of the Patient," in *Interpreting Luther's Legacy: Essays in Honor of Edward C. Fendt*, (Minneapolis: APH, 1969), p. 188.

The ILCW bases this self-sacrifice on Rom. 12:1 (*LBW: MDE*, p. 28, #25; *CWII*, p. 100). Our self-sacrifice to God includes the bread and wine to be used for the Sacrament (*The Great Thanksgiving: ILCW* — N.Y.: The Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship, 1975 — p. 6); see also the rubrics for the *LBW* which make it evident that this offering and self-sacrifice is not really optional (*LBW: MDE*, pp. 26, 28; #24, 25). E.L. Brand, project director for ILCW, shows that this offertory and self-sacrifice is not optional for the authors of ILCW when he writes that if you leave it out "you will have no grounds to call what has been done the Lord's Supper," E. Brand, "Ceremonial Forms and Contemporary Life," *Response*, VIII, 2, (St. Michael, 1966), p. 95. See also R.M. Hals, "The Concept of Sacrifice as a Background for the Eucharist," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, 26, 2 (May, 1974), pp. 174-188.

This Roman Catholic idea of combining Sacrament and sacrifice is a feature of the modern Liturgical movement of which the *Lutheran Book of Worship* is a part. C. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-111.

Luther provides an excellent contrast to the faulty thinking of the ILCW: For unless we firmly hold that the mass is the promise or testament of Christ, as the words clearly say, we shall lose the whole gospel and all its comfort. Let us permit nothing to prevail against these words . . . for they contain nothing about a work or a sacrifice . . . Therefore, just as distributing a testament or accepting a promise differs diametrically from offering a sacrifice, so it is a contradiction in terms to call the mass a sacrifice, for the former is something that we receive and the latter is something that we give. The same thing cannot be received and offered at the same time, nor can it be both given and accepted by the same person . . . What shall we say then of the canon of the mass [i.e., eucharistic prayers] . . . it would be safer to reject them all than admit that the mass is a work or a sacrifice, lest we deny the word of Christ and destroy faith together

- with the mass. [*Luther's Works*, 36, 51-52.]
18. Apology XXIV, 18; see also 68-77. See also Apology XIII, 3.
 19. Large Catechism IV, 10; V, 6.
 20. Apology XXIV, 74-75.
 21. "And the Fathers, indeed, speak of a two-fold effect, of the comfort of consciences and of thanksgiving, or praise. The former of these effects pertains to the nature [the right use] of the Sacrament; the latter pertains to the sacrifice." Apology XXIV, 75.
 22. A reading of the confessional writings clearly shows that the Confessions do not refer to the sacrament as a sacrifice:

The Augsburg Confession refers to the sacraments as "Signs and testimonies of the will of God toward us" (XII, 1-2; see also IX, X, XXIV).

The Apology calls Sacraments "rites which have the command of God, and to which the promise of grace has been added . . ." (XIII, 3; see also IX, X, XXIV).

See also Smalcald Articles Part II, Article II; Part III, Articles V, VI.

The Large Catechism refers to the sacraments as "Treasure and gift" (*Schatz und Geschenk; Thesaurus et donum*) (V, 29; see also 36). The sacraments are "not our work, but God's" and faith in the sacrament "excludes and repels all works which we can do . . ." (IV, 35 & 34).

The Formula refers to the Sacrament of Communion in Article VII: "We likewise reject and condemn all other papistic abuses of this Sacrament, as the abomination of the sacrifice of the mass for the living and the dead" (FCTD VII, 109).

This brief study clearly shows that the Confessions clearly distinguish between Sacrament (what God does for and to us) and sacrifice (what we do in response to God's gracious gift in the Sacrament). Sacrament cannot be a sacrifice — and this is a confessional principle!

For a clear refutation of the ILCW's faulty translation and exegesis of Rom. 12:1, see O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 134-137; A. Krugler, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58; Apology XXIV, 26. For a clear refutation of the mixing of Sacrament and sacrifice, see O.K. Olson, "Mix . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.

23. For texts of the German mass, see *Luther's Works* 53, or B. Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (New York: The World Publishing Co.: A Meridian Book — New American Library, 1961), pp. 95-137.

"The third captivity of this sacrament is by far the most wicked abuse of all . . . that the mass is a good work and a sacrifice" (LW 36, 35).

"Therefore these two things — mass and prayer, sacrament and work, testament and sacrifice — must to be confused; for the one [Mass, sacrament, testament] comes from God to us . . . the other [prayer, work, sacrifice] proceeds from our faith to God . . ." (LW 36, 56; also 288-289).

"Let us, therefore, repudiate everything that smacks of sacrifice, together with the entire canon and retain only that which is pure and holy" (LW 53, 26).

Luther scholars agree that Luther saw "that the most dangerous heresy of all in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was that which regarded it as 'a sacrifice and a good work.'" J. Pelikan, "The Theology of the Means of Grace," in H. Kadai, ed., *Accents in Luther's Theology* (St. Louis: CPH, 1967), p. 135. Luther "was careful not to make a direct connection between the temple sacrifice and the eucharist, if only for the reason that he had to destroy the concept of the sacrifice of the mass . . ." H. Bornkhamm, *Luther and the Old Testament*, trans. Eric and Ruth Gritsch (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 186. Luther "urged the retention of the elements that did not suggest sacrifice. The Lord's Supper was a gift to the congregation — not a good

deed of the worshipper." Conrad Bergendoff, *The Church of the Lutheran Reformation* (St. Louis: CPH, 1967), p. 51. "Luther regained for the church a sacrament in place of the sacrifice of the Mass, making Communion, in the vernacular, conform to its Biblical origin." *Ibid.*, p. 285. "In the first stage, Luther is fighting to preserve the genuine meaning of the sacrament as a gift of God in opposition to the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass." P. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 375.; see also p. 392. "The canon of the mass disappeared because this was the portion in which the reference to sacrifice occurred." R. Bainton, *Here I Stand* (Nashville/N.Y.: Abingdon Press, 1950), p. 339. "... Luther eliminated all prayers which spoke of sacrifice . . . both the small and large Canon, and many other prayers of the mass." Carl Wisloff, *The Gift of Communion: Luther's Controversy with Rome on Eucharistic Sacrifice*, trans. J.M. Shaw (Minneapolis: APH, 1964), p. 167; see also pp. 56-72, 140-155, 166-182.

"What makes the offertory procession intolerable for evangelical Christians at bottom is that by identifying the gifts that worshippers bring with the elements of Communion, a doctrinal link is made between the believer's self-sacrifice and Christ's sacrifice on Calvary, thus implying that we participate in our own redemption. There is nothing clearer in all of Lutheran theology on the liturgy than that our self-sacrifice be kept clearly separate from Christ's." O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 137.

"... The ILCW proposes to make the entire reception of the body and blood of Christ dependent upon the action of the congregation in *first* offering the gifts *needed* for the Lord's Supper . . . Is this nothing else than a return to the Roman Catholic 'Sacrifice of the Mass' that so stirred the ire of the Lutheran Reformers?" A. Krugler, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

"It is inadvisable, if not improper, to mix our gifts with God's Gifts . . . Surely the mixing of our gifts with God's Gifts detracts from the centrality of the bread and wine in the eucharist. Our present practice may have the effect of minimizing God's Gifts, to some extent even of negating them. And we must ask whether our present offertory practice does not mislead us into considering ourselves as the givers rather than as receivers of the divine Gifts. Our practice seems virtually to shout out that we are engaging in a barter or in a gift-exchange process." Arlo D. Duba, "Gifts in Worship: God's and Ours," *Liturgy* (Dec., 1976), p. 299.

24. Smalcald Articles, Part II, Article II, 6-7.

25. M.P. Strommen, M.L. Brekke, R.C. Underwager, A.L. Johnson, *A Study of Generations* (Minneapolis: APH, 1972), p. 272. See also pp. 276, and 369-Scale 15.

26. L. Green, *op. cit.*, p. 82. "... many of us who have used the rite feel that the approach of the gracious God (the central action of Baptism) has been liturgically blunted." R.G. Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 2. "The ILCW order is a basic challenge to Lutheran doctrine. It is based on theological principles which tend to blunt the doctrine of grace." O.K. Olson, "Luther's . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 17. "In its adoption of novel theological insights the ILCW has failed to safeguard the biblical doctrine of grace." O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 110. "To imbed Christ's Words of Promise into the Eucharistic Prayer is to destroy their character as Gospel to the congregation." A. Krugler, *op. cit.*, p. 56. "Luther would reject TGT [The Great Thanksgiving] as papal heresy . . ." G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, p. 29. See also T.F. Nickel, *loc. cit.*; G. Schram, *loc. cit.*; O.K. Olson, "Liturgy . . ." *loc. cit.*

27. *Lutheran Book of Worship: Ministers Desk Edition*, p. 31, #9; the text of the prayer is on pp. 309-310. *LBW: Pew Edition*, p. 122. For a thorough criticism of the use of this prayer see R.G. Hughes, *loc. cit.* The LBW text has so changed Luther's original "flood prayer" as to make it unacceptable.

28. "... one should not pray the Words of Institution but rather proclaim them to the people. Put simply, a prayer, especially of praise and thanksgiving, is our offering to God. The Gospel is God's proclamation to us. The Words of Institution are Gospel. Therefore they are to be proclaimed to the people and not prayed to God." Paul Rorem, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
 "To imbed Christ's Words of Promise into the Eucharistic Prayer is to destroy their character as Gospel to the congregation. . . . the proposal to imbed the Words of Institution in a prayer spoken by the pastor-priest at the altar is a return to the Semi-Pelagian or synergistic dogma of self-sacrifice that Luther so properly condemned. It is to change the event of Holy Communion from one in which the congregation is the recipient of God's undeserved grace to one in which the congregation makes an exchange with God. We offer Him our prayers, our money, and our bread and wine. In return He supposedly gives us the body and blood of Christ. Holy Communion becomes our feast to which we by prayer invite the Holy Spirit." A. Krugler, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57.
 "The ILCW order requires the use of a eucharistic prayer (the mass canon), something specifically rejected by the Reformers . . . because . . . to mix man's prayers with God's proclamation creates confusion and reverses the sacrament's God-to-man direction of movement . . . Luther was flatly opposed to any kind of eucharistic prayer, since the implication for the liturgy of his emphasis on grace was that the mass is essentially something God does for man, not vice versa. . . . He was against all eucharistic prayers, because *they reverse the direction of movement from God to man*. The mass becomes something man does." O.K. Olson, "Luther's . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 24-25.
 "In adopting the Commission's proposals — which of necessity means adopting the basic exegetical-theological rationale developed by the Commission — we must be aware that we are not simply enriching or enlivening the liturgical tradition of the Lutheran churches; we are changing that tradition — changing it in a massive, substantive way that strikes at the very meaning and purpose of the sacrament in the Lutheran tradition." C.L. Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 6. See also Wm. Nagel, *op. cit.*, pp. 48ff.
29. Theologians anxious to return the eucharistic prayers to the Lutheran worship service fault Luther for removing them from the service. See F.C. Senn, "Luther's Revision of the Eucharistic Canon in the *Formula Missae* of 1523," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XLIV, 2 (March, 1973), pp. 108ff. E.L. Brand, "Luther's Liturgical . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 108ff. H. Hummel, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
30. O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 137.
31. "... St. Paul's Greek text makes *remembrance* the *goal* of our act of thanksgiving . . . Narrative remembrance leads into specific prayer, the Remembrance, or Anamnesis, *Therefore, O God, with this bread and cup* . . . , etc. Here we directly call our Lord's life, death and resurrection to memory, before God and the fellowship." *TGT*, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
32. "Thus the Lord's Supper is interpreted as a remembrance of Christ's sacrifice enacted with the elements, a ceremony to which we add, not for ourselves but for God, our mental activity of recalling that sacrifice and of calling upon God to remember this sacrifice and — obviously — act accordingly. At this point the Lord's Supper has been transformed into a cult, not different from any pagan cult, by which man tries to manipulate God According to the authors our obedience to Christ's command 'Do this' involves that we do something so that God remembers something. Poor God, that he needs us to remind him! Is his memory span so short? . . . Christ's sacrifice is repeated by means of remembrance . . ." G. Krodel, *op.*

cit., p. 13. A careful study of pp. 13-24 of Krodell's paper will reveal the fundamental gap between Luther and the *Lutheran Book of Worship*.

"The casual reintroduction of the *anamnesis* and *epiclesis*, which are required in the new tire . . . implicitly deny the centrality of the Word . . ." O.K. Olson, "Luther's . . ." *op. cit.* p. 27.

"The prayer of *anamnesis* has been the locus for the sacrifice of the mass and for the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Western church. In the terminology of Lutheran theology the *anamnesis* prayer belongs to the realm of *theologia gloriae*." O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 137, 139. See also O.K. Olson, "Liturgy . . ." *loc. cit.*

The Confessions and Luther speak about a proper remembrance:

"For to remember Christ is not the idle celebration of a show, or one instituted for the sake of example, as the memory of Hercules or Ulysses is celebrated in tragedies, but it is to remember the benefits of Christ and receive them by faith, so as to be quickened by them." Apology XXIV, 72.

"By the words, 'This do in remembrance of me,' Christ meant what Paul meant by his words, 'Proclaim the death of the Lord,' etc. I Cor. 11:26. Christ wants us to make Him known when we receive the sacrament and proclaim the gospel, so as to confirm faith. He does not want us to sit and indulge in such fancies and make out of such a remembrance a good work, as Dr. Karlstadt dreams." *Luther's Works*, 40, 208.

"Thus both 'remembrance' and 'proclamation' mean nothing else than the preaching of him [Christ] publicly, as is done in all sermons." *Luther's Works* 36, 349.

"For Christ completely separates the two matters, sacrament and remembrance, when he says, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' The sacrament is one matter, the remembrance is another matter." *Luther's Works* 38, 122.

It is noted that neither Luther nor the Confessions state that remembrance is to be directed to God; it is to be proclaimed to the people.

33. "The first fault which he [Luther] found with the enthusiasts and the Swiss was that they failed to recognize that the Lord's Supper is God's gift . . . Their conception of the sacrament as primarily a meal of remembrance not only despised the clear words of Christ, but was also a merciless act toward man in his actual situation. . . . The understanding of the Lord's Supper as a meal of remembrance is ultimately nothing else than a doctrine of work righteousness which does not lead man out of his trouble. Instead, it actually leads him deeper into his trouble because it requires that he climb out by genuine remembrance and love, which he must create by his own powers." P. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 392.

For Zwingli "the purpose of the sacrament, therefore, is to lift our faith by remembrance of the breaking of Christ's body for us on the cross, to heaven, where he sits bodily at the right hand of God . . ." *Luther's Works* 37, xviii. See also G. Rupp, *Patterns of Reformation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 146-147. G.W. Bromiley, trans., ed. *Zwingli and Bullinger* (Phila.: The Westminster Press, 1953; The Library of Christian Classics, XXIV), pp. 234-235. *Luther's Works* 40, pp. 182-186; 207-214.

34. "'In remembrance of me' can then scarcely mean 'that you may remember me,' but most probably 'that God may remember me.'" J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. N. Perrin (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1977), pp. 254-255; see also pp. 237-253.

35. Here the *Lutheran Book of Worship* reflects the work of Peter Brunner:

"The fact that the church celebrates the remembrance of Christ by prayer, proclamation, and act thus becomes an event which elicits the remembrance of the Lord Himself. . . . the New Testament covenant memorial ascends to God's throne and evokes His active, end-effecting

remembering. . . . In its earthly administration it releases a heavenly event, a kingdom-of-God movement in the heavens, yes, even in the heart of God." P. Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

36. "The sacraments can be understood only in the attitude of the recipient because they, in as far as they are administered by man, involve reception; they are acts for receiving the promises. What is received in them is the content. . . . But now already it must be stated that their fulfillment can by no means be considered as resulting from man's cultic acts. That marks the difference between sacramental action and sorcery. The sorcerer purposes to effect, to generate, or even to compel something. Whenever associated with a deity, sorcery attempts to pressure the deity. To conceive of the Christ-ordained sacraments in that light would be blasphemy." W. Elert, *The Lord's Supper Today*, trans M. Bertram and R.F. Norden (St. Louis: CPH, 1973) p. 10.

37. "... TGT turns the Lord's Supper into our work . . . Christ's sacrifice is repeated by means of remembrance . . . at this point Zwingli's concept of the Lord's Supper is merged with the Roman concept of the Mass as a sacrifice . . . Zwingli . . . defines it as a subjectively-oriented remembrance of Christ's sacrifice. For him the Lord's Supper is a remembrance act of Christ's suffering and death, to be repeated by us." G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

"This reintroduction of the crude *quid pro quo* theology of the medieval mass by an inter-Lutheran commission is so unexpected and hard to believe that we are still included to look charitably for articulations of a different character within the document to relieve us of the necessity of having to face a totally unacceptable interpretation of the sacrament . . . however . . . the charitable search for mitigating language and theology appears fruitless." C.L. Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

TGT admits that "as we bring God's saving acts to remembrance" our act is to "be included in his one saving act in the Lord Jesus." TGT, *op. cit.*, p. 1. Our remembrance saves or justifies us in the sight of God, according to ILCW. This also is a feature of the modern liturgical movement which states that in the Eucharist "Christ's redemptive work is sacramentally renewed, so that we can take part in it." C. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 69; also pp. 53, 82.

Luther resoundingly rejected any such notion: "But it is still more mischievous and malicious, that he gives such remembrance the power to justify, as faith does. The proof he [Karlstadt] gives is, he says, that it is written, 'That they have done this in remembrance of me.' What think you? It is written, 'They have done it in remembrance of me.' Therefore such remembrance justifies. There you comprehend how well Dr. Karlstadt understands the Lord's Supper, his remembrance, and justification, namely, that the devil shows only ridicule and scorn in these matters." *Luther's Works* 40, 207.

38. TGT, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-3.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

40. F. Senn, *op. cit.*, p. 653.

41. U. Zwingli, *Opera*, ed. Schuler and Schulthess (Zurich: Schulthess, 1832), 3, 542; quoted in P. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 393. For Zwingli's liturgy see B. Thompson, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-156. "The Eucharist is a rite of thanksgiving, an uplifting of the heart, a confession of faith." J. Rillet, *Zwingli: Third Man of the Reformation*, trans. H. Knight, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), p. 228.

42. B. Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

43. G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12. "We know, however, that it is the Lord's Supper, in name and in reality, not the supper of the Christians. For the Lord not only instituted it, but also prepares and gives it himself, and is him-

self, cook, butler, food, and drink as we have demonstrated our belief above." *Luther's Works* 37, 142. See also F.R. Webber, *Studies in the Liturgy* (Erie, Pa.; Ashby Printing Company, 1938); see especially chapter 13, "Was There a Great Trinitarian Hymn of Thanksgiving?"

44. "Inasmuch as the authors define thanksgiving in terms of a memorializing thanksgiving, the presence of Christ depends, then, on our memorializing thanksgiving. . . . For TGT Christ and his Word are not constitutive for the Lord's Supper, but our memorializing thanksgiving is." G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 28.
45. *TGT, op. cit.*, p. 3. Krodel notes what the LBW/ILCW has done here: "Instead of biblical texts we hear a 'liturgical narrative' which the authors have 'composed.' The *authors'* particular event which justifies our present act of praise' . . . It is not the Word of God but the authors' composition . . ." G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

The Confessions note what happens to the Lord's Supper when we no longer use God's Word but the words of man: ". . . not the word or work of any man produces the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper . . . but all this should be ascribed alone to the power of Almighty God and the word . . . of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . in all places where the Supper is celebrated according to the institution of Christ, and His Words are used, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received, because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spoke at the first Supper. . . . no man makes the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself. . . ." FCSD VII, 74-76. ". . . if you take away the Word . . . you have nothing but mere bread and wine. . . ." *Large Catechism* V, 14. See also *Luther's Works* 36, 277.

If we use not the Words of Christ but our own words, the bread and wine are not consecrated; they remain bread and wine. There is then no Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the bread and wine. The LBW Narrative of Institution removes the Real Presence from the Lord's Supper, because it substitutes the words of men for the Words of Christ!

"For the authors of the *FC* the *verba* are to be recited as *verba consecrationis* because they efficaciously set up the institution. If the *verba* are not recited as *verba consecrationis* but only as a story [narrative], as Jenson and the ILCW suggest (II), then only bread and wine is distributed . . ." G. Krodel, "Consecration in the Lord's Supper: An Examination of the Proposal of the ILCW in Light of *FC.SD* VII. 83/84 and Johann Gerhard's *Loci Theologici XVIII/XXI*" (unpublished paper read to the ILCW Symposium, Ft. Wayne, Ind., April, 1977; rev. ed.), p. 31.

"Luther would reject TGT as the heresies of Karlstadt, Zwingli, and Calvin because it negates the real presence of Christ . . . and instead maintains a presence of Christ *via* a memorializing thanksgiving. . . . For TGT Christ and his Word are not constitutive for the Lord's Supper . . . Since there is no real presence, there is no distribution of forgiveness of sins, and no comfort of souls." G. Krodel, "The Great . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 28.

Carl Wisloff draws a parallel between the emphasis on sacrifice and the doctrine of the Real Presence: "The doctrine of the real presence does not lead to the idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice but is rather the most absolute hindrance against any mention of sacrifice in connection with the sacrament." C. Wisloff, *op. cit.*, p. 155. The greater emphasis on sacrifice in the liturgy would then indicate a lessening of the importance of the Real Presence.

46. "The liturgical narrative is *not* the reading of a Scripture excerpt or of a conflation of excerpts; it is our telling the story now." *TGT, op. cit.*, p. 3. What

can be the cause of this replacement of the words of Christ with the words of men? An answer is provided by a professor at Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago. He writes:

"If there is to be a liturgical renewal in our times, then a truly prophetic statement on the relation between the Bible and liturgy is in order. In such a statement one would have to come to grips with the historical-critical method of exegesis and its relation to liturgical renewal, for the Bible which is to be related to the liturgy is the Bible as we know it in the twentieth century . . . if the proposed new common hymnal . . . is to have a role in liturgical renewal, then it cannot ignore or brush aside what has gone on in critical biblical research during the last century.

"As Bultmann has shown, the primary historical datum in the New Testament is the faith of the primitive Christian community. This radically revises older understandings of the founding of sacraments like Baptism and the Lord's Supper by Jesus, and the Lutheran criteria for a sacrament stressing the command of Jesus needs redefinition. Liturgies written in a pre-critical age made far different assumptions about the primary historical data, which was then supposed to be a direct report of the life and thought of Jesus and the apostles, by the apostles. The Christians who wrote these liturgies were men of good faith who used the Bible as they understood it. However, if we are to be as biblical as they, we must use the Bible and the biblical words according to our understanding, not theirs.

"The liturgy which we have does present the Bible, but it is presented in the only way that a pre-critical age of exegesis could present it." David M. Granskou, *op. cit.*, pp. 74, 80, 85.

Another theologian reinforces the above opinion when he writes: "This is not to say, though, that the bread and wine sayings necessarily go back to Jesus." Eduard Schweizer, *The Lord's Supper According to the New Testament*, trans. J.M. Davis (Phila.: FP-Facet Books: Biblical Series #18, 1967), p. 16, footnote #41.

The LBW/ILCW also followed many of the ideas found in J. Jeremias' book, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (*loc. cit.*). This book first appeared in the mid 1930's and was the cause for Michael Reu's essay, "Can We Still Hold to the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper?" *Two Treatises on the Means of Grace* (Minneapolis: APH, 1952), pp. 40-118. Reu notes that if Jeremias' conclusions are accepted, the Lutheran Biblical doctrine of the Lord's Supper is lost.

Doubt (as to whether we have the actual words of Christ) created by historical-criticism is one contributing cause behind this change in the attitude towards the words of institution. For, in the words of M. Reu, ". . . Baptism and the Lord's Supper . . . can be such firm realities only if they are divinely instituted, and if the Spirit testifies to me, that Scripture, which relates their institution, is reliable ground, created by God Himself, that it is the Word of God itself." "What Is Scripture and How Can We Become Certain of Its Divine Origin?" *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (Aug., 1939), quoted in M.H. Scharlemann, "Reu and the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures," *Concordia Journal*, V, 1 (Jan., 1979), p. 19. See also C. Bornmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-43.

