

CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 43, Number 4

OCTOBER 1979

Announcement: Third Annual Symposium
on the Lutheran Confessions..... 271

Rabbinical Writings of the Early
Christian Centuries and
New Testament Interpretation..... Raymond F. Surburg 273

God's Ministers, Their Calls, and Their
Relationship to Each Other..... Vernon H. Harley 286

The Case of the Lost Luther Reference ... Bjarne W. Teigen 295

The State of Evangelism in the
Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod..... Erwin J. Kolb 310

An Application of Case Grammar to Two
New Testament Passages..... Theodore Mueller 320

A Reformation Hymn..... Douglas Judisch 326

Opinion of the Department of Systematic Theology 327

Homiletical Studies..... 338

Book Reviews 373



CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

ISSN 0038-8610

Issued Quarterly by the Faculty of
Concordia Theological Seminary

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

DAVID P. SCAER, *Editor*, DOUGLAS JUDISCH, *Assistant Editor*, GERHARD AHO, *Homiletical Editor*, JAMES VOELZ, C. GEORGE FRY, ROBERT D. PREUS, *Associate Editors*, LEAH MAIER, *Managing Secretary*, JACK CASCIONE, *Art Editor*.

The Faculty: GERHARD AHO, HAROLD BULS, ROBERT H. COLLINS, G. WALDEMAR DEGNER, HENRY J. EGGOLD, JR., C. GEORGE FRY, ALBERT R. GARCIA, WILLIAM G. HOUSER, DOUGLAS JUDISCH, HEINO KADAI, EUGENE F. KLUG, MARTIN F. LUEBKE, WALTER A. MAIER, KURT MARQUART, NORBERT MUELLER, RICHARD MULLER, KENNETH PFLUEGER, ROBERT D. PREUS, DANIEL G. REUNING, WILBERT H. ROSIN, 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

Announcement

Third Annual Symposium on the Lutheran Confessions

Wednesday, January 30, 1980

- 1:00** Welcome
Dr. Robert Preus, President of Concordia
Theological Seminary
"Can the Lutheran Confessions Have
any Meaning 450 Years Later?"
- 1:30** "Augustana VII and the Eclipse of Ecumenism"
Dr. Siegbert Becker
- 3:00** Break
- 3:15** "The Place of the Augsburg Confession in the
United States"
Dr. Robert Fisher
- 6:00** Dinner
- 7:00** Reception
- 8:00** Concert: "The Confessional Heritage in
Lutheran Church Music"
Professor Daniel Reuning

Thursday, January 31, 1980

- 7:30-8:00** Breakfast
- 8:50** Chapel
- 9:30** "Melanchthon vs. Luther: The Continuing
Struggle in Historical Perspective"
Dr. Bengt Häggland
- 10:30** Break
- 10:45** Response to Dr. Häggland
- 12:15** Lunch
- 1:15** "Luther's Contribution to the Augsburg
Confession"
Dr. Eugene Klug
- 2:30** Break
- 3:00** "Fanaticism as Theological Category
in the Lutheran Confessions"
Dr. Paul L. Maier

- 4:30** Panel: "The Applicability of the Confessional
Strictures Against Fanaticism to Contemporary
'Spirit' Movements in the Church"
Paul Maier, Robert Fisher, George Fry,
Kurt Marquart (Moderator)
- 6:00** Banquet
"Chemnitz and the Book of Concord"
Dr. J.A.O. Preus
- 8:00** Vespers

Friday, February 1, 1980

- 7:30-8:00** Breakfast
- 8:50** Chapel
- 9:30** "The Place of the Augsburg Confession in
Contemporary Protestantism"
Dr. George Forell
- 10:30** Break
- 10:45** Panel: "Has the Missouri Synod Been Faithful
to the Augsburg Confession?"
George Forell, Robert Preus, Siegbert Becker,
David P. Scaer (Moderator)
- 12:15** Closing — Lunch

Rabbinical Writings of the Early Christian Centuries and New Testament Interpretation

Raymond F. Surburg

Both Christians and Jews have the Old Testament as a feature of their respective faiths. Christianity utilizes as its authority the Old Testament and the New Testament. Judaism relies for its teachings upon the Old Testament and the Talmud. By the year A.D. 70 the cleavage between Christianity and Judaism may be said to have been finalized. With the destruction of Jerusalem and its sacred Temple the break between Judaism and Christianity was final. By the end of the first Christian century the New Testament canon was complete and the direction that Christianity took was permanently determined. Certain Jewish writings which came to be written in the first and second centuries A.D. likewise determined the permanent course of Judaism.