47. *TGT, op. cit.*, p. 3. A problem is also noted with the text of the Narrative of Institution:

"Further, the authors are wrong when they state that their version is faithful to Scripture's witness as a whole. . . in their version the authors are not only not faithful to the text and witness of Scripture, but they distort it. . . On these texts the authors perform major surgery. . . It must be pointed out that here the authors substitute their version of the text for Scripture. . . Further, there is a fundamental difference between the text of this verse that

- the authors present to us and the text that we find in Scripture. . . . The authors' statement is based on their version of the text, and this raises the question: Is the Lutheran church ready to adopt as basis for its liturgy the ILCW version of Scripture?" G. Krodel, "The Great . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 8-10.
48. R.W. Jenson, "Toward Reform of the Lutheran Liturgical Tradition," *Bulletin of the Lutheran Theological Seminary Gettysburg*, 56, 1 (Feb., 1976), pp. 44ff.
 49. See footnotes 44-47, and previous quote.
 50. *LBW*, *op. cit.*, pp. 70, 90, 111, 122, 124. *LBW: MDE*, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-225, 257-262, 293, 298, 309-311. *TGT*, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
 51. *LBW*, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-124; *LBW: MDE*, *op. cit.*, p. 311.
 52. "Water" is mentioned 7 times in the *LBW* liturgy; this is as opposed to 2 times in the current LC-MS liturgy (*The Pastor's Companion*, St. Louis: CPH, n.d., pp. 1-7). ". . . the answer to the catechism question, 'How can water produce such great effects,' is re-statement of the resistance of the Western church to the practice of *epiclesis*. Luther, in re-stating the position of Augustine that it is the word of God which is the means of grace, not the water, can be said to speak for the Western church. Restoration of the Baptismal *epiclesis* . . . will produce an order at odds with Lutheran doctrine on baptism." O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 140. ". . . the eucharistic *epiclesis* as at baptism . . . runs into contradiction with the apostolic Gospel." L. Goppelt, *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times* (New York: Harpers, 1970), p. 220.
 53. "An example of a substantial influence is the position of the Invocation of the Holy Ghost after the Words of Institution in the Eucharistic Prayer of the new *Service Book and Hymnal* prepared by the Inter-synodical Commission on the Liturgy, a position that reflects the theory of consecration through the *Epiclesis*, in contrast to the Western doctrine, shared by the Lutheran Confessions, of consecration through the Words of Institution." Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "The Protestant Worship Revival and the Lutheran Liturgical Movement," in M.H. Shepherd, Jr., ed., *The Liturgical Renewal of the Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), pp. 90-91.
 The Confessions make this point very clearly: "It is the Word (I say) which makes and distinguishes this Sacrament, so that it is not mere bread and wine, but is, and is called, the body and blood of Christ . . . The Word must make a Sacrament of the element, else it remains a mere element . . . It is true, indeed, that if you take away the Word . . . you have nothing but mere bread and wine." *Large Catechism* V, 10-14. ". . . where the Supper is celebrated according to the institution of Christ, and His words are used, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received, because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spake at the first Supper." *FCTD* VII, 75.
 54. The views of Calvin are found in the Scotch Confession of Faith, Art. XXI: "In the Supper, rightly used, Christ Jesus is so joined with us that He becomes the very Nourishment and Food for our souls . . . This union is wrought by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who by true faith carries us above all earthly things . . . and makes us to feed upon the body and blood of Christ Jesus, which was once broken and shed for us but is now in heaven . . ." F. E. Mayer, *Religious Bodies of America* (St. Louis: CPH, 1958), pp. 215-216, footnote 68. See also J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. H. Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966), II, pp. 563-565, 570-571, 582-583, 592; *Calvin's Commentaries: The Gospels*, (Grand Rapids: Associated Publishers and Authors Inc., n.d.), VII, p. 506.

For Zwingli's doctrine see, Ulrich Zwingli, *Fidei Ratio* (1530), in H.E.

- Jacobs, *Book of Concord* (Phila.: General Council Publication Board, 1919), II, pp. 168ff.; G. W. Bromiley, *op. cit.*, pp. 179, 183-184.
55. "A related point is that the invocation of the Holy Spirit is included in this eucharistic prayer. It is important that this sacrament be associated with the proper person of the Trinity. It is Jesus, God the Son, who gave us His body and blood. Certainly any suggestions should be avoided that the Eucharist is the Holy Spirit's supper." D. Scaer, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
 "People who consider it necessary to call upon the Holy Spirit for something to happen in the Lord's Supper shift the center of the Lord's Supper from the Second Article of the Creed to the Third, as Calvin did. For the Lutheran tradition the Lord's Supper is first of all a Christological event . . . the *Epiclesis* in the Lord's Supper is an element alien to Luther and the Lutheran tradition, and therefore to be rejected." G. Krodel, "The Great . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 15. See also, *FCSD* VII, 2-8, 55-56, 88, 104; *FCE* VII, 3-5, 29, 36; *Apology* X, 54.
 56. Not only do the *LBW* authors translate "*diatheke*" as "covenant" rather than "testament," but they also use the word in two eucharistic prayers and in two prayers in the baptismal liturgy. (*LBW: MDE, op. cit.*, pp. 258, 262, 308-309.) See the discussion in O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 152-153; also K. Hagen, "From Testament to Covenant," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, III, 1 (April, 1972), pp. 8ff.
 57. The *LBW* liturgies not only use the word "covenant" but also mention "covenant" events (*LBW*, pp. 257-264). For a listing of the 8 Covenants, see *The New Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 1317-1318. Covenant Theology is discussed in *Present Truth*, V, 7-8 (Nov.-Dec., 1976), pp. 9-57; 5-20. See also *Lutheran Cyclopedia* (St. Louis: CPH, 1975), pp. 294, 636. See A. Boehme, "A Review of the ILCW Liturgical Texts" (unpublished paper sent to ILCW committee), p. 3.
 58. L. Green, "The Statement on Communion Practices: A Critical Appraisal," *Concordia Review* (July, 1976), pp. 5-17. This article was reprinted in the *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, XLI, 2 (April, 1977), pp. 58-69. This careful study of the 1976 "Report of the ALC-LCA Committee to Study Communion Practices" reveals that there has been a move toward a Reformed position on the Lord's Supper, because of the emphasis on the "covenant." This emphasis is evident also in the "Statement on the Communion Practices" (adopted by the Fourth General Convention of the ALC, October 19, 1968). This document states that the Lord's Supper "celebrates the covenant between Christ and his Church, so that participation is a reaffirmation of this covenant." (p. 2). For a detailed study of the gradual shift of some Lutherans to a Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, see M.W. Lutz, "God the Holy Spirit Acts Through the Lord's Supper," in E.P. Kauffeld, ed., *God the Holy Spirit Acts* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1972), pp. 115-202. See also O.K. Olson and A.J. Boehme, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-7.
 59. The Sacraments have "the promise of grace" (*Apology* XIII, 3, 4, 6), and are "the signs of the promises" (XIII, 20). By faith we are to "Receive the promised things there offered in the Sacrament . . . the free remission of sins." (XIII, 19-20). ". . . where the Supper is celebrated according to the institution of Christ, and his words are used, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received, because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spoke at the first Supper." *FCSD* VII, 75.
 "And all these are established by the words by which Christ has instituted it, and which every one who desires to be a Christian and go to the Sacrament should know . . . The Words, however, are these: Our Lord Jesus Christ, the same night . . ."
 "The chief point is the Word and ordinance or command of God . . . It is

the Word which makes and distinguishes this Sacrament . . . For although the work is accomplished and the forgiveness of sins acquired on the cross, yet it cannot come to us in any other way than through the Word." LCV, 1-4, 8-14, 31; also *Luther's Works* XXXVI, 277.

60. R. Jenson, "Reply to Gerhard Foerde," *Response*, XV, 2-3 (1975), pp. 53ff. See also R. Jenson, "Toward . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 43ff.; for here Jenson makes the reception of the Gospel gift of the Sacrament dependent upon our fulfillment of the command (law) part of the Narrative of Institution. Krodel replies: "Jenson's argumentation is based on a tearing of the *verbum* into parts, namely, a law-action part — which then in *TGT* is structures, in good Anglo-Roman fashion as a prayer of many parts and actions — and a gospel-promise part in which the fulfillment is contingent on the obedient fulfillment of the law-action part To assume this, as Jenson does, is a denial of the 'Lutheran' understanding of the means of grace . . ." G. Krodel, "Consecration . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 8. See also G. Krodel, "The Great . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.

"In overlooking the distinction between Law and Gospel we endanger the doctrine of justification, the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*. Nothing worse could be said about a liturgical form offered to the Lutherans of America." L. Green, "Between . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 82.

61. FCSD V, 27.

62. Apology XXIV, 69-70; also 17-18, 49. "For when we are baptized, when we eat the Lord's body . . . God truly forgives us for Christ's sake." Ap. XIII, 4-5. The Sacraments are "properly signs of the New Testament, and testimonies of grace and the remission of sins." *Ibid.*, 14; also 18-22.

"We further believe that in this Christian Church we have forgiveness of sin, which is wrought through the holy Sacraments and Absolution, moreover, through all manner of consolatory promises of the entire Gospel. Therefore, whatever is to be preached concerning the Sacraments belongs here . . . Everything, therefore, in the Christian Church is ordered to the end that we shall daily obtain there nothing but the forgiveness of sins through the Word and signs [Sacraments] to comfort and encourage our conscience as long as we live here." LC II, 54-55.

"Thus we have briefly the first point which relates to the essence of this Sacrament. Now examine further the efficacy and benefits on account of which really the Sacrament was instituted; which is also its most necessary part, that we may know what we should seek and obtain there. Now this is plain and clear from the words just mentioned: *This is My body and blood, given and shed FOR YOU, for the remission of sins*. Briefly that is as much as to say: For this reason we go to the Sacrament because there we receive such a treasure by and in which we obtain forgiveness of sins. Why so? Because the words stand here and give us this; for on this account He bids me eat and drink, that it may be my own and may benefit me, as a sure pledge and token, yea, the very same treasure that is appointed for me against my sins, death, and every calamity." LCV, 20-22; also 28-38, 66-70. See also SA Part III, Art IV; ACIX, 2; XIII, 1-3; XXIV, 28-37; FCSD VII, 53; LC IV, 23-29, 41.

The Confessions clearly show that Sacraments are "rites which have the command of God [*mandatum Dei*], and to which the promise of grace has been added . . . For rites instituted by men will not in this way be sacraments properly so called. For it does not belong to human authority to promise grace. Therefore signs instituted without God's command are not sure signs of grace . . ." Ap. XIII, 3-4. Sacraments are rites commanded by God, i.e., that have firm support in Scripture as God-given instruments of grace.

So Luther also teaches ". . . that the chief point is the Word and ordinance

or command [*mandatum*] of God. For it [the Lord's Supper] has not been invented nor introduced by man, but without any one's counsel and deliberation it has been instituted by Christ." LC V, 4-5. See also LC IV, 6.

Jenson and the LBW misunderstand the command of God (*mandatum Dei*) and change it into Law (*lex semper accusat*). Thus for Jenson and the LBW, the Gospel character of the Sacrament is lost.

63. The following statements taken from a document adopted by the ULCA in 1960 sum up the nature of a sacrament, and also note the dangers of re-introducing any notion of sacrifice into the sacrament:

"The essential nature of the sacrament is gift (*beneficium*). The direction of God's action in it is altogether from God to man; it imparts forgiveness of sin, life and salvation. This gift can in no sense be designated as an offering from man to God, nor should it be designated as a eucharist or thanksgiving The term *sacrifice* . . . should not be used to designate the gift of the sacrament. The gift is all God's . . . An additional reason for caution with respect to the use of the term sacrifice in this context is that it provides an opening for the re-invasion of the church by notions that are alien to the gospel. Men desire a God who is malleable to their sacrifices. The Christian gospel proclaims a sacrificing God who ends all propitiatory sacrifices. But when response is designated sacrifice, the covert pelagianism which solaces the offense of the gospel is invited back into the very heart of the gospel. This invitation has the power and the peril it does because it may be liturgically invested with the most seductive piety." "The Sacrament of the Altar and Its Implications," in E. Brown, Jr., *op. cit.*, pp. 38-39.

64. "Does the heavy emphasis on a Eucharistic culmination of the form action shape of Baptism suggest an incompleteness for infants that heralds an ILCW push for infant Communion?" R. Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

The Rubrics of *LBW* answer Professor Hughes' question, when they state: "The gift of Communion is the birthright of the baptized." (*LBW: MDE, op. cit.*, p. 31.) "Customs vary on the age and circumstances for admission to the Lord's Supper. Older children and adults should commune for the first time during the service in which they are baptized. Infants may be brought to the altar and receive a blessing." (*Ibid.*, p. 30). The *LBW* has moved very close to infant communion, for it is only a small step from bringing the just-baptized infant to the altar for a blessing (implying an active use of his eucharistic birthright) to actual communion. The 1976 joint LCA-ALC Communion Statement (see footnote 56) admitted all "those who are baptized" to partake of the Lord's Supper. This clause was, however, changed at the most recent LCA and ALC conventions to prohibit infant communion. One ILCW author, Robert Jenson, who authored eucharistic prayers for the *LBW*, is one of those who was communing infants. "LCA Seminary Bars Professor from Celebrating Eucharist: The Issue is 'Infant Communion,'" *Missouri In Perspective*, VI, 6 (January 15, 1979), p. 3 Here the *LBW* reflects the influence of the ecumenical liturgical movement:

"Baptism exists as a first step towards the Eucharist. It unites us to Christ and the Church, but by relating us to the Eucharist. The Eucharist is, as it were, already active in us through baptism. Union with Christ and the Church remains the proper effect of the Eucharist which alone gives it in full Just as the Christian initiation of the individual person receives its completion in the celebration and reception of the Eucharist, so also the Church receives its full existence in a given place by the event of the eucharistic assembly." C. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-72.

Here we have the liturgical movement's rationale for infant communion. The sacrament of Baptism and our fellowship with Christ and the Church

are inadequate without the Eucharist. Here we find the theological reasons which cause some Lutheran theologians to say that barring infants from communion "excommunicates" them from the Church. *Missouri In Perspective*, *op. cit.*

65. The recent changes which allow some children to partake of communion before confirmation is also a result of the faulty theological orientation described in footnote 62.
66. Charles V forced Roman worship practices upon the Lutherans, causing the theological controversy which lies behind FC X. FC X rejected those rituals. "It is astonishing, then, to become aware of the persistent sameness of the rituals Emperor Charles V insisted be forced on the Protestants. The very same liturgical orders are being pressed on us in the name of ecumenism. The mass canon, emphatically rejected by Luther, now renamed the 'eucharistic prayer' and reinterpreted by *Mysterientheologie*, is the prime cause of a new 'liturgical consensus.' And the argument is brought home in an emphatic fashion that if we do not accept that liturgical *concordia*, we will be sectarian." O.K. Olson, "Politics, Liturgics, and *Integritas Sacramenti*," in L.W. Spitz and W. Lohff, eds., *Discord, Dialog, and Concord* (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1977), p. 79. For a study of the events behind FC X see F. Bente, *Historical Introductions to the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (St. Louis: CPH, 1921), pp. 93-112.
67. Surveys concerning the ILCW work revealed some fascinating statistics: (1) only 20% of the congregations of the 3 synods were using eucharistic prayers, and this after many years of those prayers being offered in the *Service Book and Hymnal* and the *Worship Supplement*; (2) of the ALC congregations testing LBW liturgies over half raised theological questions or criticisms about the materials, and 51% of the ALC people found the service either unacceptable, dull, lifeless, or difficult. One-third of LCA test congregations raised theological questions or criticisms, and 57% of its members found the new liturgies either unacceptable, dull, lifeless, or difficult. W. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 103; Karl L. Barth, "The President's Corner," *South Wisconsin District News* (February, 1979), p. 2.

If the people really do not, for the most part, see the new worship forms as better than the old, then why did the ILCW keep on working to get the book out? Those who originally formed the ILCW have said why:

"Seen from the viewpoint of the churches this has great practical value for inter-Lutheran dialog, paralleling other activities in the field of church unity" (p. 132).

"The new book must represent, not two-thirds of the Lutheran churches in our country and in Canada, but three-thirds of the churches. Muhlenberg's ideal of 'one church, one book,' must be more than an ideal, more than a dream; it must . . . become a reality, a dream fulfilled" (p. 113).

"It would . . . be the most significant step possible in the direction of Lutheran unity in America" (p. 114).

But the *Lutheran Book of Worship* serves not just to promote Lutheran unity: "Its value for an ecumenical core of Christian hymns has potential also in an approach to Roman Catholics, Anglicans, etc . . ." (p. 132). All these quotations derive from E.S. Brown, *op. cit.* It is also a step "toward a Christian hymnal for all major denominations" (p. 114). See also A. Boehme, "Response" (paper read at the April 1978 South Wisconsin District Pastoral Conference, available from the District Office), footnote 29.

This unity in worship forms is one goal of the modern ecumenical movement. ". . . the unity with which ecumenism is concerned is . . . unity in all realms which belong to the mission of the Church: teaching, worship, sacra-

ment, mission, service to the world." W.A. Visser T' Hooft, "Ecumenism," in M. Halverson and A.A. Cohen, *A Handbook of Christian Theology* (New York: New World Publishing Company; A Meridian Book, New American Library, 1974), p. 92.

Another author notes some of the reasons for the changes in church liturgies:

"A major influence has been the change of perspective with respect to the Bible produced by modern historical criticism and research . . . Another potent factor has been the contemporary ecumenical movement looking towards the reunion of the churches. It has become increasingly apparent that the several 'ways of worship' in the churches are divisive forces, whether theologically or psychologically, keeping Christians separated from full inter-communion." M.H. Shepherd, Jr., "Liturgy," *Ibid.*, p. 212. See also Harold O.J. Brown, *The Protest of a Troubled Protestant* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970), pp. 29-44, 248-256.

This desire to establish unity on the basis of common worship services is clearly contrary to AC VII and FC X. These Confessional statements show that true unity in the church does not consist of common human rites and ceremonies, and yet this is the goal of those in the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship which produced the *Lutheran Book of Worship*.

God's Here And Is Not Silent

Philip M. Bickel
Tune: #613 TLH

1. *In words and dreams and visions,
In miracles and songs,
Our Father spoke through prophets,
Who faithfully and long
Proclaimed the Spirit's message
To men who'd closed their minds
To God's pure truth and wisdom
And love toward all mankind.*
2. *And now once more our Father
Has spoken in our world
Through His own Son, whose power
The universe unfurled.
In Christ we see the Father,
His glory and His love;
Christ is the perfect likeness
Of Him who rules above.*
3. *The Father's love He showed us
By cleansing us from sin,
When we our own forgiveness
Could never earn or win.
He now is 'throned in glory,
The Father's right hand Man,
His name, indeed the greatest,
In all the heavenly land.*
4. *God's here and is not silent.
He's spoken to us all
In actions and in words
That sound His gracious call.
We know God as our Father
Through Jesus Christ, His Son.
Now, through His death and rising,
Our new life is begun.*

Theological Observer

PRIVATE SCHOOLS, DESEGREGATION, AND THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Hearings held before the Internal Revenue Service in Washington, D.C., in early December are of special interest to members of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, largely because they had to do with the tax-exempt status of many non-public schools, particularly those at the secondary level, within the church. The issue, as stated by the Commissioner of Revenue, was whether private schools claiming tax exemption, have a racially nondiscriminatory policy as to students. According to law, schools that engage in discriminatory practices are not entitled to tax benefits according to charities, and those who contribute to such schools may not deduct such contributions as charitable deductions on their income tax returns. What the Internal Revenue Service proposed was some new rules by which it might determine that some private schools were engaged in discriminatory practices, even though these schools publicly disavowed such practices.

What the Internal Revenue Service did not expect was the storm of criticism that swept the country, that lead to hearings far more extensive than the Revenue Service had envisioned, that brought members from almost every religious community in the country to testify against the proposed rules, that evoked more than 120,000 letters of protest and criticism. The list of those who submitted written request to testify and were included on the agenda of speakers numbered 247 representatives from every part of the United States. Among them were fifteen congressmen as well as distinguished lawyers and Roman Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant school association representatives. They came from every section of the country. Their collective voice was one of loud dissent. Some spoke in reasoned legal language, others in homely similes. With few exceptions, they made it very clear that they disagreed with the Internal Revenue Services rule proposals. One cannot catalog all of the arguments that were advanced by the speakers during the four days of hearings. Yet certain themes came through repeatedly in the testimony. It is these themes that Lutherans who hold their schools dear to their hearts need to note.

Many speakers regarded the proposed regulations as a subtle attack on private religious education. They perceived the issue, not in terms of discrimination, but as an invasion of the free exercise of religion. They said it again and again: Our schools are an extension of our church. Our Sunday schools convey the

essentials of our faith, and our Monday-Friday schools are no different. Even as government cannot propose quotas for minorities in Sunday Schools, so it has no business doing so in elementary and secondary schools that function on other days of the week. Private religious schools, whether Jewish, Roman Catholic, or Protestant, have not arisen as havens for those who wish to discriminate — although there may be some that do; for the most part, they are a response to secularism in public education, to curriculum components that are objectionable to many people. Indeed, to require that such schools have aggressive recruitment programs for minorities, employ minority teachers, and solicit minority students through scholarships might well constitute efforts to impose religious convictions on those in the community who did not agree with such positions.

What distressed many of the speakers even more was the presumption in the newly-proposed rules that a school would be presumed to be guilty of discrimination unless and until it could prove (through a program of affirmative action that included recruitment, scholarships and employment of minority staff members) that it did not engage in discriminatory practices.

In addition to these major arguments — interference in the religious life and teaching activities of the churches, and the presumption of guilt, there were many other arguments as well. Some argued that the new tests were not necessary — that the Service already had ample authority to test, to investigate and to audit the activities of non-public schools. Some argued that because of the nature of their constituency it would never be possible for them to meet the new standards the Internal Revenue Service was about to establish, no matter what their efforts to do so might be. Some regarded the proposals as a new financial burden that would have a depressing effect on their enrollments, largely because parents were already paying taxes for public education while at the same time bearing the total costs of the education of their children in non-public schools. Some challenged the proposals as action beyond the authority of the Internal Revenue Service, contending that proposals such as those advanced by the Service were properly the domain of the Congress, and that not even the courts had given the Internal Revenue Service any new directions or mandates in this area of public policy.

Apart from all these arguments of lesser significance, far and away the major argument was that government was attempting through one fashion or another to exercise control over private religious education. If the government can establish quotas for minorities, propose standards for hiring, require evidence of

scholarships, demand certain recruitment practices, what would deter it from prescribing curricula, imposing new standards of conduct, dictating fundamental moral philosophies, in short, controverting most of the principles and purposes for which private schools have in recent years been established? Might not the power to tax — or to grant favorable tax status — involve ultimately the power to destroy? Was not the government itself violating a principle laid down by the Supreme Court that prohibited entanglement in religion?

Whether intended or purely accidental, the proposals were perceived as a threat to religious education, and the religious community of the land came to Washington to defend itself against this incursion. Even though Lutherans were not very well represented at these hearings, the range of arguments in defense of religious education should serve to reinforce a long-cherished Lutheran commitment, an objective of the Synod's constitution. That is the commitment to the education in religious values of young Lutherans today who will become the Lutheran church of tomorrow, free from governmental interference, whether from state departments of education or from more subtle quarters such as those couched in the innocent Internal Revenue Service proposals to establish tests to determine whether or not schools are engaging in discrimination. The keen perception of the religious community refused to permit the Internal Revenue Service to define the issue as one of discrimination. Rather it put it in quite another, larger, and perhaps more important perspective — that of religious liberty.

Eugene Linse
Concordia College
St. Paul, Minnesota

Homiletical Studies

THE FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 16:19-31

This pericope is to be understood as an illustrative story which our Lord told, not the narrative of an actual event. V. 19: This man had in abundance all those things that most people want in life. But he apparently gave no thought to the worship of God or the service of his fellow man. V. 20: The name given the poor man is significant; Lazarus means "God furnishes help." It is probable "that the name was bestowed by Jesus to mark the pauper as a child of God" (Arndt). The fact is that apart from God nobody paid any attention to him.

Vv. 22-23: They both died. Beyond the grave there is Paradise, containing Abraham and all other children of God that have died, but there is also hell, the place of torment. We note the complete reversal that has taken place with respect to the lots of the rich man and Lazarus.

Vv. 24-26: Abraham's reply must not be interpreted to mean that unhappiness on earth automatically brings happiness beyond the grave and vice versa. "Your good things" — the things *you* valued. This was his problem: his earthly life was centered on material things. In contrast Lazarus had none of these things, but he had God and His mercy and that is what counts.

Vv. 27-31: Miracles will not change the heart; only the Word of God can do that. In the Scriptures we have the means to keep us from the lot of the wicked in the other world. This Word must be heard and followed.

Introduction: Our text is a story that Jesus once told. It tells about two men, each of whom in his way got what he wanted in life. It gives us an excellent opportunity to consider the question:

What Do You Want in Life?

- I. Different people seek different things in life as being of supreme importance.
 - A. The problem with the rich man is that he wanted the wrong things.
 1. He wanted what most people want in life: an abundance of material luxuries.
 2. He gave no thought to God or the service of his fellow man.
 - B. What Lazarus wanted most in life was God and His mercy.
 1. This is indicated by the meaning of his name: "God is my Helper."
 2. Having God did not guarantee an earthly life of ease, but this was not his first concern.
- II. From the other side we see what really counts.
 - A. There comes a time for all of us when earth's true values are seen.
 1. Our eternal future is determined by that which our heart relies upon in this life.
 2. Only that which can stand the test of dying ought to be of real value in living.
 - B. God's mercy in Christ is that value which really counts.
 1. In this life wealth and pleasure may loom large for many; but —
 2. The one thing that accompanies us across the chasm of death and never forsakes us in God's mercy in Jesus Christ.
 3. Nothing in life is worth wanting which, in any way, gets between us and God's mercy in Christ.
- III. It is God's Word which, here in this life, gives us that which abides forever.

- A. God is our Helper.
 - 1. He sent His Son who, although He was rich, for our sake became poor, as poor and despised as Lazarus.
 - 2. God invites us to trust in Him for our eternal salvation.
- B. To this end He has given us His Word.
 - 1. Here we have the message of God's great mercy.
 - 2. The Word alone has the power to change our hearts that we may trust that mercy above all else.
 - 3. We have this Word, "Moses and the prophets"; let us hear it.

RJH

THE SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 14:16-24

Even though Matthew's parable of the Wedding Feast (Matt. 22: 1-14) must be regarded as a different parable than this text, there are major insights to be gleaned from a comparison of the two. The stories are similar, but different in significant ways, and these differences help bring out the full meaning of this text in Luke 14.

- (1.) Luke's parable is not as intense a statement of judgment against the Pharisees. It makes no mention of a Son, a *wedding* feast, of killing the King's servant(s), or of vengeance upon the invited guests.
- (2.) The double invitation of the poor and oppressed in Israel (Luke 14:13; verse 21 of the text) and of the Gentiles (compare "hedges," verse 23, with Matt. 21:33; Eph. 2:14) stresses the aspect of the gracious invitation.
- (3.) The phrase "compel them to come in, that my house may be filled" with its purpose clause contains a powerful emphasis on the monergistic, unilateral nature of the invitation to attend the feast.
- (4.) The whole context in Luke around this parable is that of the grace and love of the Father, and of Jesus, His servant.

Introduction: Have you ever had a friend call you up and offer to take you out to dinner at your favorite restaurant? Sharing a meal with someone you like is a special thing anyway, and it is even better when he pays for it! Our text from Luke 14 is about a dinner; It is Jesus' way of telling us about our eternal home in heaven. He pictures heaven as a great feast, and this parable is about

Gaining Entrance to God's Great Feast

- I. You enter at God's invitation.
 - A. At God's own time
 - 1. The Jews delayed, even though the message of Jesus was, "come, for everything is ready now." The coming of Jesus was the fullness of time (Gal. 4:4).
 - 2. For us, and for all men, the message has become, "Now is the acceptable time" (II Cor. 6:2).
 - B. On God's terms
 - 1. Those in the great feast have humble hearts (Luke 14:7-11).
 - 2. Those in the great feast serve unselfishly (Luke 14:12-14).
- II. You enter by God's grace.
 - A. You have nothing to offer.
 - 1. Nothing you have or are makes any difference — remember this lesson which the proud Pharisees forgot (Luke 14:7-15).
 - 2. You are coming, and can only come, as one who is poor, halt, lame, and blind with the sickness of sin.
 - B. This meal is given free of charge, through God's grace.

1. Jesus picks up the tab; he pays the price through his death and resurrection.
2. It comes solely from God's own love. He wants to fill up his heavenly house; we are invited "in order that" his house may be full. We are the objects of God's unilateral love.

Conclusion: God's great feast is a secure place to be. For we have been invited to it not because of what we do, or who we are, but because of God's love in Christ, because of the eagerness of the heavenly Father to bestow the riches of his love on us.

Jeffrey A. Gibbs

THE THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 15:1-10

As with the text for the Second Sunday after Trinity, a comparison with the parallel account in Matt. 18:10-14 shows unique emphases in the Lukan parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin. Also, the context on both sides of these two short parables drives home with incredible force the central thought of the enormous worth of human beings in the eyes of the God of Love.

- (1.) In verse 2 of this chapter the verbs "to receive" and "to eat with" both are indications of the intimacy with which Jesus treated the tax-gatherers and manifest sinners. The Pharisees and scribes grumbled over this; they did not realize the worth which these people have in the eyes of Jesus.
- (2.) The difference in choice of verbs between Luke and Matthew is significant. In Luke 15:4 "the one which is lost" is much more forceful than "one which has gone astray." Matt. 18:12. Again, the shepherd "leaves" the sheep in Luke; this verb has the primary meaning of "forsake, abandon"; Matthew's parallel verb takes this meaning only as a secondary sense.
- (3.) The image of being abandoned "in the desert" (Luke) is more forceful than "on the hill" (Matthew).
- (4.) The existence of a second parable which teaches the same truth (The Lost Coin) indicates Luke's desire to drive home this teaching of Jesus. The following parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32) is also reinforcement of this emphasis by the inspired evangelist.

Introduction: Have you ever felt that you were not worth much? In our days of fast-paced existence, many people feel lost in the shuffle; they do not think they are important. This text from Luke 15 teaches us just the opposite. It answers the question.

How Much Are You Worth to God?

- I. Enough for Him to search until He finds you.
 - A. He begins by sacrificing His most precious possession — Jesus.
 1. Jesus, who is God the Son, died for you.
 2. Jesus, who is the only truly Righteous Man, died for you.
 - B. Then, God uses every means He can.
 1. Think in those terms; your parents, your Christian friends, the radio, the newspapers, books — all are meant to get the news out to you.
 2. The News is that you are lost in your sin; but God in Christ has found you, He has come to take you home.
- II. Enough to cause rejoicing when He does find you.
 - A. God rejoices — what a celebration that is!
 - B. The angels rejoice — those mighty beings of the spirit world — they rejoice, too, when you come to faith.

C. You should rejoice as well.

1. Over your own finding.

2. Over every other finding — baptisms, conversions, etc.

Conclusion: Here is the ultimate solution for the problem of thinking, "I'm not worth much." You *are* valuable; to us, your fellow-Christians, to the mighty angels, and to God. God has searched you out in your lostness and found you. He wanted you — because you are valuable to Him.

JAG

THE FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 6:36-42

The Gospel selection and the other readings for this Sunday (Is. 5:6-12; Rom. 8:18-23) and remind the Christian that he has been made a child of God. They also encourage him to act, not as the world acts, but as a member of God's family. Luke 6:36-42 is part of Jesus' Sermon on the Plain (6:17-49), which though similar to the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5-7), appears to have been preached on a different occasion. In this sermon Jesus reminds His disciples (v. 20) that though they suffer now, they will be rewarded in heaven (v. 23). The men described in vv. 24-26 seem very religious but inwardly they are dead and rotten (cf. Lk. 20:46, Mt. 23). The text is preceded by Jesus directing His disciples to love their enemies (6:27-35). After the words of the text Jesus points out that spiritual life shows itself not in words but in actions (6:43-49). Active love of their enemies shows the disciples of Jesus to be different than others in the world, for this is the kind of love that God Himself has shown (v. 35).

The text itself begins by picking up this theme, "Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful" (v. 36). Not only does God bestow earthly blessings upon the evil as well as upon the good (Mt. 5:45), but more importantly God lovingly put into action a plan to save a sinful world from the wrath of His holiness (Rom. 5:8, 3:25, Jn. 3:16, 15:13). We Christians should keep in mind the countless sins God has forgiven each of us. Jesus begins v. 37 by describing actions which are the opposite of showing mercy. He tells his disciples not to pass judgement and not to condemn others so that they themselves will not be judged and condemned. By being merciful the Christian avoids the condemnation of God at the Judgement, just as the disciple who endures hardship for his Lord ultimately is rewarded (6:20-23). The "good measure, pressed down, etc." (v. 38) is a description of God's abundant generosity to those who are generous. The phrase depicts a merchant dispensing grain putting as much in to a measure as possible. He shakes the container and presses it down and it still overflows. The "lap" refers to the fold of the garment in which the grain would be carried home, even as a woman might carry something in her apron. The phrase "they will give" is the Greek construction for an indefinite subject in which the third pers. plural is used. Jesus wants His followers to treat others as they themselves desire to be treated. The parable of the Unforgiving Servant (Mt. 18:22ff) is an illustration of the same thought.

Like a father counseling his children, Jesus introduces his attendant thought with an illustration. If a blind man leads a blind man they both will fall into a pit (v. 39). The language reminds the reader of Jesus' words to the Pharisees in Mt. 23:13-24. Christians who demonstrate the mercy and generosity Jesus has spoken of are not to do so self-righteously. It is the mercy of God, not being merciful, which saves us. Those who are unaware of their own sin and unworthiness are of no help in leading others to trust in the grace of God. People who are proud and self-righteous will teach others to be proud and self-righteous. But the disciple who trusts only in the mercy of God for salvation, will also be

able to lead others to trust in God's mercy alone, v. 40. The text ends with the familiar hyperbole of v. 42. If a man cannot see his own great sin, who is he to find fault with others. All men need the freely given mercy of God.

The central thought of the text is that the followers of Jesus have been shown great mercy and should reflect that mercy as they witness to others with their lives.

Introduction: All of us know of the old television program "Father Knows Best." Many of us remember it well. Even many of the youngsters know of it from the popular reruns. Nearly every episode of that program finds Betty, Bud, or Kathy, facing some sort of problem or dilemma. When Dad learns of their problem, he offers some fatherly guidance. To the kids that advice often seems wrong or too hard or simply silly, but in the end they learn that indeed Father knows best. It is the same with God, our Father. He has called upon us to love our enemies, to turn the other cheek, to give and not expect in return. He tells us not to trust in our works or godly lives for salvation but to rely solely upon His mercy. Often these words seem wrong, silly, or too difficult to us. But as Jesus points out in this reading.

Our Father Knows Best

- I. When He asks His children to emulate His mercy.
 - A. God chose to save a rebellious world by His grace.
 1. Men of the world hate and disobey God.
 2. God shows mercy by offering pardon and peace through His Son.
 - B. The wise child of God emulates his Father's example, v. 36.
 1. Mercy distinguishes the Christian from the world, v. 35.
 2. God deals to you as you deal to others. vv. 37-38.
 - a. Judgement to judgement.
 - b. Mercy to mercy.
 - c. Generosity to generosity.
- II. When He warns against self-righteousness.
 - A. The self-righteous blind themselves spiritually, v. 39.
 1. Spiritual blindness is unaware of its own sin and unworthiness, vv. 41-42.
 2. The spiritually blind may seem religious but, in fact, are like the world.
 - B. True children of God are ever aware of their own faults, v. 42.
 1. Aware of their sin they depend on the mercy of God.
 2. Aware of their sin they can teach other sinners to rely upon the mercy of God shown in Jesus, v. 40.

Conclusion: God has loved us, shown us mercy, and made us His own children. Let us heed His example of mercy as we live among men, for our Father knows best.

Robert C. Zick

THE FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 5:1-11.

Luke 5:1-11 refers to a different occasion than that presented in Mark 1:16-20 (and Matt. 4:18ff.) and hence is unique to Luke. V. 1: "The Word of God" — this term, used only by Luke to describe the preaching of Jesus, emphasizes the divine nature of the message. Vv. 2-3: The Word was God's but Jesus used both Simon's help and his boat to proclaim it more effectively. V. 4: This order constituted a test of Simon's faith. What Jesus asks is contrary to human reason

and experience; one would normally expect to catch fish at night in shallow water. V. 5: Simon evidences genuine faith. In spite of the evidence to the contrary, he acts in reliance on the word of Jesus.

Vv. 6-7: The success granted in fishing is an assurance that the disciples' labours in Jesus' service, done in obedience to His Word, would not be in vain. Vv. 8-9: They had witnessed a manifestation of divine power. Confronted with the majesty of God, Simon Peter saw his own shortcomings and declared himself unworthy of Jesus' presence. V. 10: "Do not be afraid" — a word of absolution; Jesus has come in grace to offer forgiveness and life with God. Literally, the Greek says "catch alive." The purpose of catching men is to lead them to true life. V. 11: They would be His co-workers who would devote all their time and energies to the task to which Jesus called them. We have here the beginning of the Christian ministry.

Introduction: "Let's go fishing!" Those words strike a responsive chord in many of us. For most of us, however, fishing is a sport, a hobby. So what if we fish all day (or all night, for that matter) and catch nothing? But for Simon Peter it was a different matter. For him fishing was not a sport; it was his job. Therefore, when our Lord says, "henceforth you will be catching men," He is not talking about a weekend sport. His program for catching men strikes at the essence of what discipleship is all about. That which applied so directly to Peter and his associates speaks to the primary mission of the Church today. When He says,

Let's Go Fishing

- I. Jesus calls us to the primary business of the Church.
 - A. "Catching people alive" is not a weekend sport.
 1. The primary mission of the church is to bring people to eternal life through the Gospel.
 2. The church, and the church alone, has been entrusted with this message of salvation.
 - B. Unfortunately we often act as if it were an optional, part-time activity.
- II. Jesus calls sinners to Himself for His mission.
 - A. Peter exclaims: "Depart! I am sinful!"
 1. The miracle confronted Peter with the majesty of God Himself.
 2. God's majesty makes us aware of our failure and sin.
 - B. Jesus replies: "Don't be afraid."
 1. He came to cleanse and claim sinners.
 2. He wants to use us.
 - C. "They left everything and followed Him."
 1. From that point on, Jesus came first in their lives.
 2. Is He first in your life?
- III. Jesus claims us and what we have to get His Word out.
 - A. Jesus asks for our help and resources. (Initially Jesus only asked for some of Peter's time and the use of his boat.)
 1. He asks for some of our time.
 2. He asks to use our resources (money, etc.)
 - B. Some Jesus calls to full-time ministry. (Then Jesus called Peter to full-time work in the kingdom; the beginning of the Christian ministry.)
 1. The need.
 2. The challenge.

IV. Jesus challenges our faith and blesses our efforts.

- A. Mission is an act of faith. Because Jesus has spoken, we act.
- B. Christ blesses us when we undertake great things at His Word.

RJH

THE SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MATTHEW 5:20-26

This pericope occurs in the course of the first of Jesus' five great discourses recorded by Matthew. The narrative which immediately precedes this text establishes: (1) Jesus' lineage as son of David and son of Abraham; (2) His identity as the Son of God (1:18ff; 2:2ff); (3) Jesus' identity as the one who was to be the fulfillment of Scripture (2:15ff); (4) His own stamina to remain sinless in the face of temptation (4:1ff); (5) His lordship in calling His disciples.

The first great discourse (5:1-7:27) is Jesus' own description of true righteousness. Because only Jesus can be identified with the description of 1:1-4:25, only He can intrinsically and unequivocally claim such righteousness.

In this text Jesus enunciates two basic ideas which demand attention. These concepts must *ultimately* refer to Jesus Himself. They are the concepts of a righteousness which superabounds, and of reconciliation with our brother and opponent at law. Both these terms bring one to Jesus Himself in spite of the fact that there is no apparent gospel in this text. In applying these terms to Jesus' own work of reconciliation and His righteousness which is imputed to us through faith, the gospel can be brought into the sermon in a quite natural way — using the terms of the text itself.

Introduction: Many Christians are concerned about righteousness. Often this concern is whether their righteousness meets God's standards. Sometimes one may become very doubtful about his own salvation when he sees that even his best attempts at living do not stack up against what Jesus commands in this text. Jesus here speaks about a righteousness which surpasses the standards of even the most pious man. Jesus tells us that

An Exceedingly Abundant Righteousness

- I. Is Necessary to Enter the Kingdom of Heaven
 - A. Our righteousness must exceed the empty shell of outward obedience (v. 22).
 - 1. Few manage even outward purity. One may look good in the public eye, but in private this shell fades away. We all sin in thought, word, and deed.
 - 2. Even an outwardly pure life is, in reality, only a whitewashed tomb (cf. Mt. 23:27) which appears beautiful, but is full of uncleanness. The example of murder shows this to be true (v. 22).
 - B. Without such a higher righteousness, one cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven (v. 20, 26).
 - 1. The Pharisees *looked* good. Jesus allows that such was the case, but admonishes us that our righteousness must exceed theirs.
 - 2. Jesus also calls upon us not to count on a righteousness of outward form. With only that we can in *no way* enter the Kingdom of Heaven (vv. 20, 26).
- II. Comes from Jesus Himself
 - A. His righteousness in no way falls short.
 - 1. His righteousness goes beyond outward purity. He not only

preaches love, justice, and forgiveness; He loves, He is just, He forgives!

2. It does not fall short in coming to us (cf. II Cor. 5:21). Here is the significance of this exceedingly abundant righteousness: It is ours through faith.

B. Through Jesus we make friends with our opponent at law (v. 25).

1. Jesus has made us friends with God. God is no longer our opponent, but our friend in the truest sense.
2. Because of this reconciliation we can be reconciled with our brother.

Conclusion: An exceedingly abundant righteousness cannot come from within any man born of the flesh. Here Jesus has shown us this fact. We can be thankful that He was in all ways exceedingly righteous. Most of all we can be thankful that His righteousness is our very own.

David L. Bahn

THE SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MARK 8:1-9

The compassion of Jesus spoken of in verse 2 is the key which makes this miracle text uniquely its own. When Jesus fed the five thousand He did so in response to the hasty entreaty of the disciples: "send them away" (Mark 6:36). The feeding of the five thousand shows that Jesus is compassionately responsible for His people. There also He admonishes His disciples to be responsible for those who follow Him.

In this pericope Jesus summons His disciples to Him and declares: "I feel compassion for the multitude . . ." (v. 2). He shows His awareness of their physical needs. This He can do because He is of like nature. He knows the frailties of flesh and blood. He also provides for those same needs as only God is able to provide. Verse 4 asks the question which allows us to see that this Jesus is God in the flesh. There can be only one answer to the disciples' question of "where?". This food must come from God's hand. Jesus not only satisfies them, He provides more than enough (v. 8).

It is interesting that after this event Jesus is met by the Pharisees who desire to see a sign from heaven. Their real desire had been to test Him. Had they only been with Jesus and seen the sign which the multitudes had just seen! This shows that Jesus did not perform this miracle for its own sake — He did it because He was truly concerned. It is important that the disciples did not grasp the significance of Jesus' feeding of the five thousand or the four thousand (cf. Mk. 8:18-21). Jesus was, through all of these miracles, showing just who He was.

Introduction: When you meet a great man you want to know more about him. What is his background? From where does he come? How is he able to think so clearly? What is he capable of doing? These were certainly typical of the questions which ran through the minds of these four thousand once-hungry people. Surely these who were now so completely and miraculously satisfied wondered about this man who had satisfied them with food there in the wilderness. They must have asked:

Who Is This One Who Satisfied Us So Well?

- I. He is One who has gracious tenacity.
 - A. He is not thwarted by ignorance and unbelief.
 1. The disciples seem to be skeptical about His ability to provide. The ask "Where?" (v. 4).

2. We too may doubt Jesus' ability to provide for our needs. We may be ignorant of Jesus' capabilities.
3. But Jesus does not forget us. He provides for us. He does not give up on us.
- B. He is not stopped by limited resources.
 1. He feeds 4,000 with 7 loaves and several fish!
 2. He blesses the work of our hands today, and provides for our needs daily.
- II. He is One who has a unique identity.
 - A. He shows that He is a compassionate man.
 1. He knows hunger and need. He is aware of the frailties of human flesh (vv. 2, 3).
 2. He is willing to do something about the situation. He *cares* about these people. But being a compassionate man is really only half the story. A mere man would be stymied in such a situation. This One not only cares; He does something about this situation. He must be more than a man, and He is.
 - B. He is the powerful God.
 1. He blesses this small amount of food in an amazing way and shows His great power.
 2. It is ultimately from His hand that we too are blessed in every way, for He is in control. He works everything for the good!

Conclusion: When we begin to see just who this Jesus is, we will also begin to trust in Him more fully. One who has gracious tenacity will not give up in blessing us. He who has a unique identity will never send us away empty. That is real cause for complete trust.

DLB

THE EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MATTHEW 7:15-23

There is a constant need for pastors to warn their flocks against the subtle intrusions of false doctrine. In recent years the LCMS experienced the disastrous and painful results of unrecognized and unmarked false doctrine. Every pastor knows only too well how easily Satan can sow the seeds of doubt or misbelief in a Christian's heart by one flashy evangelist, one "innocent looking" pamphlet, one appealing book purchased in the local department store. This text is a classic one in which the Savior warns His people to watch out for false doctrine, showing the destructive nature of all false doctrine by the terrifying judgement rendered on those promoting and believing it. Verse 15: "Beware" (Gk. *prosechete*) is a pres. impv. implying a constant attitude or posture. Verse 16: "fruits" refer primarily to a prophet's doctrine, since it is finally doctrine that separates a true teacher of Christ from a false one (cf. Dt. 13:1-3; Rom. 16:17). Verse 21: "the one doing" is a present part. (Gk. *poiōn*), the one who is in this state of doing; "the will of My Father" is another way of saying, "the one believing in Christ as Savior" (cf. Jn. 6:29, 39, 40). Verse 22: "have we not . . . in your Name?" — the negative *ou* expects an affirmative answer; note also that the emphasis of these false prophets is on what *they* have done. Verse 23: "I never knew you" — the verb "knew" is aorist (Gk. *egnōn*), implying that there was not even one moment when they were ever in any intimate relationship with God; "workers of iniquity" — all the superficial good they did fully expecting an eternal reward is exposed by Christ as being really iniquity literally, "lawlessness".

Are You Watching Out for False Doctrine?

Introduction: It is dangerous to be a sleepy Christian. As members of the "Church Militant" we Christians can expect to be attacked spiritually by the Devil in many devious ways (1 Pet. 5:8). Christians who are unprepared or careless can easily become Satan's victims and not victors over him.

- I. Satan's attacks on our Christian faith are very subtle.
 - A. False doctrine and false teachers usually come masked in enough truth to be believable (v. 15). The external appearance of false doctrine is often most pious (v. 22).
 - B. But false teachers and their false doctrine can be recognized and unmasked if we weigh carefully their "fruits" with the touchstone of God's Word.
 - C. It is vital that we grow in our knowledge of Christian doctrine and trust in our Savior's merits by regular study of Christ's Word and attendance at His Sacrament (Eph. 4:14).

False doctrine is never harmless! Unrecognized false doctrine can lead us away from the true Shepherd with disastrous results.

- II. The dangers of false doctrine are shown by the judgement rendered on those promoting it or believing it.
 - A. Wolves will receive a wolf's reward — everlasting rejection by the Shepherd Himself and alienation from the flock of true believers (v. 23).
 - B. False teachers will receive such a condemnation, since all false doctrine is finally rebellion against the Good Shepherd Himself. A disciple of Christ hears and follows only His master's voice (Jn. 8:31; Jn. 10:27).
 - C. Having identified false doctrine we must therefore avoid it (Rom. 16:17) following our Savior's example (vs. 23).

Conclusion: God guard us from false doctrine and give us a greater hunger and thirst for the pure milk of His Word until, by His grace, we enter His great Church of Glory.

Steven C. Briel
Fairmont, Minnesota

THE NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 16:1-9

We have taken the liberty of including with this pericope verse 10-13 since these verses form the necessary conclusion to the parable and contain Jesus' own explanation. The central thought of this text directs the *Christian* to use all his blessings and talents properly. As the unrighteous steward used his authority as steward to insure for himself certain benefits following his discharge from service, so the Christian should be so zealous and ingenious in his use of his material power or blessings so as to insure for himself a rich reward in the life to come. (The pastor should review our Lutheran doctrine concerning the rewards promised to a Christian's good works as Melancthon explains it in Apology III, "We teach that rewards have been offered and promised to the works of *believers*. They are meritorious, not for the remission of sins, for grace or justification, which are obtained only by faith, but for other rewards, bodily and spiritual, in this life and after this life . . .").

Verse 1: Note carefully that this parable is addressed not to the general public, but to believers who are in the Kingdom already through faith in the Savior's atonement (Gk. *pros tous mathētas*, ie., "to the disciples"); "a steward" (Gk.

oikonomon) — every Christian is merely a manager of the blessings God has given Him by grace and should so use them to God's glory and the benefit of his neighbor. Verse 8: The steward is commended because he acted *shrewdly* (Gk. *phronimōs*), and this point is really the *tertium*, the point of comparison; "they are wiser (Gk. *phronimōteroi*) than the children of light" — Christians should learn from the ungodly to be so shrewd and devoted in the pursuit of their heavenly "reward" as are the ungodly in the pursuit of a temporal one. Verse 13: "mammon" — this word is perhaps related to the Hebrew root *AMN* signifying "to trust in" or "to have confidence in"; a person can serve only God *or* Mammon, never both. The way in which one uses his earthly blessings demonstrates to which god his heart is really devoted.

What Kind of a Spiritual Retirement Plan Do You Have?

Introduction: We Americans carefully prepare for a secure retirement (insurance, stocks and bonds, real estate, etc.). Good investments promise a secure future. But many people spend little effort preparing for eternity. They make their investments now as if this life were to last forever. But we know it will not. What kind of a spiritual retirement plan do you have?

I. There are only two available plans, one being the "mammon plan" and the other being the "God plan" (v. 13b).

A. The majority of people today are investing in the "mammon plan."

1. The word "mammon" signifies anything or anyone in which we place all our trust and confidence (cf. Large Catechism, First Commandment).
2. Mammon can wear many "masks" — money, possessions, prestige, family, popularity, etc.
3. Mammon is an elusive and tyrannical master — always increasing his demands on us; never really giving what he promises (peace of mind and security); rendering one bankrupt spiritually for eternity.

Most people worship this god mammon, bending all their efforts to his service. But he insures for his investors only eternal death, and so Jesus warns us, "What is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his soul" (Matt. 16:26)?

B. God's gospel is the alternative plan.

1. Whereas mammon's benefits are really nothing, God's gospel benefits are high — by the suffering and death of Christ our sins are blotted out; we are God's own children (baptism); we have the certain promise of everlasting life in heaven through faith in the Savior's blood.
2. Even in this present life we can begin to draw from its benefits — we can pray; we can know God is always protecting us; we can receive His forgiveness regularly through the Means of Grace.

These are the only two available plans. We cannot be serving both of them (v. 13). Which plan are you adopting for yourself? How are you making your investments now with the things God has entrusted to your stewardship?

II. The plan we have adopted for ourselves is reflected by how we are making our investments now in this life. What does your spiritual portfolio look like?

A. Those serving mammon invest everything in the gratification of their passions and lusts, giving little concern to the life to come.

1. God always comes last in the use of their time and money (first table of the Law).

2. They are concerned only about self and not about others (second table of the Law).

In this text God warns against having such a portfolio, reminding us that if one cannot be trusted with little things (i.e., the proper stewardship of his earthly possessions and talents), how can he be trusted with eternal matters (verse 11)? We Christians should learn to use the same kind of ingenuity and care in investing for our eternal future as did this wicked steward, since we are all really but stewards of God's blessings (v. 8).

B. We should learn to use our material blessings or talents to God's glory and to the benefit of others.

1. We can be using our time, our money, our talents, our prayers to support Christ's church.
2. We should be reflecting the love we have been shown by Christ, especially in our families (v. 8).
3. Our good works produced by the Spirit dwelling in us are evidence of a living faith in Christ (evidence of a wise investment plan) and will someday be graciously rewarded by the Savior Himself (Matt. 6:20; Lk. 12:33; Matt. 25:35; Lk. 14:14).

Conclusion: Wise investors re-examine their portfolio regularly. When did you last examine your spiritual portfolio? God make us all wise investors as we place all our trust in Christ and His atonement and devote all our God-given blessings to His service and glory.

SCB

THE TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 19:41-48

In the Third Commandment God declares, "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy," meaning, of course, not that we Christians must worship on a specific day, but that we must have the proper attitude towards God's Word as Luther so aptly explains this commandment, "We should . . . hold it sacred and gladly hear and learn it." God's people must constantly be warned against despising God's Word and Sacrament lest they mistakenly assume (as did the Jews) that God works through His Word and Sacrament *ex opere operato* without faith in the promise. This text affords the pastor this opportunity to warn his flock against such spiritual apathy or carnal security. For if God did not spare His "holy city" neither will he spare those today who continue in sin despising His Word of grace.

Verse 41: "He wept" (Gk. *eklausen*) is an ingressive aorist indicating that He broke into loud crying (used of Peter in Mk. 14:72); "If you had known . . ." is a contrary to fact condition; "peace" (Hebrew *Shālōm*) is a state of complete bliss and reconciliation with God. Verses 43-44: Critics would deny to our Lord Jesus that ability to foretell future events claiming that Luke put these words into His mouth after the event. Obviously such a mistaken notion is unacceptable for those acknowledging the Savior's deity. This predicted destruction actually occurred in A.D. 70 when Rome sacked Jerusalem and razed it to the ground as Josephus reports. Verse 44: "visitation" (Gk. *episkopēs*) refers to God's advent in Christ bringing salvation (cf. Lk. 1: 68, etc.). Verses 45 ff.: Here Jesus cleanses the Temple for the second time (cf. Jn. 2:13-16). Verse 45: "it is written" is a perfect tense (Gk. *gegraptai*) meaning written once and for all; Jesus always took in hand the sword of the Word. Verses 47-48: The Jewish leaders seek to kill

Jesus (Gk. *edzētoun* — imperfect) while the “ignorant” masses hear Him eagerly (Gk. *akouōn* — present tcp.), recalling the Savior’s prayer in Matt. 11:25. Verse 48: “the people were eager to hear Him” is, literally, “they were hung on Him.” Pricaues suggests this metaphor is taken from iron being “hung onto” a magnet.

God’s Tearful Warning against Apathy and Unbelief

Introduction: Our Savior Christ is not only God’s eternal and sinless Son, but He also shares our humanity completely (excepting sin). On two occasions during His earthly ministry the Scriptures report that He was moved to tears. One occasion was at the death of His dear friend Lazarus (Jn. 11:35). The other was when He beheld Jerusalem, the city which from the days of King David had enjoyed God’s particular blessing and mercy, but whose history had been marked by general rebellion against God. The tears that flowed from His compassionate eyes are tears that still flow today as our Savior sadly views people like those living in Jerusalem who have rejected His proffered mercy and will have to endure God’s wrath because of their unbelief. His tears also warn us against such apathy or unbelief.

- I. Apathy is reflected in one’s use of God’s Word and Sacraments.
 - A. In His Word God offers His forgiveness and grace earned by Christ’s vicarious suffering and death.
 1. Through His prophets God had given His Word to His people in the Old Testament; through this Word and by means of the sacrificial systems in the Old Testament the people were directed to trust in that Promised Savior.
 2. Through the Word and Sacraments God points us today to the Savior who *has* come and who has paid our debt fully with His own sacrificial blood.
 - B. But many take God’s Means of Grace lightly despising the promised forgiveness offered therein.
 1. The history of Israel was marked by apathy and rebellion against God; the people assumed that “going through the motions” of religion would satisfy God (but cf. Is. 1: 11ff.; Hosea 6: 6; etc.).
 2. We also must guard against the mistaken notion that mere religious ritualism can benefit us spiritually (cf. Heb. 4:2).

God gave us His Word and Sacraments so that He might distribute to us today the benefits of our Savior’s atonement — forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. But those who despise these Means of Grace will not only forfeit the benefits, but will finally bring upon themselves God’s punishment.

- II. Continued misuse of God’s Word will result in condemnation.
 - A. God will punish those who despise His Word of grace.
 1. Because of their misuse of God’s Word (vv. 45-46), the Lord Jesus warned the people in Jerusalem that God’s wrath would come (vv. 43-44).
 2. God through the Roman armies carried out this threat in 70 A.D., destroying His “holy city” thoroughly.
 3. Jesus warns people today, “He that does not believe the Son will not see life, but God’s wrath remains on him.”
 - B. But in His mercy God gives people opportunity to repent.
 1. He gave Jerusalem some forty years to repent before allowing Rome to sack and burn the city.
 2. Today the Lord is still a patient Lord who “is not willing that any should perish” (cf. also Romans 2:4).

Conclusion: Today the Lord Jesus still weeps tears when He encounters apathy and unbelief. His tears are not tears of anger, but of deep compassion. He

loves us all. He suffered and died for the sins of all. God defend us from apathy and unbelief and give us true faith in Christ our Savior as we use His Word and Sacraments through which He bestows on us all the spiritual blessings earned for the world by His suffering and death.

SCB

THE ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 18:9-14

What is the basis for one's justification before God? His own inherent righteousness earned by obedience to God's Law (the so-called *opinio legis*)? Or Christ's perfect righteousness imputed to him through simple faith in His vicarious suffering and death? This was the central issue in the Lutheran Reformation. And it is still the central question today as any pastor who knows his people will testify. In this classic text the pastor is able to contrast clearly these two "methods" of justification (i.e., works or faith) showing that "men cannot be justified before God (*coram Deo*) by their own strength, merits, or works, but are freely justified for Christ's sake, through faith . . ." (A.C. IV).

Verse 9: "to those having confidence on themselves" — note that this text is directed precisely against what our confessions call the *opinio legis*, that is, confidence in one's own righteousness apart from Christ; "righteous" (Gk. *dikaioi*), is a "courtroom" term implying legal innocence before God. Verse 10: the Pharisee represents the greatest piety in the nation at that time and the publican represents the greatest sinner in society. Verse 11: "to himself" (Gk. *pros heauton*) implies that this Pharisee had not really examined himself before God to determine His verdict; note the catalogue of sins mentioned by this Pharisee, showing that he did not really know what sin is — that it is not merely external, but begins in the heart, as Jesus so clearly shows in His Sermon on the Mount. Verse 13: "God be merciful to me" — this translation does not really communicate the rich meaning of the word used here, which is *hilasthēti*, "be propitiated." This word contains that doctrine which is central to the entire Bible, that God is angry with sin and must be pacified by a sacrifice offered in place of the sinner. The entire Old Testament sacrificial system pointing to Christ's final atoning sacrifice was certainly understood by this publican as his prayer demonstrates. Verse 14: that this publican understood the doctrine of justification by faith is clear from the Savior's own verdict on him (i.e., "he went down to his house justified" — *dedikaiomenōs*).

Do You Know How to Receive a "Not Guilty" Verdict from God?

Introduction: "How can I stand before a perfect God without being consumed by His burning anger against my sin?" This was the central question in the Lutheran Reformation. Luther had been taught to rely on his own piety and good works, but still his sins loomed before him condemning and accusing him. Do you know the way to perfect righteousness before a holy God who demands that you be as perfect as He is?

- I. Like the Pharisee, one can try to earn this "not guilty" verdict from God by keeping God's Law.
 - A. But one must not forget that God demands perfect obedience to His Law, not only outwardly in deeds and actions, but also inwardly in thoughts and attitudes (the Pharisee clearly misunderstood this, vv. 11, 12).
 - B. If we examine ourselves in the light of God's Law, we realize not only that we have not kept His Law as He demands, but also that we are unable to do so, since we have been maimed and crippled

spiritually by sin, as the Bible so clearly declares (i.e., original sin).

That which really matters in God's court, as in any human court, is not what verdict *we think* we deserve, but the verdict which the Judge renders. God, the true Judge, has rendered His verdict on those trying to earn their own pardon from God. "By the works of Law shall no one be justified in God's sight" (Rom. 3:20). How, then, can we sinners escape the "quilty verdict" we justly deserve because of our sins?

II. Like the publican, we must throw ourselves at the mercy of God's court, pleading our Savior's payment in our behalf.

- A. Since our great debt must be paid our only plea is Christ's sacrifice for us. This was the publican's plea ("God, be propitiated to me a sinner").
- B. Pleading His sacrifice for us God declares us "not guilty; debt paid in full." This was the Savior's verdict on this publican (v. 14). We have heard this "not guilty" verdict in Word and Sacrament.
- C. Knowing that we sinners have been graciously declared innocent before God, not because of anything we have done, but solely because of our Savior's suffering and death in our behalf, how can we any longer despise other sinners around us as did the Pharisees (v. 9b)? Cf. I John 4: 10 ff.

Conclusion: God guard us from pharisaical pride and self-justification. May He not only give us a real knowledge of our sins, but, most importantly, teach us always to trust solely in our Savior Christ, who, with His own blood, has paid for us the great debt we owe God.

SCB

THE TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MARK 7:31-37

During His ministry the Savior would not permit Himself to be viewed merely as a "miracle-worker." Many times, as in this text, He urged people not to spread the reports of His miracles lest His real work be overlooked. The miracles He performed were really incidental to His real mission which was to atone for the sins of the world by His holy life and vicarious suffering and death (cf. Matt. 20:28). In our own day many sects and "movements" within Christendom seem to place greater emphasis on miraculous phenomena than on the Savior's atonement (e.g., the charismatic movement and neo-pentecostalism). In preaching this text the pastor must be careful lest he give the impression that we can expect such physical healing today; Christ Jesus has not promised us this, but He has most surely promised us forgiveness and salvation through His Word and Sacrament and, as this text so vividly shows, Christ's Word can perform what it promises. With this text the pastor must be *evangelical*; he must preach Christ crucified for sinners.

Verse 31: It is important to note that this area was essentially pagan spiritually. Perhaps this accounts for Jesus' unusual procedure in healing the deaf-dumb man (cf. Edersheim, *Life and Times*, II, p. 45). Verse 32: "They urged Jesus (*hina*) to lay his hands on him" — perhaps trying to dictate to the Savior his method for healing, implying that there was some "magic" connected with the laying on of hands (another possible reason for Jesus' unique method employed here). St. Mark emphasizes that Jesus took the man, away from the crowd (Ck. *kat' idion*), perhaps so the man's attention would not be diverted from Jesus. Verse 33: commentators disagree as to why Jesus added these visible signs to His Word. Only the most naive exegete would suggest that these were "magical rituals" necessary to the healing. Luther's opinion still seems to be the

most sane theologically — that Christ attached His promise (“Be opened!”) to these visible signs to excite faith as God today attaches His promise to visible signs in Holy Baptism and the Holy Communion. Verse 35: “Ephphatha!” — Mark seems to want to emphasize that it was the Word which really healed the man and so he quotes Jesus’ command in the original; “and he was speaking naturally” — he now spoke “straightly” or “rightly” (Gk. *orthōs*), implying that previously he had not been entirely dumb but unable to speak intelligibly due to his being deaf. Verse 36: Undoubtedly Jesus’ command here was to guard against a misconception about His ministry.

Christ’s Word — Our Only Source for Spiritual Health

Introduction: Everyone wants to be healthy. We exercise, eat well, and rest so that we do not lose our good health. Spiritually we want to be healthy too. An unhealthy Christian is reflected by doubts, complaints, and general apathy toward everything godly and spiritual. The only remedy for spiritual bad health is found in our great Physician Jesus and His Word.

- I. Christ Jesus alone has authority over sin and its devastating effects.
 - A. Spiritual bad health can be traced to the sin inherited from our parents. It is sin which causes all the pain and suffering in our world; it was sin that caused this man’s malady.
 - B. Jesus came to our world to destroy sin’s power and curse. By His suffering and death He paid to God our debt, crushed the devil’s power, and broke the curse of death and hell by rising again from the dead.

As Jesus healed this man from the obvious effects of sin he shows us His authority over sin itself. We cannot expect physical healing ourselves, since God has not promised us this (cf. Acts 14:22, for example), but we can have confidence that He will heal us from our sin, for this He *has* promised us in the gospel.

- II. The instrument through which Christ heals us spiritually today is His Word.
 - A. His Word has the power to do what it promises. In our text Jesus’ Word was “Be opened!” and so it happened. Thus today Jesus’ Word promises, “Believe in Me and your sins are forgiven.”
 - B. Jesus attaches His Word to visible signs to make it more personal for us and to excite our faith (here Jesus took the man apart by himself (Gk. *kat’ idion*) and used very unique signs connected with His Word). Jesus attaches His promise of forgiveness to water in our Holy Baptism, declaring to us as He calls us by name, “He that believes and is baptized shall be saved.” And in the Holy Communion He takes bread and wine and gives with these elements His true natural body and blood with the promise, “Given and shed for you for the forgiveness of your sins.”

Through His Word (whether oral or sacramental) Jesus restores us to spiritual health. May we use these divine means of grace more faithfully declaring with the crowds, “Jesus has done everything well.”

SCB

THE THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 10:25-37

Christians must always fight that *opinio legis* which expresses itself most crassly in the lawyer’s question in this text, “What good thing must I do to inherit eternal life?” Evangelical pastors must constantly be urging their people to believe the gospel, that it is Christ’s atonement alone upon which we must base

our hope for salvation and forgiveness and never upon our own piety. In interpreting this parable the lawyer's initial question must be kept in mind (v. 25), lest the pastor forget the context of this entire pericope (i.e., how a sinner is justified before God) and leave the mistaken impression that, if one acts like the good Samaritan toward others (something no one really does, as even this proud lawyer had to acknowledge), he can somehow earn God's favor. Luther's treatment of this pericope is still the most evangelical — the Samaritan represents Christ, the robbed and beaten man along the roadside represents the sinner maimed by the devil and sin, and the priest and Levite represent the Law, which will never help us to reach eternal life.

Verse 25: "What good thing must I do . . . ?" (Gk. *ti poiēsas*, aorist participle). This man believed that by one great heroic deed he could merit eternal life. Verse 28: "This do" (Gk. *poiēi*, present). While this lawyer thought that by one great deed he could merit eternal life, Jesus quietly reminded him that one's entire life must be perfectly in tune with the Law if he would merit such a thing (an attitude shattered by the following parable). Verse 29: "wishing to justify himself" — apparently Jesus' point was driven home to this man and so in desperation he made one last attempt to save face. Verse 33: "a Samaritan" is in the emphatic position in the text (the pastor should review the relationship between Jews and Samaritans, e.g., John 4:9); "he had compassion on him" — the Gk. word used here, *esplangchnisthē*, is used in the gospels exclusively of God's compassion on sinners, a significant fact lending credence to Luther's identification of this Samaritan with the Lord Jesus. Verse 37: "You, go and do likewise" (the verbs here are in the present tense, *poreuou . . . poiēi*) — quite obviously Jesus is making the point that no one has ever nor can ever live so sacrificially in behalf of another. Jesus alone has done this for all mankind and He alone deserves our trust and faith.

What Is the Price-tag on Eternal Life?

Introduction: Everything in life today seems to have a price-tag on it. Before buying anything we must be certain we have enough money to pay for it at the checkout counter. Some people seem to think they can buy eternal life from God. Before trying to do this we had better ask, "What is the price-tag on eternal life?"

- I. The price is high — complete obedience to God's Law in thoughts, attitudes, and actions.
 - A. The Law promises life, but its promise is conditional (vs. 28, "If you do this you will live"). God demands absolute obedience to all His Law, threatening, "The person who sins (breaks my law in even one point) must die."
 - B. In telling this story of the Good Samaritan Jesus shows us clearly that we have not loved our neighbor as ourselves (summary of the Second Table), and if we have not kept the Second Table of the Law, we quite obviously have not kept the First Table either requiring love for God above everything.

None of us can pay the price set on eternal life. The Bible declares that we are all by nature spiritually bankrupt, by nature "dead in our trespasses and sins"; someone must pay this price for us if we sinners are to receive from God the priceless treasure of eternal life.

- II. Jesus has taken on our nature and paid our debt to God for us.
 - A. The poor man in this story who was robbed and beaten is really you and me and our world. We have all been stripped and left naked spiritually by the devil and our sin.
 - B. The priest and Levite represent the Law, which seems to offer help to us ("This do and you will live"), but, like the priest and Levite in the parable, passes by on the other side, giving no comfort or help.

- C. Jesus is our Good Samaritan. Like the Samaritans who were despised by the Jews, our Lord Jesus was despised and rejected by men (Is. 53:3; Jn. 1:11). Having every reason to pass by us on the other side, He did not. But, having compassion on us, He paid us our debt to God by His innocent life and vicarious suffering and death. And like the Samaritan who took the wounded man to the inn, our Lord Jesus has brought us to the inn of His Church where we are nurtured and strengthened through Word and Sacrament.
- D. Having been shown such love, we should now reflect it in our dealings with others (v. 37). Cf. also I John 4.

Conclusion: God give us a firmer faith in our Good Samaritan Christ who, by His blood and death, has rescued us from certain eternal death. May we live for others as He lived and died for us — sacrificially — until He returns giving us His Divine commendation, “I was hungry and you gave me to eat . . . anything you did for one of My brothers here, however lowly, you did for Me” (Matt. 25).

SCB

THE FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 17:11-19

God’s mercy and benevolence extends not only to the believers but also the ungodly (cf. Matt. 5:45). However, as Luther points out in the fourth petition of the Lord’s Prayer, we Christians should learn to acknowledge God as the Giver of all good gifts and receive His blessings with thanksgiving. This text affords the pastor the opportunity not only to encourage Christians to remember that it is God through Christ who daily showers us with material and spiritual blessings, but also to encourage them to receive His blessings with thanksgiving.

Verse 11: “through Samaria and Galilee” explains the presence of the lone Samaritan leper. Verse 12: “lepers” — were considered dead while still living and were required by Mosaic Law to separate themselves from the living (cf. Lev. 13:45). Verse 13: “have mercy” (Gk. *eleēson*, aorist impv.) — “do an act of mercy for us” (what faith and confidence is contained in this short word!). Verse 14: the text clearly implies that they were suddenly cleansed while on their way to the priest, their faith being based solely on Jesus’ word and not on sight, since they left Jesus still leprous but believing that they would be healed. Verse 15: “glorifying God” (Gk. *doxadzōn*, present pct.) implies a continuous action. Verse 16: the fact that this Samaritan was glorifying God (Gk. *ton theon*), coupled with the fact that he “fell before Jesus’ feet” in an act of divine homage, implies that he believes in Jesus’ deity. Verse 17: “were there not . . .” — the negative *oūch* expects an affirmative answer; “ten cleansed” (Gk. *ekatharisthēsan*) — even though the nine did not thank the Lord Jesus they remained cleansed of their leprosy (God still gives His blessings to the unthankful). Verse 18: Jesus receives this man’s homage because He is God, unlike Peter in Acts 3, who refused such homage. Verse 19: “your faith saved you” — Jesus here praises faith, not as though faith in itself possessed the miraculous power to save which only Christ’s Word possesses, but faith as the way in which the sinner receives the benefits of Christ’s Word to himself.

God Deserves Our Thanksgiving!

Introduction: “Thank you!” What simple words, but how precious they can be, often more valuable than a fistful of dollars. Surely as we consider our gracious God, whose generosity surpasses even our wildest comprehension, we are moved to sincere thanksgiving.

- I. God is a very merciful God who always cares for us and daily floods us with His blessings, both material and spiritual.
 - A. We are surely not deserving of the least of His benefits when we consider our sin. The lepers as outcasts of society, being considered dead while still living, did not merit the Savior's time and attention.
 - B. But due simply to His mercy God showers us with His blessings.
 1. Materially He gives us and all people everything we possess in this life (cf. Luther's explanation to the first article).
 2. But not the least of His mercies is the compassion shown our world in giving us His only-begotten Son to pay our debt of sin for us by His vicarious suffering and death.
- II. God gives us all His gifts putting no conditions on them.
 - A. We should learn to trust His Word and not waver in our faith in Him.
 1. The ten lepers took the Savior at His Word, not knowing initially how Jesus would help them, and went confidently to the priests believing that Jesus would deliver them.
 2. We should learn to trust God also with firm hearts. We should pray to Him in confidence as did these lepers ("Have mercy"), believing that He will hear our prayer and answer it.
 3. We should believe the promises given in His Word (i.e., promises of forgiveness and salvation given us in Word and Sacrament).
 - B. We should learn to receive His blessings (both material and spiritual) with thanksgiving.
 1. Jesus praised this lone leper who returned for a moment to thank Him.
 2. We should remember to "give thanks to the Lord for He is good."
 3. We who have received so much at the hand of our gracious God should learn not only to thank Him, but to thank those through whom our gracious God gives us His benefits (i.e., parents, spouse, employers, etc.), even if we might be met with ingratitude.

Conclusion: God give us faith to trust in Christ as our greatest Friend, placing all our confidence in His Word. And God give us thankful hearts to receive His benefits gratefully, extending our thanksgiving also to those around us.

SCB

THE FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MATTHEW 6:24-34

The god "mammon," whatever mask he wears, is a tyrant. Servitude to mammon promises only discontentment, general unhappiness, and everlasting misery and condemnation. Christian people, no less than others, are tempted to put their trust in this elusive god called "mammon" and they also reap his dubious rewards at times. In this text the Savior warns against serving mammon and He urges us to place our trust and confidence in Him alone. Worrying and complaining are always symptoms of misplaced trust and confidence. In preaching this text the pastor must guard against giving the impression that material blessings are in themselves wrong. The point Jesus is making here is one of priorities as He Himself puts it so aptly, "Seek *first* the Kingdom of God . . ."

Verse 24: "... and love the other" — the Gk. word *agapēsei* is used here, indicating a love of purpose moving the person to sacrifice in behalf of the object which is loved (the same word used of God's love for a sinful world moving Him to sacrifice His Son in our behalf); "mammon" — perhaps related to the Hebrew root *AMN*, meaning "to trust" or "have confidence in." "Mammon" would be whatever we trust in for happiness and for all good (cf. especially Luther's Large Catechism under the first commandment). Verse 25: "do not worry" (Gk. *mē merimnate*) means "stop your worrying and resist the urge to worry in the future"; "is not your soul . . .?" — the Gk. negative *ouchi* implies an affirmative answer. Verse 26: "(He) cares for them" (Gk. *trepheî*) is present tense; "God is constantly caring for them." The word carries the picture of a mother's tender care for her nursing infant. Verse 27: "worrying" is a circumstantial ptc. of means showing the sheer folly of worrying. Verse 28: "learn . . ." (Gk. *katamathēte*) is aorist impv. and an intensive verb meaning "observe carefully." Verse 31: "the gentiles" (Gk. *ethnē*) are those who do not have the true God as their Father. Verse 33: "seek first" (Gk. *zēteite*) is a present impv. implying continuous action (a posture in life); "first" addresses a question of priorities; "the kingdom" — as Luther correctly observes in the Large Catechism the Kingdom is really Christ and His gospel; for when you have the King, you have the Kingdom; "all these things" — not the luxuries but the things necessary for contented living. Verse 34: "tomorrow" (Gk. *aurion*) is personified here. If tomorrow is to do the worrying, then we can be carefree since tomorrow never really comes; we are always living in today.

Who Is the Master of My Life?

Introduction: Do you ever worry or complain? All of us do, but such things can be symptoms of misplaced trust. If we worry and complain we must re-examine our faith and ask, "Who is really the master of my life?"

- I. Many worship and serve the god Jesus calls "mammon" and they reap his dubious rewards.

A. What is the god "mammon?"

1. "Mammon" is anything we trust in above the true God; possessing it we are happy and secure, and losing it we are discontented and unhappy (cf. Luther's Large Catechism under the first commandment).
2. Mammon can wear many masks in our lives — wealth, property, children, popularity, education.

We are often guilty of bowing before this god "mammon." Our worrying and complaining illustrate our misplaced trust.

B. But mammon is a dubious god.

1. He constantly increases his demands on us (Ecc. 5:10).
2. He never really gives those things he promises — peace of mind, security, contentment.
3. And he certainly cannot bring eternal happiness and security (Matt. 16:26).

- II. There is only one master in whom we should place our confidence — only one true and faithful God in whom we should trust — the Triune God as revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ.

A. Unlike mammon who never does anything for us but requires everything from us, God has done everything for us.

1. He took our sin upon Himself and paid our debt to Himself by His vicarious suffering and death.
2. In His Word and Sacraments He has bestowed on us individually all the blessings of salvation earned for the world.

B. He also cares for us and watches over us now.

1. He knows our smallest needs and is concerned about them (v. 32).
 2. St. Paul reminds us, "If God spared not His own Son . . . will He not with Him give us everything we need?"
 3. If God cares for the most insignificant of his creatures (v. 28, will He not care for the crown of His creation for whom He suffered and died?
 4. He will not only give us everything we need for contented living now, but also promises us an eternity of sheer happiness in heaven.
- C. We should, therefore, learn to seek Him first in life.
1. We seek the Kingdom by seeking to have Christ the King as *our* King and Savior.
 2. We should seek Him first by studying His Word faithfully and attending His Sacrament regularly.

Conclusion: Mammon is a vicious tyrant, an elusive god offering us no real rewards but heartache and eternal misery. God alone merits our trust and faith. Let us, therefore, seek first in life His Kingdom by trusting in Christ as our only Savior from sin. And let us devote all our energies and talents to the study of His Word and to serving Him alone, leaving all our problems and cares to His divine providence.

SCB

THE SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 7:11-17

Our Savior's Word is a powerful Word! During His ministry He was able to awaken the dead as from sleep by a mere word, and He is able today to awaken souls out of spiritual death to new life by His Word. In preaching this text the pastor will not only want to demonstrate the Savior's power over death, but will also want to show the power of Christ's Word as we have it today in our Holy Scriptures and Sacraments to forgive sins, awaken faith, and bestow eternal life.

Verse 12: Here the Prince of Life meets Death carrying its helpless prey (Lenski); this poor mother had walked this lonely road to the grave previously; first her husband died and now her only (Gk. *monogēnes*) son (all means of sustenance now were gone); Elijah the great Old Testament prophet had once encountered a similar situation (I Kings 17), but in Jesus a greater than Elijah has come, as the text demonstrates. Verse 13: "seeing her" — see here the Savior's intimate knowledge of and compassion for the individual; "he had compassion" is an aorist (Gk. *esplangchnisthē*); Jesus' compassion is never abstract but moves Him to beneficial action; "do not weep" (me with a present impv.) implies "stop your weeping and resist the urge to weep in the future" (unlike the others Jesus alone is able to give her reason to stop her crying). Verse 14: "he touched the coffin" — such an action was forbidden by Mosaic Law to guard against defilement, but Jesus is the Lord of Life and by raising this dead boy He rendered that which is unclean, clean; "young man, to you I say, 'Arise!'" — Jesus speaks to this dead corpse as if he is living; note the sharp contrast between Jesus and Elijah (I Kings 17). Elijah must wrestle in prayer with God, while Jesus merely says "I say." Verse 15: "the dead one" — Luke emphasizes the fact that the boy was dead; "sat up" is an aorist, indicating a sudden awakening, as if suddenly startled out of sleep; "he gave him to his mother" is a direct quote from the LXX of I Kings 17:23 (an obvious allusion to Elijah's miracle). Verse 16: "God has visited His people" is a Messianic phrase, and in the following section (verses 18-23) Jesus points to this miracle (among others) to prove that He is "the coming One," i.e., the Messiah of God (cf. verse 22, "the dead are raised").

Jesus Provides Certain Comfort for All Our Troubles

Introduction: We have many troubles and disappointments in life. The greatest enemy we face is death. Jesus alone is able to deliver us from our heart-aches and troubles, whatever they might be. Since He has power over death, our last great enemy, He shows us that He also has the power over all the other things that cause us such misery and suffering. In our text He urges us not to grieve hopelessly as do the ungodly who have no hope, but to learn to trust in Him.

I. Jesus knows all our troubles and they are a concern to Him.

A. We do not deserve His compassion.

1. All our troubles and suffering have been brought down on us because of our sin inherited from our parents.
2. In the midst of our suffering we may be tempted to think that God has forgotten us or is punishing us for some reason.

B. But the Savior never forgets His people in their suffering.

1. The Savior took the time to notice this poor woman and have compassion on her specifically (v. 13).
2. Jesus is always concerned about what happens to us too (cf. Matt. 10:30).
3. Knowing that our greatest problem is sin, Jesus out of sheer mercy, took on our nature in order to pay for us the debt we owed God.
4. St. Paul reminds us that God cannot forget those for whom He died (Rom. 5).
5. In his Sacraments the Savior speaks to the sinner individually offering comfort and help.

Jesus never forgets us. Our troubles concern Him. We should learn from Him to extend this kind of concern and compassion toward those around us as St. Paul urges us, "Weep with those who weep; rejoice with those who rejoice."

II. But not only is Jesus concerned about our troubles and problems, He alone has the power to lift our burdens from us, to deliver us from our troubles.

A. Jesus' promises to us are not empty ones.

1. He promised this widow woman that she would stop crying and, in raising her son from the dead, was able to take away her reason for crying.
2. Jesus has this same power today to deliver us from our troubles. Death is a mere sleep to Jesus; He can awaken the dead more easily than we awaken someone from a sound sleep.
3. In all our troubles Jesus urges us, "Call on Me in the day of trouble, I will deliver you and you shall glorify Me."

B. The instrument through which Jesus delivers us is His Word.

1. His word to this woman was "Young man, I say to you, Arise!" and His word worked life in the boy's body.
2. We today hear the Savior's promise in His Word and Sacrament where He offers new life and awakens from spiritual death.
3. We should learn to listen to His Word and believe it, knowing that if the Savior promises to us forgiveness and salvation (as He does in His Word and Sacraments), we have it.

C. We should learn from our Savior not only to feel compassion for other people in their troubles, but to help them in their troubles in any way we can (cf. James 2:14-17).

Conclusion: May we learn in all our troubles to place our trust in our Savior's all-powerful Word knowing that He not only is concerned about us individually,

never forgetting nor forsaking His own, but also has the power to carry out His promises whatever they might be. As we await the day when we will each realize the fulfilment of all His promises completely, may we live sacrificially for those around us, showing to others the compassion and help that Christ has shown to us.

SCB

THE SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: LUKE 14:1-11

The Sabbath-day healing of the man suffering from dropsy was only one action in a series which aroused the anger of the Pharisees (cf. Lk. 6:6-11; 13:10-17). Verse 1: Better food was served on the Sabbath and it was customary to invite friends to the meal (Ylvisaker). Verse 2: The medical term used here is unique to Luke the physician. Dropsy is caused by a stagnated circulatory system. Also called edema, its symptoms are swelling in the subcutaneous tissue and distention of the stomach. Verse 5: The rabbis were divided on this question. Some felt that the animal could only be fed, others that it could be removed. Apparently removal was permissible in Perea (Arndt). Verses 7-11: Jesus is not merely providing guidelines for attending a Jewish wedding feast. He is telling a parable and therefore teaching a spiritual lesson. The divine principle of verse 11 makes this plain. The point of comparison is the necessity of practicing humility (Arndt).

One element common to both the miracle account and the parable is the attitude of pride. In the first case, pride is involved in the Pharisees' lack of concern for the man suffering from dropsy. In the latter, pride is involved in the selfish, rude striving for the seat of honor. The outline is developed around this common element. The problem is that pride is a constant enemy of every Christian. The goal of the sermon is to portray the destructive force of the sin of pride.

Pride: The Relationship Ruiner

It can ruin your relationship:

- I. With yourself (vv. 7-10)
 - A. As a child of God you daily want to express Christian humility.
 1. Since your eternal worthiness is not self-gained, but in Christ.
 2. Since your temporal successes are gifts of a gracious God.
 - B. But pride produces sinful superiority complexes.
 1. It did in the case of the Pharisees.
 - a. They viewed themselves as being morally, socially, and spiritually superior.
 - b. So they loved to pick out places of honor whenever possible.
 2. It can in your life.
 - a. When you view yourself as being a better student, athlete, businessman, or housewife than you really are,
 - b. Christian humility can be replaced by Pharisaic rudeness and arrogance.
- II. With your fellow man (vv. 1-6)
 - A. Loving others as oneself is the proper Christian attitude.
 1. Since they also are creations of God.
 2. Since they also have been redeemed by Christ's death.
 - B. But pride prevents the proper demonstration of love to the neighbor.
 1. It did in the case of the Pharisees.

- a. Mercy towards the man with dropsy was overcome by legalistic pride.
 - b. They "viewed others with contempt" (Lk. 18:9).
 - 2. It can in your life at home, work, and school.
 - a. When arrogance belittles others along with their wants and needs.
 - b. When selfishness saps your ability to be compassionate.
- III. With your Lord (v.11)
- A. He blesses those who are humble.
 - 1. They are aware of their sin and its condemnation.
 - 2. They are aware of God's undeserved forgiveness through faith in Jesus.
 - B. But He punishes those who are proud.
 - 1. In their pride they break His commandments.
 - 2. In their pride they tend to reject the Savior (cf. Lk. 18:9).

PWB

THE EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MATTHEW 22:34-46

V.34: Jesus had just put the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection, to silence. Now the Pharisees tried to embarrass Jesus in their specialty, the Law. V.35: "A lawyer" is a scribe, an expert in the Law. V.36: "What sort of command is the great commandment?" If Jesus had singled out one, He would have implied that the others were of lesser importance. The rabbis reckoned more than 600 precepts in the Law. The schools made a distinction between light and heavy commands. A person could neglect some if he kept the big ones (cf. Jas. 2:10). V.37: Jesus avoids the pitfall by giving a summary of the whole Law. The Law demands an undiluted love of God (Dt. 6:5) and the neighbor (Lv. 19:18, 34).

The heart is the seat of understanding; the soul, of the living power; the mind, of the intellectual powers. Love is the fulfilling of the Law (Ro. 13:16). *Agapaō* means "to love with affection and corresponding effect and purpose" (cf. 1 Jn. 4:21; Mt. 7:12). V.40: "Hang all the Law and the prophets" — all moral and religious precepts are comprehended in these two statutes. V.41: Now Jesus moves in to try to win the Pharisees (cf. Mk. 12:35-37; Lk. 20:41-44). If they accepted his argument, they might be persuaded to accept Him as the Messiah. Only after they refused, did He utter His woes (Mt. 23). V.42: The Pharisees commonly referred to the Messiah as the Son of David, nothing more. "What think ye of the Christ, the Messiah?" V.43: If David calls him Lord, Jesus must be divine. Otherwise, how could David call him son and Lord? "In spirit" means under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. V.44: Jesus quotes Psalm 110:1 ("Utterance of Jehovah to my Lord (*adonai*)"). Here the eternal Father speaks to the eternal Son. "Right hand" refers to the place of honor and power (Mt. 28:18). "Thine enemies they footstool" — the enemies (Sin, death, the devil) are under His feet in utter defeat (1 Cor. 15:25-27; He. 1:13). V.45: How could the Messiah be both Son and Lord of David? The Pharisees could not answer that question without admitting that Jesus was both man and God, the true Messiah. A man's estimate of Christ will decide his eternal fate. V.46: The Pharisees could not refute Christ's argument. They would not believe and so they went away empty.

Introductory thought: People have many questions about religion, but they ultimately boil down to two.

The Two Great Questions of Religion

- I. Which is the great commandment of the Law (v.36).

- A. The Pharisees ask the question to try to discredit Jesus.
- B. If He selected one above the others, they would charge Him with discounting the importance of some laws.
- C. Jesus' answer: The highest law is love.
 - 1. Love the Lord thy God (Dt. 6:5). with all your
 - a. Heart (seat of the will).
 - b. Soul (your living being).
 - c. Mind (intellect).
 - 2. Love your neighbor as yourself (Lv. 19:18, 34).
- D. The Law is important because it serves as a
 - 1. Curb (Ro. 7:7).
 - 2. Mirror (Ro. 3:20).
 - 3. Rule (Ps. 119:105).
- E. The Law can save no one.
 - 1. The tragic thing about the Pharisees was that they thought they could be saved by the Law (Mt. 19:20).
 - 2. Because no one can keep the Law perfectly (Jas. 2:10).
 - 3. The Law shows only the wrath of God (Ga. 3:10).
 - 4. It leads to despair (Ro. 7:9; Judas; Cain).
 - 5. It produces contrition (2 Sm. 12:13; Ac. 2:37; Ga. 3:24).

Let us thank God for His Law and seek to live by it. But let us not make the Pharisees' mistake of thinking we can be saved by it. Let us rather repent of our sins, confessing with the publican: "God be merciful to me, the sinner."

Transition: The Pharisees asked an important question of religion, but not the ultimate question. Jesus asked that one in order to bring them to faith.

II. What think ye of Christ?

- A. The Pharisees were quick to answer: "The son of David."
 - 1. The truth was plainly written in the Old Testament (Is. 9:7; Mt. 21:9).
 - 2. But they expected a Messiah who would be no more than a man, only a political Messiah (Jn. 6:15).
- B. To lead them to a saving knowledge Jesus asks: "If David then called him Lord, how he is his Son?"
 - 1. Jesus is indeed David's Son, true man, except for sin (Lk. 1:35).
 - 2. But He is also true God (Jn. 1:1-14; Lk. 1:35).
 - 3. He is God and man in one person (Col. 2:9).
- C. The personal union is important to man's salvation.
 - 1. As the God-man, Christ put all enemies under His feet.
 - a. He had to be a man to be our substitute (He. 2:14).
 - b. He had to be God to offer a sufficient sacrifice (Ps. 49:7).
 - 2. As the God-man He kept the Law for us (Ga. 4:4) and paid the penalty of our sins (Is. 53:5-6).
 - 3. Now our mortal enemies are conquered: the Law, sin, death, and the devil (Col. 2:15; 1 Cor. 15:55-57).
 - 4. As the God-man He is seated at the right hand of God.
 - a. To make intercession for us (He. 7:25).
 - b. To be the Head of the Church (Eph. 1:22).
 - c. To be worshipped by men and angels (Re. 5:12).

Christ did not win the Pharisees, and finally He could only weep over Jerusalem. May He not have to weep over us. Let us continue in faith to worship Him as true God begotten of the Father from eternity and also true man, our Savior and our King.

THE NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MATTHEW 9:1-8

Verse 1: Jesus had returned to Capernaum. His presence and preaching had gathered a large crowd (cf. Mk. and Lk.) Verse 2: "Their" faith includes "his" faith. Jesus deals with the sin before the sickness! Verse 3: Since it was not the Sabbath, the scribes and Pharisees were forced to employ another plan of attack against Jesus. They realized that by claiming authority to forgive sin, Jesus was claiming divinity. From their point of view, that was blasphemy. Verse 4: Jesus' divinity also becomes apparent at this point of the account. But also impressive in His compassion for those who were rejecting Him. He wants them to believe. Verse 5: Jesus combines simple logic with divine power. It is a rhetorical question. The answer is obvious. "Anyone can say, 'Your sins are forgiven.' But visual evidence will either verify or refute the statement, 'Rise and walk.' Then if I can do the harder, must you not believe that I have done the 'easier'?" Verse 6: Here becomes manifest the purpose of the miracle. It is not done purely out of compassion for the paralytic. Its goal is to convince the unbelievers of Jesus' own authority to forgive sins — His divinity. Verse 8: The miracle was effective . . . at least for some.

One unique feature of this particular miracle account is the great emphasis on the forgiveness of sins: man's need of it and Jesus' authority to provide it. Forgiveness of sins is mentioned explicitly three times (vv. 2, 5, and 6) and implicitly once (v.8). The following outline is built around this unique feature of the text.

The problem is that it is easy for us Christians to lose sight of the most important aspects of life. Satan loves to confuse Christians as regards their life priorities. Predominant worldly attitudes provide him with an effective resource.

The goal of the sermon is to instill in the believer a fresh awareness of the most important and basic aspects of human existence.

Life Priorities: A Christian Perspective

- I. Our greatest problem is sin — in spite of our amoral society (v. 2).
 - A. It was for the paralytic.
 1. He had other problems (paralysis).
 2. But Jesus showed the priority of his sin by dealing with it first.
 - B. It is for us.
 1. We have many other problems (sickness, depression, loneliness, etc.).
 2. But they are only symptoms of the big problem.
 - a. Sin is the root of temporal problems.
 - b. Sin is the cause of eternal separation from God.
- II. Our greatest helper is Jesus — in spite of our man-centered society (vv. 3-7).
 - A. He was for the paralytic.
 1. The paralytic had other helpers (his four friends).
 2. But only Jesus could give him what he needed most.
 - a. Jesus claimed this authority with His words (v.6).
 - b. He demonstrated this authority with His deeds (v.7).
 - B. He is for us.
 1. We have other helpers (parents, teachers, pastors, counsellors, etc.).
 2. But only Jesus has dealt with other greatest problem — sin.
 - a. By means of His perfect life.
 - b. By means of His sacrificial death.
 - c. By means of His victorious resurrection.
- III. Our greatest blessing is forgiveness — in spite of our materialistic society (v.2).

- A. It was for the paralytic.
 1. He had other blessings (physical health).
 2. But forgiveness was his new power source ("Take courage").
- B. It is for us.
 1. We have other blessings (freedoms of democracy, spouse, leisure time, etc.).
 2. But only forgiveness provides what we need most.
 - a. The strength to deal with temporal problems.
 - b. The assurance of eternal life with God.

PWB

THE TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MATTHEW 22:1-14

V.1: "them" refers to the disciples and others. Mark says the Pharisees left after the withering parable of Matthew 21. "Answered": This word often does not signify a response. It means, "took occasion to observe," here concerning the schemes of His enemies. This parable is like the parable of the Great Supper (Lk. 14), but is spoken earlier and in a different locality. V.2: *Gamous* refers to marriage festivities lasting several days. V.3: In the East the original invitation is followed by reminders (Est. 6:14). "His servants": Here we are to think of the prophets and John the Baptist. "Them that were bidden" are the Jews (Ro. 9:4). "They would not come" is, literally, "they did not wish to come." V.4: "Other servants" may refer to the Apostles and to the seventy. "My dinner" refers to the lighter mid-day meal which began the festivities. The blessings of the Kingdom are compared to a feast (Mt. 8:11; Lk. 22:30). V.5: "They made light of it": This is a case of studied insolence and insult. These people were careless and indifferent, busy with worldly concerns (Lk. 16:14). One guest was a landed proprietor. The second was a busy trader. V.6: Other guests were actively hostile, like the Scribes and Pharisees. "Took his servants": Cf. Ac. 4:3; 9:2; 12:4; 5:4; 19:19; 16:23. "Slew them": Ac. 7:48; 12:2. V.7: "His armies": Think of the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 by Titus and his legions. The tares shall be gathered by the angels and cast into the fire. V.8: The guests were "not worthy" because they rejected the gracious call (Ac. 13:46-47). V.9: "The highways" is, literally, "the partings of the ways, places where roads met beyond the city limits." Many would pass through such places. "As many as ye shall find": The invitation is no longer exclusively for the Jews (Ac. 8:5.38; 10:28.48; 13:46). "Bad and good": The visible Church contains a mixed company (Mt. 13). "Guests" is, literally, "recliners at meal." V.11: "To see" is, literally, "to gaze at intently." "Wedding garment": An Oriental custom was to present each guest invited with a wedding garment. At any rate, this man wanted to come on his own terms, without faith. V.12: "Speechless" is, literally, "muzzled, tongue-tied." His silence condemned him. V.13: God will lay bare man's deceit, if not before, then on the day of judgment. V.14: "Few are chosen" because some refuse, some are open enemies, and some want to come into the Kingdom without the garment of Christ's righteousness. Luther: "One of the two it must be: either receive the Gospel and believe and be saved, or do not believe and be condemned eternally."

Introduction: When you receive a wedding invitation, you rejoice. You consider it an honor to be invited, and you look forward to sharing the hour of joy with the bride and groom.

To refuse an invitation is a serious breach of etiquette; it insults the couple and deprives you of sharing in the joys of the wedding. All this is true also in the spiritual realm. Let us reflect upon this as we hear God's invitation.

Come to the Wedding

- I. Because a gracious God invites.
 - A. The king prepares a marriage feast for his son.
 1. There are provisions enough for a week of celebration.
 2. He extends his invitations far and wide.
 - B. Like this king, God has prepared a wedding feast.
 1. He provided for the world of sinners forgiveness, life, and salvation.
 2. He did this at a tremendous cost: the life and death of His own Son.
 - C. Like the king, God invites men to share in the feast of grace.
 1. He invites those who are by nature His enemies.
 2. He repeats his invitation: "Come to the wedding."
 3. We accept by repentance and faith.

Application: Come to the wedding. Take in faith the treasures of God's grace: the forgiveness of your sin, eternal life in Christ. Let no one think that he is excluded. Come to the wedding.

- II. Because refusal brings dire consequences.
 - A. The attitude of men toward the king's invitation. You would think that all would accept, but
 1. Some refused outright.
 2. Some were preoccupied.
 3. Some treated the messengers meanly.
 4. One insulted the host by being attired in his own wedding garment.
 - B. Throughout history many have responded to the invitation in the same way as those in the text.
 1. Some simply refuse: "O Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together . . . and ye would not."
 2. Some are pre-occupied: they have no time for God; the rich fool.
 3. Some are moved to anger: persecutions throughout history.
 4. Some want to come to God on their own terms: the do-it-yourself generation.
 - C. All of these suffer the same fate.
 1. They suffer loss of heaven.
 2. They suffer eternal damnation.
 3. They have only themselves to blame.

Application: what a solemn warning. "Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your heart." When God invites: "Come to the wedding," may your answer be:

Just as I am without one plea
 But that Thy blood was shed for me,
 And that thou bid'st me come to Thee,
 O Lamb of God, I come, I come.

HJE

THE TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: JOHN 4:46-54

The nobleman who came to Jesus showed remarkable faith. He trusted the promise when Jesus said of his son, who was about to die, "Your son will live." He believed without, "signs and wonders", a requirement typical of the Galileans

(cf. Luke 4:23ff.). Upon the word of Jesus, the nobleman confidently was proceeding on his way when he was met by his servants who relayed the good news of his son's recovery- "that his son was doing nicely." The ultimate result of this man's faith in Jesus was that "he and his whole household believed", i.e., they acknowledged Jesus as Savior and devoted themselves to Him.

He Brought His Concern to Jesus and Left It There

- I. The nobleman brought his concern to Jesus.
 - A. The nobleman had a concern.
 1. A sick child-because of infirmities about to die.
 2. Something that we can identify with.
 3. A very difficult burden to bear.
 - B. He brought his concern to Jesus.
 1. All his other resources, which must have been considerable, were useless.
 2. Through the other miracles of Jesus he had become acquainted with Christ.
 3. He turned to Jesus, the only source of help.
 - C. Jesus seemed to rebuke him.
 1. Jesus said, "Except you see signs and wonders you will not believe."
 2. The people of Nazareth were well known for being "sign seekers" (Lk. 4:23ff.).
 3. Jesus' apparent rebuke was intended to test motives and purify faith.
 4. There are those today who are more interested in "signs and wonders" than in a personal relationship with Jesus Christ.
- II. He left his concern with Jesus.
 - A. Jesus sent him away with the word of promise.
 1. He went with the promise that his son would live.
 2. The nobleman believed without "signs and wonders."
 - B. His faith was vindicated.
 1. "As he was going down", his servants met him with good news.
 2. The son "began doing nicely" at the time when Jesus spoke the promise, "about the seventh hour."
 - C. Jesus' ultimate purpose was accomplished.
 1. The nobleman and his whole household believed, i.e., they acknowledged Jesus as Savior and devoted themselves to Him.
 2. The more significant "healing" took place.

NHM

THE TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MATTHEW 18:23-35

We will recall that in parable preaching the *tertium*, or "point of comparison" of the parable, is to govern its treatment. In this particular parable, the Lord Himself articulates for us in verse 35 the *tertium*, "So also my heavenly Father will do to every one of you if you do not forgive your brother from your heart." There is a connection between this parable of "The Unmerciful Servant" and the parable of "The Pharisee and the Publican." The connection lies in this, that pharisaic self-righteousness and contempt of others may easily lead to unforgiving and unmerciful conduct, which is utterly incompatible with a sense of one's own need of divine mercy and forgiveness. The parable follows the exhibition of a form of self-righteousness which would keep score of how often

we should forgive, being unmindful or forgetful of our own need of unconditional and unlimited forgiveness at the hands of our God. It is in the exercising of our own forgiving spirit that we reflect God's great mercy and grace in dealing with us and we give evidence of our faith in the forgiveness of sins.

The Forgiven are Forgiving

I. Our Forgiveness.

A. We are called to give an account before God.

1. The day of reckoning can no longer be put off.
2. Before the King we are unmasked.
3. The enormity of our debt and sin is realized.

B. The hopelessness of our situation is brought home.

1. There is no way in which the debt can be repaid.
2. Even our best effort could not meet the minimum of what our God demands.
3. Our only recourse is to cast ourselves upon the mercy of our God.

C. God's forgiveness is complete.

1. God's declaration of forgiveness is full and complete-on account of Jesus Christ.
2. God's forgiveness is unconditional.

II. Our Forgiving.

A. We are to keep on forgiving, as God keeps on forgiving us.

1. Factors that limit our forgiving of others are
 - a. Pride.
 - b. Self-righteousness.
 - c. Unmerciful attitudes.
2. Has God ever said to us, "So many times, but no more"?

B. Failure to forgive undercuts our faith in the reality of the forgiveness of sins.

1. This removes the possibility of healing and wholeness.
2. This ultimately brings down upon us the judgement of God.

C. We are forgiving because God's forgiveness changes us.

NHM

THE TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY: MATTHEW 22:15-22

It was a strange alliance, to say the least — this newly formed coalition between representatives of the fiercely nationalistic Pharisees and a party of Herodians who accepted the house of Herod as the rightful rulers of Palestine. It was their mutual hatred of Jesus of Nazareth that forged this temporary alliance. The question posed, "Should one pay taxes or refuse?" was intended to entrap. We bear in mind that the accepted view at that time was that the right of coinage implied the authority to level taxes and so constituted evidence of *de facto* government and one's duty to submit to it. Christ's response: "pay off" or do "your duty" to Caesar, and "what your duty" is to God, do that. Edersheim says: "It answers for all time that Christ's Kingdom is not of this world; a true theocracy is not inconsistent with submission to the secular power in things that are really its own; . . . The state is divinely sanctioned and religion is divinely sanctioned, and both are equally the ordinance of God."

Our Duty to God and Government

I. Render to Caesar that which is Caesar's.

- A. This was a question of entrapment, i.e., an attempt to elicit some

- remark which could be turned into an accusation against Jesus.
1. The people who posed the question were allied against Jesus.
 2. The payment of taxes constituted evidence of government and the duty to submit to it.
- B. Jesus Christ reminds us that government is ordained by God (cf. Rom. 13:1-7).
1. The type of government is beside the point.
 2. The quality of government is not germane.
 - a. Government is of God and is, in and of itself, not evil.
 - b. We take issue with those who would view all government as satanic.
 3. Respect and obedience to government is enjoined.
 - a. There are no conditions here.
 - b. We are to render or pay our duty to Caesar in the things that are his.
- II. We are to render to God that which is His.
- A. We are summoned into a new relationship with God, by God.
1. Through the redemptive act of Christ we are reconciled to God.
 2. And in faith we live the new life which is ours in Christ.
- B. We are to render unto God the things that belong to Him.
1. We are called and set aside to live the Christ-like life in all that it entails.
 2. From this text we also conclude that among the duties we are to pay to God as Christians is to take seriously our duty to the government under which we live. (cf. 1 Pe. 2:13-17).
 - a. More prayer for it.
 - b. More personal and active involvement in it.
 3. Obedience to human governments, however, is not a blind obedience.
 - a. Obedience to law is not tantamount to supporting corruption, and wrong-doing.
 - b. In point of fact, because something is "legal," does not make it right or moral or permissible for a child of God, e.g., divorce, abortion, alternative life-styles.
 4. "Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the emperor" (1 Pe. 2:17).
- C. Thank God that His forgiveness in Christ avails also to cover our sins of unfaithfulness and neglect against the government which He has ordained.

NHM

**THE TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY:
MATTHEW 9:20-22 (LUKE 8:43-48)**

The Gospel holds before us two miracle accounts, "The Recovery of the Woman" and "The Raising of Jarius' Daughter." We consider in this study and outline only the miracle of the recovering of the woman. The disease was of long standing. The text tells us twelve years. We can be sure that this woman had tried every remedy. The Talmud lays down no fewer than eleven cures for affliction. Some of these cures could be quite effective; some were merely superstitious remedies. The real remedies of the physicians as well as the superstitious remedies only served to leave the woman disillusioned and in virtual despair. Yet the more

acute tragedy of her illness was that, according to Jewish law, it made her unclean. This meant she could never attend a synagogue service. She could not associate with other people, sit on their chairs, etc., because to do so would render them unclean. It short, she was cut off from all religious and social life. In addition to her pain and trouble, due to her illness she also had to bear the loneliness of being shut out from the worship of God and from the society of her friends and even of her family. Still this woman had faith, but it was such that it threatened to run over into superstition. It was a faith that needed to be called forth, purified, and perfected. The source of power was not the garment, but the Christ. The healing came not from touching the fringe, but from coming into personal contact with Jesus Christ.

In Her Seemingly Hopeless Plight the Woman Turned in Faith to Jesus

I. The plight of the woman was seemingly hopeless.

A. The woman was in a sad state.

1. It was in part physical. Her pain and suffering were of a long duration.
2. Her illness made her, according to Jewish law, unclean.
 - a. Thus she was cut off from religious services.
 - b. She was cut off from the society of her friends and even of her family.

B. Her plight was apparently hopeless.

1. No physician had helped.
2. All other remedies had failed.
3. The only recourse she had was to turn to that Jesus who was at hand.

II. She turned in faith to Jesus.

A. A faith that Jesus called forth.

1. She cannot remain anonymous in the crowd.
2. Jesus actively seeks her out.
3. She acknowledges and makes confession.

B. A faith that Jesus purified.

1. Hers was a faith that appeared to border on superstition.
2. Jesus lead her to realize that the healing came not from the touch of the garment, but from coming into contact with Jesus Christ Himself.

C. A faith that Jesus perfected.

1. Not only was she healed physically.
2. But, more importantly, her faith had made her whole. She had found spiritual health through faith in the redeeming love of Jesus Christ as her Savior.

NHM

Book Reviews

I. Biblical Studies

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH. By William Henry Green. Introduction by Ronald F. Youngblood. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. xviii and 184 pages. Paper. \$4.95

Baker Book House which has been issuing many out of print classics has reprinted from the 1895 edition, published by Charles Scribner's Sons a book which many regard as the *magnum opus* of William Henry Green, Professor of Oriental Languages and the Old Testament in Princeton Theological Seminary. In the centenary year of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (1878) Baker has reissued the valid conservative criticisms of the arguments advanced by Wellhausen upon which the so-called Wellhausen Theory rests. Green wrote this volume "to show, as briefly and compactly as possible, that the faith of all past ages in respect to the Pentateuch has not been mistaken." In this six-chapter book Green shows that the Pentateuch is the "basis or foundation" of the entire Old Testament (chapter 1, pp. 1-18), that it has one theme, "which is treated with orderly arrangement and upon a carefully considered plan suggestive of a single author" (chapter 2, pp. 18-30), that its author was Moses; that the various forms of opposition to Mosaic authorship are in error; and that the hypotheses concerning the composite nature of the Pentateuch are baseless (chapter 3, pp. 31-58; chapter 4, pp. 59-133). Green concluded his book by defending the genuineness of the Pentateuch's laws against the development hypothesis and by showing how this hypothesis is radically unbiblical.

Professor Ronald Youngblood of Bethel Seminary, St. Paul, in the introduction has given an excellent survey of the literature which has been published since the appearance of Wellhausen's *Prolegomenon*. The Wellhausen theory or hypothesis has been attacked by both critical as well as conservative scholarship. Youngblood's 13 page introduction will show that Green was correct in his contentions and criticisms of a theory which has seriously undermined the veracity and reliability of God's inspired Word.

Raymond F. Surburg

AN EVALUATION OF CLAIMS TO THE CHARISMATIC GIFTS. By Douglas Judisch. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978.

Christians are admonished to "test the spirits to see whether they be of God" (1 John 4:1). This is the most helpful book that the reviewer has ever seen, except for Scripture itself, to aid Christians in this test. The volume does what its title indicates that it is aiming to do — to evaluate the claims so widespread today to the possession of the charismatic gifts or, more strictly speaking, the "prophetic gifts" — that is, prophecy itself and those other miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit which serve as the basis of prophecy or its means of authentication. The standard by which the spirits are tested in this monograph is the Word of the Holy Spirit Himself, the Sacred Scriptures.

In this reviewer's estimate (and he has read a great many books on the charismatic gifts and the Chrismatic Movement), Professor Judisch has probed more deeply into the testimony of Scripture concerning the prophetic gifts than any other book on the market. While most authors examine only a few standard portions of the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the New Testament Epistles, Professor Judisch begins with Genesis and pursues his examination of the prophetic gifts down through Revelation. He adds an appendix which appeals to the history of the first four centuries of the Christian era to confirm the teaching of Scripture itself.

After defining precisely what is meant by a "prophecy," namely, the utterance of words "supplied to the speaker by a supernatural source — in the New Testament instances, by the Holy Spirit," Professor Judisch traces this gift in its manifold manifestations throughout the Old and New Testaments. He delineates its primary significance, its source, its form, its content, and its purpose from clear passages of Scripture. False teachings are exposed, while true prophecy is given the divine honor which it demands for itself. After six rigorous and thoroughly Biblical tests have been applied, Professor Judisch demonstrates conclusively that the prophetic powers once bestowed by God upon the prophets and apostles in ancient times are no longer available in the post-apostolic era. Indeed, the author shows from Holy Scripture that God has clearly disclosed a time when prophecy and the other prophetic gifts should cease. This time has come. We now have the complete and authentic revelation of God's justice and grace in the form of the canon of the Old and New Testaments. Hence, in the writings of the apostles and their duly approved co-workers we have God's final utterance for the duration of the New Testament era. Let us hear them! Any modern Christian, therefore, who lays claim to the charismatic gifts is sadly deceiving and hurting himself.

This reviewer is in whole-hearted agreement with the argumentation and conclusions of this book. Professor Judisch first permitted me to read it in manuscript form at a time when a number of students on the campus of our seminary were involved in the so-called Charismatic Movement. After the author presented the essence of the book to the student body in two open forums, many students who had formerly been sympathetic to the Movement were moved by the Biblical testimony of the Holy Spirit to alter their views. Never, they stated, had they heard such a clear exposition of Scripture concerning the proper means of distinguishing the true Spirit from false spirits. The reviewer has subsequently been privileged to test the theses of this monograph, in association with its author, in counselling a number of seminary students and their wives who laid claim to the possession of one or more prophetic gifts, especially the ability to speak in "tongues." In each instance, when these men and women studied the manuscript of this book, they were convicted by the testimony of the Scripture here set forth and realized that they had been misinterpreting their experiences. Again and again, the Word of God presented in this book freed the hearts of those who had been trapped in a quest for illusory spiritual experiences to find new joy in the assurance that God has fully accomplished the salvation of the world through the gift of His only Son, that He has spoken His last word through the Lord Jesus Christ and those who bore witness to His incarnation.

The reviewer, then, commends this book to all who will, with the author, search the Scriptures with an open heart in order to behold the glory of the only-begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth!

W.G. Degner

EXEGETICAL NOTES ON THE ILCW GOSPEL TEXTS: SERIES B (PENTECOST). By Harold H. Buls. Concordia Seminary Bookstore, Fort Wayne, Ind. Paper. \$4.10.

Dr. Buls of the seminary's exegetical department has prepared a set of exegetical notes for pastors who are writing sermons on the basis of Series B of the ILCW texts. The notes are designed to take the preacher quickly into the Greek text in preparation for the Sunday sermon. They are not intended to take the place of commentaries, lexicons, and concordances, but to alert the preacher

to salient points of grammar, meaning, and thought. Very valuable are the comments about contemporary translations and which of these should be avoided if the original meaning of the pericope is to be presented. This is the second printing of *Exegetical Notes*, as they have already proved popular. Two pages are devoted to each Gospel pericope; they are concise and to the point. Requests may be submitted directly to the seminary bookstore. The price indicated covers handling and postage.

David P. Scaer

ISAIAH'S IMMANUEL. By Edward E. Hindson. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Nutley, New Jersey, 1978. 100 pages. Paper. \$2.95.

This volume by Dr. Edward E. Hindson, Professor at Liberty Baptist College, Lynchburg, Virginia, is of the books in *An International Library of Philosophy and Theology*. The book has as subtitle: *A Sign of His Times or the Sign of the Ages?* As the author states in the preface: "The identification of Immanuel has long been debated as many attempts have been made to demonstrate his significance in these passages. Without doubt, his proper identification centers on the interpretation of Isaiah 7:14, where a virgin is said to conceive this child."

Dr. Hindson contends that the virgin birth of Christ is a foundational doctrine of the Christian faith. With the coming of theological rationalism has this historic Christian doctrine been challenged by liberalism, a movement intertwined with the employment of the historical critical method. It is a liberal brand of higher criticism which has rejected the Messianic character of Isaiah 7:14. Critical scholars would interpret Isaiah 7:14 as merely a sign given to Ahaz that a woman at that time was pregnant and after she had given birth to her son would name him Immanuel, God with us. The serious attack on the virgin birth rendering has caused evangelicals to propound the "double fulfillment" view, which Hindson correctly believes is a compromise position.

This work is an expansion of a Master's thesis at Trinity Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois of about ten years ago. Those Christians who believe that under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the prophet Isaiah predicted the virgin birth of Jesus Christ, will find an excellent discussion of all aspects associated by exegetes and commentaries with the interpretation of Isaiah's prophecy to the "house of David."

The author summarized his study in the following words:

The Old Testament context alone makes it clear that a child is to be born of a virgin and will come to rule on the throne of David and His rule shall bring everlasting peace for He is 'God with us.' There is emphatically substantial evidence for interpreting the birth in Isaiah 7:14 as a virgin birth. There is good evidence that the pre-Christian interpreters also saw this passage as a messianic virgin-birth prediction. Therefore, there is the highest degree of possibility that Matthew had every reason to assert the fulfillment of Isaiah's statement in the birth of Christ. Therefore, the New Testament provides an inspired interpretation to guide us. Therefore, we have the highest degree of probability that a direct, single-fulfillment of Isaiah's prediction is in the birth of Christ.

The book has an excellent bibliography which lists many volumes and journal articles dealing with the subject of the virgin birth.

Raymond F. Surburg

ISRAELITE AND JUDEAN HISTORY. Edited by John H. Hayes and J. Maxwell Miller. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1977. 736 pages. Cloth. \$25.00.

This is the most recent volume in Westminster's *The Old Testament Library*, which includes Eichrodt's *Theology of the Old Testament*, commentaries on 18 of the 39 books of the Old Testament by such scholars as von Rad (Genesis and Deuteronomy), Noth (Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers), Soggin (Joshua), Hertzberg (I & II Samuel), Gray (I & II Kings), Weiser (Psalms), McKane (Proverbs), Kaiser (Isaiah 1-12; 13-39), Westermann (Isaiah 40-66), Eichrodt (Ezekiel), Porteous (Daniel), Mays (Amos, Micah, Hosea). A number of these are translations from the German commentaries in *Das alte Testament Deutsch* (Those of von Rad, Noth, Hertzberg, Weiser, Kaiser, Westermann). Soggin has written an *Introduction to the Old Testament* for this Old Testament Library, while Ackroyd a book treating Hebrew thought of the sixth century, entitled *Exile and Restoration*. There is also a book in this series dealing with apocalypics by Russell under the title, *The Method of Jewish Apocalyptic*.

The scholarship represented in these Westminster commentaries and Old Testament aids incorporate the results of the historical-critical method and those wishing to acquaint themselves with the scholarship which employs the results of a radical type of literary criticism, form criticism, tradition criticism will find this series useful.

Israelite and Judean History is a comprehensive volume which surveys Israel and Judean history from the earliest times to the Roman era. Fourteen different American, British and European scholars attempt to "review the currently available sources of information for Israelite and Judean history, to assess the present status of scholarly discussion, and to present a reconstruction of the history of Israel and Judah as understood by some of today's biblical scholars."

Following a chapter, "The History of the Study of Israelite and Judean History," by John H. Hayes, the different periods are treated in turn by scholars selected on the basis of the focus of their scholarly interest. William G. Dever and Malcom Clark contribute a chapter on "The Patriarchal Traditions," "The Joseph and Moses Narratives" are reported on by Dorothy Irvin and Thomas L. Thompson. J. Maxwell Miller writes a chapter on "The Israelite Occupation of Canaan." "The Period of the Judges and the Rise of the Monarchy" is written by A.D. H. Hayes. "The Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom" is described by J. Alberto Soggin. "The Separate States of Israel and Judah" are surveyed by Herbert Donner. "Judah and the Exile" are covered by Bustenay Oded. "The Persian Period" is set forth by Geo. Widengren. "The Hellenistic and Maccabean Periods" are delineated by Peter Schafer. "The Roman Era" is the joint effort of A.R. C. Leaney and Jacob Neusner.

Graduate students and specialists in Biblical history as it relates to the Old Testament period, the intertestamental era and the New Testament will find much (in fact full) bibliographical information scattered throughout the volume, in addition to a bibliography of the major histories of Israel and Judah published during modern times is provided in a separate appendix. The works of reputable conservative scholars are totally ignored, evidencing a prejudice on the part of higher critical scholarship which will not allow deviations from their basic rationalistic positions.

This volume will not doubt serve both as a textbook and a reference work for years to come. The editors of this book are John H. Hayes and J. Maxwell Miller, both Associate Professors of the Candler School of Theology, Emory University.

Raymond F. Surburg

HISTORY, CRITICISM, & FAITH. Edited by Colin Brown, Inter-Varsity Press, England. Available from Inter-Varsity-Fellowship, Box F, Downers Grove, Illinois, 60515. 233 pages. \$4.95. Paper.

This volume contains four explanatory studies by Gordon J. Wenham, F. F. Bruce, R. T. France and Colin Brown. According to the preface these essays by four British evangelical scholars are exploratory in a double sense. Colin informs his readers that the essayists "seek to probe certain crucial areas where history and faith meet. They seek to probe this ground in the light of current critical thinking, and to give a positive, constructive statement of their conclusions."

The areas chosen were the Old Testament, the New Testament and "philosophical questions that arise for a faith that is grounded in history." Dr. Wenham has given a survey of "History and the Old Testament." Two studies deal with "History and the New Testament," one by Professor Bruce, entitled "Myth and History" and the other by Dr. France who examines and defends "The Authenticity of the Sayings of Jesus." The editor of these exploratory essays deals with "History and the Believer," pp. 147-224, the longest of the four contributions.

Wenham has discussed in particular the relationship between Biblical theology and history, methods employed by Old Testament criticism and the bearing of archaeology on the conquest of Canaan. Wenham, lecturer in the Department of Semitic Studies, The Queen's University of Belfast, believes that Christ's teachings about Old Testament issues need not be accepted if they cannot be shown as supportable by the valid conclusions of Biblical critics. Thus he writes: "Though the Christian is committed by the teaching of his Lord to affirming the truth and inspiration of the Old Testament, I do not believe that this means he must believe that every narrative in the Old Testament must necessarily be regarded as a record of a historical event" (p. 33).

Wenham devotes a section of his essay to an evaluation of the different types of criticism utilized by modern critical scholarship, such as textual criticism, source criticism, form criticism, tradition criticism and redaction criticism. Wenham believes that all these are valid forms of interpretation, although he endeavors to point out weaknesses in current assumptions underlying these types of criticism and challenges many conclusions of present-day scholarship.

There is a tendency on the part of so-called British evangelical scholars to try to come to terms with critical Old and New Testament scholarship and make concessions which some years ago some of the older British evangelical scholars would not have done, as may be seen from earlier articles in *The Evangelical Quarterly*, now under the editorship of F. F. Bruce. Bruce has defended the historical-critical method and has adopted positions other conservative scholars would reject. Bruce, together with Pinnock, Berkouwer, Hubbard, Ladd, and others has joined the group who among evangelicals oppose the inerrancy of the Bible, arguing that there are errors and mistakes in the original autographs. The denial of the inerrancy of the Bible goes hand in hand with the adoption of the historical-critical method. How far a scholar goes in the use of the historical-critical method is then a matter of the individual's reason and feelings, dangerous criteria to follow in Biblical interpretation.

Raymond F. Surburg

NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION. ESSAYS IN PRINCIPLES AND METHODS. Edited by I. Howard Marshall. Paternoster Press, Exeter, England, 1977. 406 pages. 6 Pounds net.

In this volume seventeen well-known New Testament scholars have cooperated to provide a guide for New Testament students as well as others interested in the literature and theology of the New Covenant. These essays are wide-ranging but concise. The editor in his forward states the reason for the publication of these essays, most of which are written by British scholars, although three of the contributors are American is as follows: "Although the interpretation of the New Testament has been the subject of much discussion and offer a comprehensive and practical guide to the task of interpretation. It was with this lack in mind that the New Testament study group of the Tyndale Biblical Research took up the theme at its meeting in July 1973" (p. 8). These studies now appear after nearly five years in a revised form.

The contributors and the editor realize that to have dealt completely with all the areas attempted would have required a number of volumes, however these scholars hope that their essays are sufficiently succinct and comprehensive to present for the students a basic understanding and grasp of what is involved in the interpretation of the New Testament.

Today there exist differing schools of thought on practically every area of New Testament study; sometimes these schools represent positions which are radically different from each other. Marshall informs his readers that the contributors of this book "have written as conservative evangelicals who combine a high regard for the authority of Holy Scripture "with the belief that we are to study it with the full use of our minds."

New Testament Interpretation is structured around four major areas: Part I-The Background to Interpretation. F. F. Bruce has given a history of New Testament study, while Graham N. Stanton has written on the presuppositions in New Testament criticism. In these articles the writers have submitted their own as well as the presuppositions of other scholars.

Part II concerns itself with "The Use of Critical Methods of Interpretation." In this part eight different subjects are treated and evaluated. Anthony C. Thiselton discourses on "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation," Donald Guthrie on "Questions of Introduction," John W. Drane on "The Religious Background," I. Howard Marshall on "Historical Criticism," David Wenham on "Source Criticism," Stephen H. Travis on "Form Criticism," David R. Catchpole on "Tradition History," and Stephen S. Smalley, on "Redaction Criticism."

Part III. deals with "The Task of Exegesis." In this area there are to be found the following three contributions: E. Earle writes on "How the New Testament Uses the Old," Ralph H. Martin expiates on "Approaches to New Testament Studies," and R. T. France discusses "Exegesis in Practice: Two Examples."

Part IV. concerns itself with the fact that New Testament interpretation should not only be occupied with setting forth the bare meaning of the text, but that the interpreted text must affect the readers attitudes and understanding. In this area of application the following have written: James D. G. Dunn, "Demythologizing-The Problem of Myth in the New Testament," Anthony C. Thiselton on "The New Hermeneutic," Robin Nixon on "The Authority of the New Testament," and John Goldingay on "Expounding the New Testament."

Norman Hillyer, formerly librarian, Tyndale House, Cambridge has furnished an excellent bibliography. Indexes of New Testament passages cited, and authors quoted plus a general index enhance the usefulness of this significant contribution to Biblical studies.

The careful and knowledgeable reader will discover a lack of unanimity among the essayists represented in this volume. While the contributors are reputed to share the same general outlook, there are points in which some contributors disagree with each other. The book, the editor assures his readers does not carry any sort of *imprimatur*. Each writer was responsible only for his views. Marshall believes that the plurality of opinions found in these different essays is justified since they are the first attempts for the most part to deal with issues not heretofore raised in conservative circles. Hypotheses and conjectures are found in these contributions, which no doubt will cause discussion and help to a fuller comprehension of the truth.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE ROLE RELATIONSHIP OF MEN AND WOMEN. By George W. Knight, III. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. 76 pages. Paper. \$3.95

Knight, a professor at Covenant Seminary, St. Louis, offers a forceful Biblical argument against the ordination of women pastors. His treatise is targeted to the conservative or evangelical churches in which this issue is still up for discussion. Most large mainline churches have officially endorsed the practice. Proponents of the ordination of women must either work with a restricted doctrine of Scriptural infallibility or relegate Paul's directives in this matter to culturally conditioned commands, according to Knight. After outlining the current debate in the first chapter, the author gives an exegesis of the pertinent passages, I Timothy 2:11-15, I Corinthians 11:1-16, and 14:33b-38. Central to Knight's thesis is that while male and female are equal heirs of salvation, the submission of the female to the male, as outlined in Genesis, remains valid in the home and church organization. This position is of course the same one adopted by the Missouri Synod. The application of this principle to various church organizations, including boards, voters assemblies, and conventions would make a lively topic of discussion. Knight's writing style is well suited for the lay audience. The more intricate exegetical arguments are placed in the footnotes. Complete Biblical and subject indices makes the treatise quite usable in adult study groups. Lutherans will not want to get involved in Knight's distinction between preaching and ruling elders (pp.63f.), a system which Presbyterians find binding.

This fine treatise might be rounded out in a second edition with a discussion of the imagery of Christ as the bridegroom and the church as the bride. Such imagery would, however, suggest a certain ecclesiology. With the major Protestant and Lutheran church bodies ordaining women pastors, this issue will plague the Missouri Synod for at least another generation. Knight's book brings the data compactly together.

David P. Scaer

II. Theological — Historical Studies

THE BATTLE FOR THE GOSPEL. By Marvin W. Anderson. Baker Book House, 1978. 136 pages. Paper. \$4.95.

This study by the professor of Church History at Bethel Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota, deals with the Bible and the Reformation, 1444-1589. Anderson claims that it was E. Harris Harbinson's *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation* which inspired him to give serious study to the Biblical scholars of

the period between 1444 and 1589. The volume is a product of graduate study in Europe and a sabbatical leave at Cambridge University with Professor Rupp. *The Battle for the Bible* purports to present a synoptic view of the Bible and the Reformation.

Anderson has effectively shown that the issues of faith, which were of primary concern to the people of the sixteenth century, were not just the sole domain of pedants or dusty theologians. People at all levels of society battled over the interpretation of the Bible. The debates that occurred were not merely word battles but sometimes people had to suffer persecution and even death for their particular views.

The Bethel Seminary professor spotlights two subjects, which even in the twentieth century, are still of considerable interest and importance namely, the Bible and the Reformation. This well-documented study concentrates particularly upon the role the Bible played in the teaching and piety of several fifteenth and sixteenth century scholars. The fifteenth-century humanists, Luther and his colleagues, Calvin and his associates, and finally the response of the Catholic reformers to the efforts of Lutherans, Zwinglians and Calvinists are treated.

Chapter I discusses the humanists and their attitude and use of the Bible; Chapter II, treats of Word and Spirit, as they were understood at Wittenberg; Chapter III deals with Reformed Clarity and Certainty; and Chapter IV discusses the Pauline Renaissance and the Catholic Crisis. A brief concluding chapter summarizes the main issues as they centered around "God and Spirit."

Relative to Luther Anderson wishes his readers to believe that Luther was not concerned with the inerrancy of the Word of God and cites Lutheran Scholars, committed to the historical critical method, in support of this position. Thus Anderson appears to be lining himself up with that school of thought in current neoevangelicalism which believes the Bible is errant. In his study Anderson explains: "Commentary, confession, and controversy show how lively and enlightened the sixteenth-century Church became . . . Scripture was the mighty power whereby God shaped His faithful servants after the very fashion of Christ."

The twentieth-century is facing a serious battle about the Bible as the infallible and inerrant Word of God. One's attitude toward the Word of God could ultimately also determine how a person understands the true nature of the Gospel.

Raymond F. Surburg

GOSLAR UND DER SCHMALKALDISCHE BUND, 1527/31-1547. By Gundmar Blume. Heft 26, Beitrage zur Geschichte der Stadt Goslar. Im Auftrag der Stadt Goslar und des Geschichts- und Heimatsschutzvereins Goslar e. V. Herausgegeben von Werner Hillebrand. Goslar 1969. 175 pages. Cloth.

Goslar, an imperial city, joined the Smalcald League in 1531. In the progress of Protestantism in North Germany it is apparent that Goslar would play a special role. The elector at Celle, Ernst der Bekenner, was introducing the Reformation with considerable vigor. When Kloster Wienhausen would not accept the Reformation, he sent knights with grappling hooks to pull the walls down. At Goslar, fearing an attack by Henry the Younger, the leaders of the city destroyed the churches and cloisters outside the wall in 1527 to prevent them from giving support to Henry. In 1528 Nikolaus von Amsdorf came to introduce the Reformation after several previous efforts had failed. The city council waited until 1532 before they consented to the burgers and joined the Smalcald League.

The story has been told by Edward Crusius (1842) in eight pages. Paul Jonas

Meier offered a brief sketch in 1926. General Reformation histories have been inadequate. With the exception of brief essays the treatment of the northern cities is lacking, including Braunschweig, Einbeck, Goettingen, Hamburg, Hannover, Luebeck, Magdeburg and Minden. Studies of the major princes are lacking also, though Adolf Wrede makes a good beginning *re* Ernst the Confessor, signer of the CA.

Goslar sent Dr. Dellinghausen to Augsburg in 1530. On his way there he escaped an attack, but on the return trip he fared badly. Even in Augsburg he was shadowed. Near Bad Homburg he was captured and taken to a castle Blankenau on the Weser. He offered 4,000 to von Falkenberg as ransom, but was turned over to Duke Henry the Younger, who incarcerated him at Schoeningen. After two years in a dark dungeon he was ill. The ducal medico offered him an herb in a drink. The duke was charged with poisoning. They buried him secretly. In 1542 the victorious Smalcald knights disinterred him, still wearing his black garment and his weapon harness. They buried him honorably in the parish church . . . The story is told with great attention to detail.

Otto F. Stahlke

GREAT WORDS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Donald Coggan. Abingdon, Nashville, 1978. 128 pages. Cloth. \$5.95.

The author of this volume is the 101st Archbishop of Canterbury. He is reputed to be one of the world's great church leaders, and a man possessed of exceptional evangelical warmth. In this book he discusses the following important words of Christian theology: 1) Humanity, 2) God, 3) Jesus, 4) Church, 5) Love, 6) Faith, 7) Grace, 8) Peace, 9) Life, 10) Suffering, 11) Anxiety, 12) Discipleship, 13) Guidance, 14) Prayer, 15) Bible.

The Contents of Coggan's book is based on a series of messages delivered on the Protestant Hour Radio program. The publishers believe that these 15 chapters probe the depth of the meanings of these key words in the vocabulary of the Christian faith. Bishop Robinson, Bishop of Western New York, says in the preface:

In this book, Archbishop Coggan presents these eternal truths with clarity and insight. He makes the old new. His simple words reflect his own depth of faith. He teaches us the Christian faith as he wears his high office with grace and humility.

The book is designed to help many people who are religious illiterates to plumb the depths of the Judeo-Christian faith. This reviewer found these word studies interesting but at the same time believes that the eminent Archbishop of Canterbury did not do full justice to many of them. The Biblical God is the Triune God — that is what the Three Ecumenical Creeds of Christendom confess, but no hint of this foundational truth is found in the opening study treating of the God of the Bible. The chapter dealing with Christ is not completely adequate because the deity of Christ while not denied is not explicitly set forth. The phrase that God was in Christ does not appear to mean for Coggan what it means for those who believe John 1:1: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God *and the Word was God.*" While Coggan does frequently speak of Jesus Christ, and even asserts that Jesus is more than an example, that He is the Word of God, the Son of God, the Savior, he does not state how Jesus is Savior or makes clear the need for people to accept Christ as personal Savior in order to have eternal life in heaven. The Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, is generally ignored and yet Scripture tells us that no man can call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Ghost. Coggan claims that often the Greek "Kyrios," used of Christ, just means "sir." That we question!

The fifteenth word discussed is "The Bible." Coggan claims that the Bible is a means of grace because it speaks about God (p. 119). Indeed he claims "this is the main burden of its message." Jesus, who was God, stated that unless a person believed in Him, accepted Him as Lord and Master that person could not have eternal life. The Eucharist for Coggan appears to be more of a symbolical action that a true means of grace, in which by means of bread and wine the communicant receives the very body and blood of Christ slain on Calvary's hill.

Raymond F. Surburg

IN A VALLEY OF THIS RESTLESS MIND. By Malcolm Muggeridge. Illustrations by Papas. William Collins and World Publishing Company, Cleveland, Ohio, 1978. 176 pages. Cloth. \$8.95.

Malcolm Muggeridge is well-known to the readers of the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY* as a television personality (I first recall learning of him through his appearances on the Jack Paar program in the 1960's; others may associate him with his BBC specials on Paul and the Christian saints), a popular author (of such volumes as *JESUS REDISCOVERED*, *PAUL: ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY*, and *A THIRD TESTAMENT*), and a celebrated convert to Christianity (his face was on the cover of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* the week in which I wrote this review). In his "Introduction" to *IN A VALLEY OF THIS RESTLESS MIND* Muggeridge comments on the false impression all of this notoriety has caused:

It is generally assumed, by those who know me only through the media, especially television, that for the greater part of my life my attitudes were wholly hedonistic and my ways wholly worldly, until, in my sixties, I suddenly discovered God and became preoccupied with other-worldly considerations. (p. 13)

This is not the case. For several decades Malcolm Muggeridge had been seeking God. No where is this made more evident than in the volume *IN A VALLEY OF THIS RESTLESS MIND*, first written in 1938 and now, forty years later, reissued to the general public through the courtesy and insight of the editorial staff of William Collins and World Publishing Company.

In the late 1930's Jonathan Cape of London had commissioned Malcolm Muggeridge to do a "systematic study of contemporary religious attitudes and practices . . . in the manner of William James's famous work, *VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE*." Muggeridge, however, produced something entirely different. *IN A VALLEY OF THIS RESTLESS MIND* is a difficult book to classify. *THE SYDNEY BULLETIN* said it "partakes intermittently of the qualities of the novel, the essay, and the book of thematically-linked short stories. In music, it would probably be called a symphonic poem." What we find in these 176 pages, wistfully illustrated by Papas, is "the sensitive picture of one man's journey of despair through the jungle of modern panaceas." As Augustine was driven by Sin, Luther by Guilt, Muggeridge was possessed by what he calls "Lust" ("Of the Seven Deadly Sins, Lust is the only one which makes any serious appeal to the Imagination, as distinct from the Will, eroticism being a sort of *ersatz* transcendentalism which can easily be mistaken for the genuine article."). Writing as Motley ("the womanizer"), Wraithby ("the anti-hero"), and Flammonde ("the returned traveller from over the hill"), Malcolm Muggeridge describes his search for salvation through the 1930's — ranging from High Church Anglicanism to an experiment in Communalism (complete with free love), from psychiatry (with Dr. Appleblossom) to Free Church Christianity — to discover that only when Lust is overcome, can Life begin (for that is "the truth of the Apostle Paul's saying that to be carnally minded is death and to be spiritually minded life and peace"). For Muggeridge, the cross, the sign of death,

was the source of life, for it was love and conquering Sin (Guilt, Lust — "Sin has as many varieties as Heinz beans, but the essential ingredients tend to be always the same. The Devil, a con-man of con-men, finds the same old formula goes on working from generation to generation and from age to age").

A modern-day PILGRIM'S PROGRESS (some wags called it PILGRIM'S REGRESS), IN A VALLEY OF THIS RESTLESS MIND first was published on the eve of World War II, a child born out of season, and the freshly printed volumes were consumed in the German blitz of London. Collins-World is to be commended for bringing this book, long out of print, to the attention of today's reading public. Though set in the world of the late 1930's (ranging from England to France to Switzerland and Egypt), the spiritual pilgrimage here portrayed is timeless, one that rings true for any generation, a fire, as it is, with the passion of an Augustine, the intensity of a Bunyan, and the vision of a Francis. In the late 1970's when a satiated (yet ever restless) West struggles with the enveloping boredom that is the end result of Lust enthroned as the supreme divinity (the PLAYBOY — PENTHOUSE philosophy), this testimony of Malcolm Muggeridge is particularly pertinent. I highly recommend it to the stout of heart, who are not offended at explicit description of sin, and who seek to be effective cures of souls.

C. George Fry

THE MORMON PAPERS. ARE THE MORMON SCRIPTURES RELIABLE? By Harry L. Ropp. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, IL., 60515. 118 pages. Paper. \$2.95.

In this volume, Harry L. Ropp, challenges the authenticity of the Mormon Scriptures. The Church of the Latter-day Saints is one of the fastest growing churches in the United States. In the last ten years they have won one million members and are currently winning new adherents at the rate of 350 per day. Ropp claims that over ninety per cent of the new converts are won from the membership of various denominations. This is largely due to the fact that more and more dark-suited and clean-cut Mormon missionaries are seen in areas where Mormonism has only been known by name.

The purpose of this book is to examine the Mormon's claims to be the true church. In this apologetical volume the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is discussed, whose headquarters are in Salt Lake, Utah and not any of the splinter groups formed after the death of Joseph Smith.

Ropp first discusses the Mormon teachings and compares them with traditional Christianity. Since many believe that the Mormons are Christians, the author convincingly shows that under no circumstances are Mormons Christians, even though they do speak about Jesus Christ. In Chapter 2 he explains the origin of Mormonism and challenges the foundations of their faith. Ropp concentrates on the evidence and the theories for the origin of the Book of Mormon. By various quotations internal inconsistencies are shown among the various writings of Mormonism. Since Mormon apologists have endeavored to support some of their scriptures by the findings of American archaeology, Ropp shows that there is no archaeological evidence whatever to support any of the statements occurring in the Mormon scriptures. The author spent ten years on the examination of original Mormon papers. As a result of his studies, Ropp was able to demonstrate the inauthenticity of key Mormon documents and uncovered major flaws such as Joseph Smith's spurious translation of the Book of Abraham supposedly found in the Mormon scripture, *The Pearl of Great Price*.

In the last chapter the author makes a number of suggestions for those interested in witnessing to Mormons with the goal of winning Mormons to recognize the falsity and erroneous character of Mormonism.

At present Mr. Ropp, with the M.A. degree from Lincoln Christian Seminary is the founder of Mission to Mormons, located at Roy, Utah.

Raymond F. Surburg

CORTES AND MONTEZUMA. By Maurice Collis. Avon Books, New York, 1978. 251 pages. Paper. \$2.50.

The conquest of Mexico by a handful of *conquestidores* has always been one of the great mysteries of history. Maurice Collis, Irish-born, English-educated, British civil servant in India and Burma, has, in his retirement, turned his attention to this issue. Regular readers of the *Quarterly* will find in this paperback (originally published in hardcover in 1954) a readable and reliable introduction to the chief individuals and issues involved in the European occupation of the Aztec Empire. The author rightly centers his attention around the two major actors in the drama — Cortes and Montezuma. Of great value is Collis' emphasis on the role of religion in the conquest — the ardent Catholicism of Cortes and the devoted paganism of Montezuma. Both the Spanish soldier and the Mexican king saw themselves as being literally driven by divine forces beyond their control. I highly recommend this to all who are concerned with Christian faith and life in Latin America in general, in Mexico in particular.

C. George Fry

THE HOLY WAR. By John Bunyan. Moody Press, Chicago, 1978 edition, originally published in 1948. 375 pages. Paper. \$7.95.

This is one of the Wycliffe Classic Series, which include:

Memoirs of McCheyne by Andrew A. Bonar

The Suffering Savior by F. W. Krumacher

Our Lord Prays for His Own by Marcus Rainsford

The Holy War by John Bunyan.

John Bunyan, born in England in 1628, became a Christian through his wife's influence. He began to preach all over England and was jailed for long periods of time for his beliefs. After his release from prison, became pastor of Bedford, a church he served till he died in 1688. Next to *Pilgrims Progress*, the *Holy War* is regarded as the best allegory on the Christian life. *The Holy War* depicts the spiritual warfare between God and Satan for the town of Mansoul. The town of Mansoul represents the world, and more specifically, the individual soul. Diabolus (the Devil) covets God's perfect city, and the resulting attack upon it and its final capture make up one of the most brilliant parts of Bunyan's allegory.

Just as during the past three hundred years *The Holy War* has been an instrument for strengthening the faith of Christians, so present-day Christians will have their faith strengthened through its reading.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE FINAL CONCLAVE. By Malachi Martin. Pocket Books, New York, 1978. 421 pages. Paper. \$2.50.

The San Francisco *Chronicle* predicted that THE FINAL CONCLAVE would "become one of the season's most controversial books." The *Christian Science Monitor* hailed it as "an extraordinarily thought-provoking book." The

Sacramento *Union* felt it was "one of the most important books you'll ever open." Though I usually do not like to parrot other reviewers, in this instance, I simply must. This is a compelling book!

Especially appropriate for the year 1978, the year of three popes. *THE FINAL CONCLAVE* in its first one hundred and twenty-five pages gives a factual report on the papacy of Paul VI. Then beginning with the death of that pontiff, Malachi Martin switches to fiction, describing the various factions contending for leadership in the conclave of cardinals that must select the new pope. Four parties coexist under the papal umbrella of the Roman Church — Traditionalist (longing for the days of Trent), Liberationist (anticipating a rapprochement with Marxism), Progressive (searching for an accommodation with secular, radical, and liberal thought), and Conservative (making change only as necessary). Written before the election of either John Paul I or John Paul II, this book, authored by one intimately acquainted with the operations of the Vatican, remains revelatory and relevant. I highly recommend it as both good fiction (high drama and suspense) as well as fine factual reporting (hard-hitting and no holds barred) by a committed Roman Catholic experiencing personal anguish at the recent developments in his Church.

C. George Fry

THE 12TH PLANET. By Zecharia Sitchin. Avon, New York, 1976. 436 pages. Paper. \$2.50.

I have seen this volume in various sections of bookstores — History, Anthropology, Sociology, Religion, Science Fiction, Literature and even the Occult. Having read it, I can now see why a salesperson would experience some confusion in categorizing *THE 12TH PLANET*. The claim is made that the text is "the product of thirty years of assiduous scholarship." A work of the *van Daniken genre*, the book contends that earth folk are really the creations of the *Nefilim* described in Genesis 6, who were, in fact, "a superior race from Marduk, the 12th planet." Marduk has an irregular orbit around the sun, so it is only seen every 3,600 years. Sitchin claims that he has uncovered the real meaning of both the Old Testament as well as Sumerian, Akkadian, and Assyrian literature and theology. Extremely popular, this "sci fi" revisitation of Genesis will probably continue to sell well, win favorable reviews (*East-West Magazine* called it "one of the most important books on earth's roots ever written; *Library Journal* maintained that it "presents documentation for a radical new theory . . ."), but to this reader it will remain "a cleverly devised myth."

C. George Fry

NICHT SEHEN — UND DOCH GLAUBEN. By Gottfried Wachler. Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, Berlin, 1978. 40 pages. Paperback. —, 80 M.

The author is rektor (president) and professor at the theological seminary of the Lutheran Free Churches in Leipzig, East Germany. This seminary, founded in 1953, became necessary after World War II because of the geographical division of Germany. After 1961, when the infamous Wall was erected by the Communists between the two zones, it became all the more necessary for the Lutheran Free Churches to provide for a continuing supply of ministers through their own seminary. On the occasion of the 25th anniversary celebration, October 21, 1978, it was the privilege of the undersigned, in the name of the faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana, to confer a honorary doctorate on Gottfried Wachler who has played a significant role in behalf of Confessional Lutheran theology both through his teaching and also through his writing.

This little book — costing less than an East German Mark! — illustrates excellently well the clear, incisive argument and style of its author who teaches systematic theology in the small Leipzig seminary. He brings a strong apologetics in behalf of Christian faith. No man can be argued into Christian faith, Wachler recognizes. On the other hand, faith does not stand naively or in a vacuum, without its foundation and evidence. This lies in the Word of God itself, the Gospel of forgiveness, with its power under the Holy Spirit to convert. Wachler nicely sifts between this God-given source of power into faith and the personal testimonies of the “born-again” Christians, who often magnify their “I-have-taken-Jesus-into-my-life” in such a way that the emphasis comes down on the “I” rather than on God’s gracious means of grace, Word and Sacrament. Wachler does not rule out the possible validity of such conversions, but he underscores that then “the signs (of conversion) become more important than the Gospel.” The same risk is there for the Charismatic spirits of our day, as also those who forever seeking after new or additional revelations beyond the prophetic and apostolic Word. Luther, as Wachler shows, put the focus entirely on Word and Sacrament (especially Baptism), beyond which there ought to be no aspiring for divine support for one’s faith.

The book merits wider distribution through a translation into English. Its appeal would serve both clergy and laity.

E. F. Klug

THE WATER THAT DIVIDES: The Baptism Debate. By Donald Bridge and David Phypers. Intervarsity Press, Downers Grove, Ill. 1977. 208 pages. Paper. \$3.95.

A free church minister and a candidate for the Anglican ministry team up to plea for moderation between the advocates of adult believers baptism and infant baptism. About three-quarters of the book traces the problem from the New Testament through church history right up to the modern missionary movements. The authors tip their cards when they come to the Waldensians, a group who practices infant baptism among themselves but baptized those joining their group who previously had been baptized. The final solution is that paedobaptists, those supporting infant baptism, and baptists, those supporting baptism for confessing adults, should live and let live. One restriction is suggested. Paedobaptists should restrict the practice to those church members who give evidence of having true belief. The really ideal compromise would be baptizing four year olds, a solution the authors know would never really satisfy either group.

Though the authors represent two opposing traditions on baptism, they are fundamentally agreed on an awakening type conversion. With such a presupposition, they fail to grasp Luther’s concept of infant faith. Lutherans come out as badly as Catholics. Both paedobaptists and baptists are scored for using the pericopes of Jesus’s blessing the children to support respectively infant baptism and infant dedication. But the authors do not tell us for what purpose these pericopes were included. Was this a sharing of creative love with tiny tots? Tensions between both groups in Great Britain moved the writers to help resolve the tension. Their resolution has only given us new tensions. Intervarsity has provided many outstanding works in New Testament studies. It is regrettable that they have put their stamp of approval on a concept of conversion that is more at home with the Baptists and charismatics. The Missouri Synod founding fathers warned of the synergism of American Protestantism. The warning remains current.

David P. Scaer

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

COMMUNICATING CHRIST CROSS-CULTURALLY. By David J. Hesselgrave. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. 511 Pages. Paper. \$9.95.

Dr. David J. Hesselgrave is Professor of Mission and Director of the School of World Mission and Evangelism at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. In this thorough text Hesselgrave has provided an introduction to missionary communication through the use of a seven-dimension framework: (1) World Views (ways of viewing the world), (2) Cognitive Processes (ways of thinking), (3) Linguistic Forms (ways of expressing ideas), (4) Behavioral Patterns (ways of acting), (5) Social Structures (ways of interacting), (6) Communication Media (ways of channeling the message), and (7) Motivational Sources (ways of deciding). "The serious work of a gifted scholar" (to use the words of Kenneth S. Kantzer of CHRISTIANITY TODAY), this book, COMMUNICATING CHRIST CROSS-CULTURALLY will be of great value to the missionary, the mission-executive, and the missions professor.

C. George Fry

CONCORDIA COLLEGE, FORT WAYNE, INDIANA, 1839-1957. By Herbert George Bredemeier. Fort Wayne Public Library, Fort Wayne, Indiana, 1978. 378 Pages. Cloth \$20.00.

Herbert George Bredemeier is well known in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod as a churchman and educator. A native of Fort Wayne, a graduate of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, with graduate work at Washington University and Indiana University in history, and doctorates from two institutions (L.H.D., Indiana Institute of Technology and L.L.D., Valparaiso University), Dr. Bredemeier served as president of both Concordia College (1945-1957) and Concordia Senior College (1972-1977). Bredemeier, however, is also an author and historian. In this volume he turns his attention to the story of Concordia College, from its inception in 1839 until its incorporation into Concordia Senior College in 1957. What is presented is nothing less than the saga of 118 years of educational service to the Synod by the faculty and staff of Concordia College.

Believing that "history is total human experience," Dr. Bredemeier presents a holistic account of faith and learning at Concordia College, giving attention to "students, faculty, presidents, boards, the curriculum, athletics, student life, economics, religion." The readable and fast-moving text is supplemented with a series of appendices which include a variety of material, ranging from the Charter and By-Laws to sample school songs and athletic contest yells.

To survey more than a century of academic achievement, in an institution that was founded in Missouri but matured in Indiana, and which, in its lifespan occupied sites in three cities (Altenburg, St. Louis, and Fort Wayne), is no easy matter. Background chapters on the Lutheran emigration to America and on the Fort Wayne Lutheran community are helpful. Having established a "sense of place" (in spite of the pilgrim character of the college), a feeling for people is conveyed through a series of biographical vignettes that highlight the character, the career, and the contributions of each of the presidents and many of the representative faculty members. A grasp of the educational process is then provided in chapters on student life, athletics, the military department, the library, finances, the alumni, and the academic program. The result is that one obtains an insight into church-related higher education over a period of eleven decades.

Dr. Bredemeier has done a fine job of investigation (in a variety of oral and written sources in both the English and German languages), narration (especially in the biographical sections, for, in many respects, biography is the most difficult branch of History), and interpretation (honest and faithful, speaking the truth in love). A concluding evaluation of the contribution of Concordia College to church and community is especially helpful.

It was a pleasure to read this book, and it is a privilege to recommend it to all who cherish the history of their Synod and its institutions. As Dr. Bredemeier reminds us, "a church that forgets its history is as a man who loses his memory." Because of this fine book, one part of the Lutheran experience will be remembered and celebrated, to the benefit of posterity as well as to the honor of our ancestors.

C. George Fry

THE WANDERERS: THE SAGA OF THREE WOMEN WHO SURVIVED. By Ingrid Rimland. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1977. 323 Pages. Cloth. \$8.95.

"Gleaned and condensed from the driftage of history," and dedicated to a father "exiled to Siberia in 1941," this first novel by Ingrid Rimland is a saga of the plight of the German-speaking Mennonites of the Ukraine in the twentieth century. First invited into Russia by Czarina Catherine in 1789, the Mennonites initially found religious liberty in that vast eastern land. Colonies of German-speaking Mennonites were established across Eurasia. The beginning of the end came in 1914. The invasion of Russia by Imperial Germany caused the peaceful Mennonites to be regarded as hostile resident aliens rather than as productive neighbors. It is at this juncture that this story begins. One could call it "a twentieth century Exodus account." For the book traces the quest of the Mennonites for a promised land, from Russia to Germany and then to Paraguay.

While the ordeal of the German Mennonites of Russia forms the backdrop to this novel, the focus of the work is on how this drama affected three generations of women — Katya, the matriarch, (1914-1941), living through the traumas of World War I, Revolution, Civil War, and Marxism; Sara, Katya's daughter as the result of rape, (1941-1945), more often the victim of circumstances rather than a conqueror, surviving life under both the Nazi and Soviet Armies, the "Great Trek" from the Ukraine to Germany, the "Battle of Berlin," and resettlement in South America; and Karin, Sara's talented and rebellious daughter, (1946-1957), who feels torn between Mennonite tradition and the need for a new life in secular society, finally resolving the tension by forsaking her people for life in the world.

Definitely adult-fare (and not designed for those who are repelled by

violence), this novel provides an almost numbing introduction to the tragedy and absurdity of the wars and revolutions that swept Central and Eastern Europe from 1914 until 1945. Here is an autobiographical introduction to the history of Modern Europe, a narration of the wandering of the Mennonites seeking land and liberty, and a description of three generations of women trying to cope with self, society, and circumstances. The sting of reality is on every page — as is the eloquent testimony of the author to the human will to live and to be free.

C. George Fry

THE MACMILLAN ATLAS HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY. By Franklin H. Littell. Cartography by Emanuel Hausman. Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., New York, 1976. 176 Pages. Cloth. \$19.95.

It was said when the Ohio Constitution was published at the dawn of the last century that people complained because it lacked pictures. No one can remain unhappy that the history of Christianity has not been illustrated in picture and map. A valuable recent contribution is **THE MACMILLAN ATLAS HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY**. Franklin H. Littell, Professor of Religion at Temple University, has provided a readable, reliable, and valuable commentary and Emanuel Hausman has rendered the excellent cartography of this text. **THE MACMILLAN ATLAS HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY** is a must for the bookshelf of any serious student of the Christian past.

Christian history is treated by Dr. Littell in three great epochs: (1) "Early Christianity in Its Setting" (the worlds of the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans), (2) "The Christian Roman Empire" (a survey of "territorial Christianity" from Constantine to the passing from dominance of the state-church models in the nineteenth century), and (3) "The Age of Personal Decision" (an intensive treatment of Christianity in the current era). Within each unit Littell has given attention to three aspects of the Christian adventure: (1) intellectual discipline (theology), (2) moral and ethical discipline (society), and (3) expansion (missiology), the growth of Christianity from its sources as a Palestinian sect to its current status as a planetary religion. All of this is done in 197 maps, 162 illustrations, and 163 pages of text. Bravo!

As with any effort to survey almost two millenia of history in such brief compass there will be statements of opinion that may be questioned (does Eastern Orthodoxy *really* lack a theology of ethics and a missiology, as implied on page 59? Was Joan of Arc actually rehabilitated only twenty-five years after her martyrdom, as indicated on page 71? Were the policies of the Mongols regarded as "enlightened" by others, as we are told on page 35? In the mention of Egyptian and Ethiopian African Churches on page 160, why is the Latin Church of the North omitted? And did German Roman Catholics in fact emigrate to America to escape the *Kulturkampf* as one learns on page 134?), certain errors of fact (the Spanish Armada sailed in 1588 not 1558, as stated on page 54; Melancthon is not regarded as the author of the Schmalkald Articles, as indicated on the map on page 66; the Arabian heartland was not part of the Ottoman Empire, as is suggested in the map on page 114; and for many Jews and Christians the Bible is "without error," for a belief in inerrancy is not a peculiarity of Muslims, cf. p. 27; and Patriarch Cerularius really did not reign from 104-58, as we are informed on page 34), and differences of preference (for example, Quran, is I believe, preferable to Koran, Hijra to Hegira, and Umayyads to Omayyads, page 27). But given the scope of the book, the excellence of its execution, the stimulating narration of its author, the accuracy of its cartographer, and its value to the professional and amateur student of the Christian past, these minor

flaws serve only to heighten its major worth. I highly recommend THE MACMILLAN ATLAS HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

C. George Fry

THE LUTHERAN HISTORICAL CONFERENCE: ESSAYS AND REPORTS, 1974. Volume VI. By the Lutheran Historical Conference. Lutheran Historical Conference, St. Louis, 1977. 206 Pages. Paper. \$5.00.

Founded in 1962 "as a forum for Lutheran archivists, historians, and librarians dealing with the history of Lutheranism in America," the Lutheran Historical Conference has published its papers and proceedings since 1964. This is the sixth volume in a happy series (Volume I, *Essays and Reports* of the 1962 and 1964 meetings, now out of print; Volumes II, III, IV, and V containing material from the 1966, 1968, 1970, and 1972 meetings are available from the Concordia Historical Institute, 801 De Mun Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri, 63105, as is the text under review) that has enriched our understanding of the Lutheran heritage in North America. Many of the chapters in this anthology honor anniversaries — that of the birth of Charles Michael Jacobs, the death of John Hachman, the founding of the Wisconsin Synod, and the creation of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio and Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield/Fort Wayne, as well as an essay for the observance of the nation's bicentennial. There are also entries on Abdel Ross Wentz as a champion of ecumenism and helps on how to establish a multi-media center in the parish. Minutes of the Board of Directors and of the Seventh Biennial Meeting are included, as well as a "Welcome Address" by Ralph Bohlmann and a charming *entre* by August Suelflow entitled "Did He or Didn't He?" (read the book to find out what he did or didn't do!). All in this is a readable and useful contribution to the task of understanding Lutheranism in America.

As with all anthologies, the articles vary in quality and utility. Springfield men will enjoy the contribution by Lorman M. Petersen on "Theological and Higher Education at Springfield, Illinois." Being only an adopted and honorary Springfielder, my eye was caught by an account of my own alma mater, Capital University. Written by my former colleague, David Ownes, it surveys 125 years of history in a masterful fashion. On a couple points, however, I must indicate disagreement with the interpretation that Owens offers. His description of the four vice presidents of Capital University during the later Yochum years as "excellent academic in-fighters" who "promptly embarked on a program of empire building" is one not widely shared by the Capital faculty of the Columbus community. Since Dr. Yochum's health had been impaired by a heart-attack, the startling changes at Capital in curriculum, plant construction, community relations, and calendar in the late 1960's can only be explained in terms of the co-operation and contribution of the vice presidents of academic, student, finance, and development affairs. Then, too, the writer claims that "it is not excessive to write that there is little of today's Capital that was not begun during the Yochum years." This statement could easily be mis-interpreted. Changes began in the late 1960's, but, as I suspect future historians will note, it was during the Langevin Administration that Capital became a "multiple opportunity university" involved in the multifaceted life of the Columbus area. But as can be seen, this is a book that invites and provokes reflection on the Lutheran experience. That is the mark of a good historical work. I highly recommend this collection of *Essays and Reports*.

C. George Fry

THE TAO OF PHYSICS. By Fritjof Capra. Bantam, New York, 1977. 332 Pages. Paper. \$2.95.

A Ph.D. from the University of Vienna, Fritjof Capra combines a professional interest in research in theoretical high-energy physics with a personal commitment to Eastern mysticism. This book is a result of that combination. Subtitled "An Exploration of the Parallels between Modern Physics and Eastern Mysticism," THE TAO OF PHYSICS contains three units: one on "The Way of Physics," one on "The Way of Eastern Mysticism" (in Hinduism, Buddhism, Chinese Thought, Taoism and Zen), and one on "The Parallels." Though difficult reading, THE TAO OF PHYSICS indicates the new direction of contemporary philosophy — away from Materialism and toward Mysticism. Should this continue, Western thought at the end of this century will be occupying the exact opposite position from which it began its recent odyssey.

C. George Fry

III. Practical Studies

BIBLICAL INTERPRETATIONS IN PREACHING.

By Gerhard von Rad. Translated by John E. Steely. Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1977. 125 pages. Cloth. \$5.95.

This book originally appeared in German as *Predigt-Meditationen* in 1973. Dr. Gerhard von Rad, now deceased, was until his death regarded as one of the outstanding German Old Testament scholars. He is famous especially for his *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 volumes), *Wisdom in Israel* and many other writings.

The homiletical meditations appeared originally between 1946 and 1966 chiefly in the *Göttinger Predigtmeditationen* and then in book form as *Predigt-meditationen*. Added to the sermon studies was a lecture on preaching prepared for the winter 1965/66, during which von Rad together with Prof. Guenther Borkamm and Prof. Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, established an exegetical-homiletical practicum for theological students. Von Rad in this volume endeavors to show theological students and pastors how exegesis is to be used in sermon construction. In twenty-one interpretations the author shows how scholarly interpretation combines with the Scriptures to make true contemporary sermons.

Von Rad emphasizes the fact that Biblical texts must be used in preaching and that they can be employed. For each Biblical pericope there is a strong exegetical foundation, as well as suggestions for sermon construction. Twenty of the sermon studies are from the Old Testament and one from the New Testament. In these studies it will be found that von Rad has drawn upon his wide knowledge of history and theology.

Inasmuch as von Rad is committed to the historical-critical approach to Biblical studies, his exegesis is decidedly influenced by his higher critical views. The hermeneutics espoused by von Rad is the new hermeneutic which results in Biblical text being understood in a different manner than would be the case if von Rad had used the Lutheran hermeneutics found in Luther and the Lutheran Confessions. It is interesting that when von Rad makes applications he frequently cites from Luther's work. Six of the twenty Old Testament texts are from Genesis, and exegetical statements in the studies are reminiscent of what the users of von Rad's *Commentary on Genesis* would have read. Thus we have sagas, aetiologies in Genesis, material taken over from pagan Canaanite sources, materials which in their original setting had a different meaning were given a new meaning. Form and tradition criticisms are presupposed. A comparison of these

sermon studies with those of the Lutherans Reu, Lenski, Fuerbringer, Laetsch and many other Lutheran homileticsians would show a big difference in approach and the application which they make as compared with Lutheran von Rad.

Whether dealing with texts from Genesis, Joshua, Psalms, Isaiah, von Rad always reflects the views of critical Old Testament scholarship which does not allow von Rad to do justice to these Old Testament pericopal texts.

Raymond F. Surburg

LANGUAGE AND ITS STRUCTURE. SOME FUNDAMENTAL LINGUISTIC CONCEPTS. By Ronald W. Langacker. Second Edition. Hartcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Atlanta, 1973. 275 pages. Paper. \$8.75.

The second edition of this book is a revision of a volume which appeared in 1963. While not changing the basic character of the original version of this work, the author has added suggestions for study and discussion to accompany each chapter. Chapter five has completely been rewritten, and substantial changes have been made in chapters two and nine.

Justification for the study of language is stated by Langacker as follows:

Despite its undeniable importance in human affairs, language is poorly understood. Misconceptions about it are legion, even among well-educated people, and not even professional linguists can claim to understand it fully. It is a radical mistake to assume that the nature of language is self-evident or that we know all about a language just because we speak it. Gradually, however, linguists and other scholars are gaining a better understanding of this remarkable instrument of human communication.

This volume therefore, purports to summarize important facts which are known about language especially for those with little or no previous knowledge of linguistics.

Part One is introductory and in Chapter One Langacker points out reasons for studying language *per se* and gives a thumbnail sketch of the history of language study. Chapter Two lays the groundwork for a more detailed discussion of language structure as described in Part Two. Chapter Three deals with dialect geography, social attitudes toward language, and writing.

In Part Two the student is introduced to a non-historical examination of language structure. Chapter Four discusses lexical items and the ways in which the components of a language are organized to pair meanings and sequences. In chapters Five and Six syntax and phonology are treated respectively, with concentration on English by Langacker particularly in the interest of clarity and coherence.

Part Three deals with the relationships between linguistic systems. Chapter Seven treats the historical relationships between earlier and later stages of a single language. Chapter Eight discusses genetic relationships and Chapter Nine examines the sense in which all languages can be said to be related.

New for the revised edition is a select bibliography of books and readings by means of which the student can enlarge his knowledge of the field of linguistics.

Students, pastors and professors cannot afford to ignore the advances which have been made in the area of linguistics. Many of the serious problems of our world involve language in its essential way. Furthermore, insights about language are of immense intellectual significance, and have implications for other disciplines. A study of linguistics is valuable for those interested in the practical applications of linguistic research, to the study and use of foreign

languages. Linguistic insights about language can enable the knower to improve his teaching and acquisition of native as well as of foreign languages. Finally, as Langacker has pointed out "an accurate appreciation of language is valuable if only because no one can be considered truly well educated if he remains ignorant about the instrument of so much of his instruction. Since language permeates virtually all of human affairs and is central to so many of them, an appreciation of language really needs no justification" (p. 5).

Those interested in pursuing further study in this area can follow this book up by the study and reading of the same author's more advanced *Fundamentals of Linguistic Analysis*, also published by Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972.

Raymond F. Surburg

Books Received

- THE ACT OF MARRIAGE.** The Beauty of Sexual Love. By Tim and Beverly LaHaye. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich, 1978. 315 pages. Paper. \$2.25.
- HOW TO WITNESS SUCCESSFULLY.** By George Sweeting. The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, 1978. 127 pages. Paper. \$2.95.
- TOOLS FOR TIME MANAGEMENT.** Christian Perspectives on Managing Priorities. By Edward R. Dayton. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich, 1978. 192 pages. Paper. \$3.95.
- THE MOON IS NOT ENOUGH.** By Mary Irwin with Madalene Harris. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1971. 175 pages. Cloth. \$6.95.
- KARL BARTH.** Markers of the Modern Theological Mind. By David L. Mueller. Word Books, Publisher, Waco, Texas, 1972. 172 pages. Cloth. \$5.95.
- SPIRITUAL CARE.** By Sharon Fish & Judith Allen Shelly. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1978. Paper. 178 pages. \$4.95.
- RESURRECTION.** By Ulrich Wilckens. John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1978. 134 pages. Cloth. \$6.95.
- LIFESTYLE OF LOVE.** Studies in John 13-17. By Mary Thompson. InterVarsity Press Downers Grove, Illinois, 1978. 72 pages. Paper. \$1.95.
- SPIRITUAL CARE WORKBOOK.** A companion to Spiritual Care. By Judith Allen Shelly, InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1978. 61 pages. Paper. \$2.95.
- ROZEL'S COMPLETE LESSONS.** Commentary on International Bible Lessons Uniform Series. By James Reapsome, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. 320 pages. Paper. \$5.95.
- THEY WERE THERE.** Two Series of Lenten Monologs. By Roy Barlag, Richard Andersen, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1977. 79 pages. Paper.
- FROM TEXT TO SERMON.** Responsible Use of the New Testament in Preaching. By Ernest Best, John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1978. 117 pages. Cloth. \$5.95.
- THE GOSPEL FOR KIDS, SERIES B.** By Eldon Weisheit, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1978. 128 pages. Cloth \$4.95.
- GOD'S WAY TO JOYFUL AND ABUNDANT GIVING.** By Carl W. Berner, Sr., DD, Graphic Publishing Co., Inc. Lake Mills, Iowa, 1978. Paper.
- 1979 PASTOR'S ANNUAL.** A Planned Preaching PROGRAM for the Year. By T. T. Crabtree, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. 352 pages. Paper. \$6.95.
- THE THEOLOGY OF CONCORD.** A Study of the Book of Concord. By Robert D. Preus, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1977. 94 pages. Paper. \$1.95.
- THE STORY OF CONCORD.** A History of the Book of Concord. By David P. Scaer, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1977. 100 pages. Paper. \$1.95.
- THE MINISTER'S FILING SYSTEM.** By Paul Gericke, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. 47 pages. Paper. \$1.95.
- THE BEST OF A. W. TOZER.** By Warren W. Wiersbe, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. 251 pages. Cloth. \$6.95.

-
- YOUTH EDUCATION IN THE CHURCH.** By Roy B. Zuck & Warren S. Benson, Moody Press, Chicago, 1978. 478 pages. Cloth. \$9.95.
- MEMOIRS OF MCCHEYNE.** Including his Letters and Messages. By Andrew A. Bonar, Moody Press, Chicago, 1978. 448 Pages. Paper. \$7.95.
- CHRISTIAN COUNTER-CULTURE.** The Message of the Sermon on the Mount. By John R. W. Stott, InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Ill., 1978. 222 Pages. Paper. \$2.95.
- THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE COMMENTARY.** Volume II. By Frank E. Gaebelein, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1978. 464 pages. Cloth. \$14.95.
- EVANGELICALS AND JEWS IN CONVERSATION.** On Scripture, Theology, and History. By Marc H. Tanenbaum, Marvin R. Wilson, and A. James Rudin, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1978. Cloth. 326 pages. \$7.95.
- TRADITION AND DESIGN IN LUKE'S GOSPEL.** By John Drury, John Knox Press, Atlanta 1976. 208 pages. Cloth. \$7.95.
- ARMAGEDDON N.W.!** The Premillenarian Response to Russia and Israel since 1917. By Dwight Wilson, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1977. 258 pages. Paper. \$4.95.
- DIETRICH BONHOEFFER.** Makers of the Modern Theological Mind. By Dallas M. Roark, Word Book Publisher, Waco, Texas, 1972. 141 Pages. Paper. \$5.95.
- WHAT DEMONS CAN DO TO SAINTS.** How Satan Attacks Christians and Selected Case Studies. By Merrill F. Unger, Moody Press, Chicago, 1977. 204 pages. Cloth. \$6.95.
- THE COMMUNITY OF THE KING.** By Edward A. Snyder, Inter-Varsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1977. 216 pages. Paper. \$4.25.
- THE PIETY OF JOHN CALVIN.** An Anthology Illustrative of the Spirituality of the Reformer. By Ford Lewis Battles and Stanley Tagg, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1978. 180 pages. Cloth. \$9.95.
- SIX PSALMS OF JOHN CALVIN.** Psalms 25, 36, 46, 91, 113, 138. By John Calvin Ford Lewis Battles and Staneley Tagg, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. 24 pages. Paper. \$1.95.
- GOD AND HUMAN ANGUISH.** By S. Paul Schilling, Abingdon, Nashville, 1977. 304 Pages. Cloth. \$11.95.
- HOW TO RESPOND TO . . .** The Occult, The Lodge, The Cults, The Latter Day Saints, Transcendental Meditation, The Jehovah's Witnesses. By Herbert Kern, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1977. 38 pages. Paper. \$7.00.
- LIBERATION AND CHANGE.** Freedom and Salvation, and The Death and Resurrection of the American Dream. By Richard Shaul, Gustavo Gutierrez, John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1978. 200 pages. Paper. \$4.95.
- A NEW LAND TO LIVE IN.** The Odyssey of an African and an American Seeking God's Guidance and Marriage. By Francislee Ossseo — Asare, Inter Varsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1977. 159 pages. Paper. \$3.95.
- A STUDY GUIDE COMMENTARY.** By Howard F. Vox, Zondervan Books Corp. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. 144 pages. Paper.

- WHY DID THIS HAPPEN TO ME? By Leslie Brandt, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1977. 64 pages. Paper. \$1.95.
- GOD HAS NOT REJECTED HIS PEOPLE. By Richard R. De Ridder, Baker Book House Company, 1977. 88 pages. Paper. \$2.95.
- THE LIBERATED GOSPEL. A Comparison of the Gospel of Mark and Greek Tragedy. By Gilbert C. Bilezikian, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1977. 159 Pages. Paper. \$6.95.
- THE GOSPELS. A first Commentary. By F. G. Herod, John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 110 pages. Paper. \$2.95.
- PLAIN TALK ON THE EPISTLES OF JOHN. By Manford George Gutzke, Zondervan Book Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1977. 122 pages. Paper. \$3.95.
- JESUS ON TRIAL. A Study in the Fourth Gospel. By A. E. Harvey, John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1976. 140 pages. Cloth. \$6.95.
- AN EXPOSITION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. On John Mark, Luke, Matthew. By Hershel H. Hobbs, Baker Book House Company, 1968. 296 pages. Paper. \$19.95. 4 volumes.
- THE SEPHARDIC JEWS OF BORDEAUX. By Frances Malino, The University of Alabama Press, 1978. 166 pages. Cloth. \$11.50.
- THE SUFFERING SAVIOR. By F. W. Krummacker, Moody Press, Chicago, 1978. 444 pages. Paper. \$7.95.
- WRITINGS ON THEOLOGY AND RELIGION. By Ernest Troeltsch, John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1977. 260 pages. Cloth. \$17.50.
- BLIND — AND I SEE! By Robert Weller. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1978. 145 pages. Paper.
- UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL GIFTS. By Robert L. Thomas. Moody Press, Chicago, 1978. 238 pages. Paper. \$3.95.
- COMPETENT TO LEAD. By Kenneth O. Gangel. Moody Press, Chicago, 1974. 144 pages. Paper. \$3.95.
- THE LOST ART OF DISCIPLE MAKING. By Leray Eims. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 188 pages. Paper. \$3.95.
- THE BOY CHILD IS DYING: A South African Experience. By Judy Boppell Peace. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1978. 91 pages. Paper. \$2.25.
- BEING HUMAN: The Nature of Spiritual Experience. By Ranald Macaulay & Jerram Barrs. InterVarsity Press, Downers Gove, 1978. 212 pages. Paper. \$4.95.
- AND GOD GAVE WOMEN TALENTS! By Marlys Taege. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1978. 191 pages. Paper. \$3.95.
- CANDLES IN THE NIGHT. By Frederick A. Radtke. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1978. 83 pages. Paper. No Price Given.
- THE NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT AND BIBLE TRANSLATION. John H. Skilton & Curtiss A Ladley, Editors. Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., Phillipsburg, New Jersey, 1978. 241 pages. Paper. \$5.00.
- NURTURING CHILDREN IN THE LORD. By Jack Fennema. Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1977. 162 pages. Paper. \$4.95.
- SPIRITUAL CARE: The Nurse's Role. By Sharon Fish & Judith Allen Shelly. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 1978. 178 pages. Paper. \$4.95.

TOOLS FOR TIME MANAGEMENT.: Christian Perspectives on Managing Priorities. By Edward R. Dayton. Zondervan Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1978. 192 pages. Paper. \$3.95.

SCRIPTURAL WORSHIP AIDS. By Leroy Koopman. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 83 pages. Paper. \$2.95.

REACHING PEOPLE FROM THE PULPIT: A Guide to Effective Sermon Delivery. By Dwight E. Stevenson & Charles F. Diehl. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 172 pages. Paper. \$3.95.

A COMPLETE SOURCE BOOK FOR THE LORD'S SUPPER. By Charles L. Wallis, Editor, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 228 pages. Paper. \$4.95.

FRIENDSHIP EVANGELISM: The Caring Way to Share Your Faith. By Arthur G. McPhee. Zondervan Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1978. 139 pages. Paper. \$2.95.

HOW TO WITNESS SUCCESSFULLY. By George Sweeting. Moody Press, Chicago, 1978. 127 pages. Paper. \$2.95.

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

A PROFILE FOR A CHRISTIAN LIFE STYLE: A Study of Titus with 20th-Century Lessons for Your Church. By Gene A. Getz. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 200 pages. Paper. \$1.95.

CHURCH MUSIC AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Erik Routley. Agape, Carol Stream, Illinois, 1978. 153 pages. Paper. \$3.95.

THE POWER OF ERROR. By Jay E. Adams. Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., Phillipsburg, New Jersey, 1978. 49 pages. Paper. \$1.95.

CERTAINTY, ASSENT AND BELIEF. By Heikki Kirjavainen. Publications of Luther-Agricola-Society B 11, Helsinki, 1978. 204 pages. Paper.

THE MINISTER'S FILING SYSTEM. By Paul Gericke. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 47 pages. Paper. \$1.95.

MATTERS OF CONCERN TO CHRISTIAN COUNSELORS: A Potpourri of Principles and Practices. By Jay Adams. Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing co., Phillipsburg, New Jersey, 1977. 104 pages. Paper. \$2.95.

FOUR WEEKS WITH GOD AND YOUR NEIGHBOR. By Jay E. Adams. Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., Phillipsburg, New Jersey, 1978. 69 pages. Paper. \$2.50.

NOT READY TO WALK ALONE. By Judith Fabisch. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 122 pages. Cloth. \$5.95.

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN: An Expository Commentary, Vol. 4, John 13:1-17:26. By James Montgomery Boice. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 487 pages. Cloth. \$9.95.

THE COUNTRY OF THE RISEN KING: An Anthology of Christian Poetry. By Merle Meeter, Compiler. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 446 pages. Cloth. \$12.95.

JESUS/NOW. By Leslie F. Brandt. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1978. 191 pages. Cloth. \$6.95.

EXPOSITORY COMMENTARY ON JOHN. By J. C. Macaulay. Moody Press, Chicago, 1978. 276 pages. Cloth. \$6.95.

THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE COMMENTARY, VOL. II. By Frank E. Gaebelein, General Editor. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 464 pages. Cloth. \$14.95.

DEMONS, EXORCISM AND THE EVANGELICAL. By John J. Davis. BMH Books, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1977. 15 pages. Paper. 50¢.