The Talmud is the primary major source for the understanding of Judaism. In addition to the Talmud, other sources are laws known as Baraithoth and passages from a collection called the Tosefta. The Talmud is comprised of two main parts: the Mishnah and the Gemara. The Mishnah was put into written form in the first and second centuries of the Christian era, although in its oral form its roots extend back a number of centuries prior to Christ's birth. The word "Mishnah" means "repetition"; it is a lawbook that was produced by rabbis and scholars who resided in Palestine before the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 as well as during a century and a half after the destruction of Jerusalem. The Gemara, which means "completion," is a commentary of the Mishnah, and is the work of later scholars called the Amoraim. The Gemara treats of legal matters and those matters known as Haggadah, meaning "saying" or "narrative."

In order to understand adequately the background of the Gospels and the Epistles it is desirable and helpful to have an acquaintance with those writings that exhibit the character of Judaism, namely, the Mishnah, the Midrashim, the Tosefta, and the Baraithoth. The origin and character of these writings will briefly be discussed in this essay, because these writings will help show the different direction Judaism took as compared with Christianity in the two centuries after the close of the New Testa-

ment canon. Solomon Zeitlin wrote about the importance of the Talmud as follows:

The Talmud is a storehouse of law, religion, history, ethics, metaphysical speculations, medical science, astronomy and folklore. It is an encyclopedia covering every phase of human activity, a mine of information for the study of religion, history and civilization not only of the Jews but of the peoples of the entire middle east. It is important for a proper understanding of the origin of Christianity, since this literature came from men who taught at the time that Jesus did. It is essential for a true comprehension of the controversies over the law between the Pharisees as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels.¹

The Oral Law and the Written Law according to the Jewish Conception

Jewish scholars believe that from the very beginning of their history as a nation the Hebrews had both written and oral laws that existed side by side. The written laws are found in the Torah, or the Pentateuch of Moses. In the writings of the prophets and in the Hagiographa (*Kethubim*) there are references to laws that are not contained in the Torah of Moses, thus showing that there were oral laws existing besides the written one. Thus in the Book of Jeremiah it is recorded that, when Jeremiah purchased a field from Hanamel, a deed was written in the presence of witnesses. Yet in the Pentateuch there is no law stating that a sale of property was transferred by means of a deed witnessed by people who signed their names to it. The custom of transferring property by taking off the shoe as described in Ruth 4 is not required by the Torah. Zeitlin believes that the unwritten laws coexisted with the written laws.² The Jews had a tradition that thousands of laws were forgotten during the time that the people mourned for Moses after he had died. The unwritten laws were called "torah shebe-al pe" ("oral law"), while the written laws were referred to as "torah shekitab" (that is, "written law").

With the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem in 587 B.C. the surviving Jews in the Dispersion began to keep the letter of the law and build a hedge around the 555 different laws which the Jews claimed they found in the Pentateuch. There arose a new group of specialists in the Scriptures who came to be known as the Sopherim, "the Scribes." They claimed Ezra as the founder of their order, which by the time of Jesus had become the recognized guild of Bible-text specialists.

The position was taken by the Jews that the written laws of Moses had to be adapted as new conditions developed. The claim is made by the Talmud that the "Great Synagogue" (120 men) had

such authority, but modern scholarship is convinced that no real proof exists of the existence of this body of men. At first, it is believed, legal interpretation was the prerogative of men of priestly lineage, but in the course of time members of other tribes also became experts in the Old Testament Scriptures. In Ezra 6:7, Ezra is called "a scribe skilled in the Law of Moses." Also in Ezra 7:12, 21 Ezra is given the title "Ezra the Priest, the scribe of the law of heaven." In one of the Aramaic portions of Ezra, 7:12-16, Ezra is referred to as an official in the bureaucracy of the Persian Empire, and as an official for the Jews he would need to have had knowledge of Jewish law as well as of Persian.

Some scholars also hold that the rise of the Sopherim was furthered by the need to guard the Old Testament canon, which was in existence by the time of Ezra and Nehemiah according to the statement of Josephus in his apologetic writing, *Contra Apionem* (I:8).³ The Sopherim probably saw to it that all copies of the Old Testament Scriptures would conform to the standard text. It is held that during the first century B.C. these men resorted to the device of counting all the verses, words, and letters of each book and placed the statistics at the end of a book. This information would enable future copyists to check their own copies against the right total of verses, words, and letters. These statistics have been incorporated into the *Masora Finalis* of each book of the Massoretic Bible. The Sopherim worked out the so-called *tiqqune sopherim*, eighteen decrees laid down by the scribes in the interest of Biblical interpretation. An analysis of these rules would show that some have little justification for use. A number were of an antianthropomorphic character, aimed at protection of the dignity of God in some way.

The Development of the Oral Law

The oral tradition of Judaism is believed to have developed in houses of study and in the synagogal service. Synagogues are believed to have originated during the Babylonian exile. Jeremiah addressed his letter (Jer. 29:1) to the elders, priests, and prophets among the Babylonian exiles. From Ezekiel it can be inferred that the prophet Ezekiel had meetings with the elders. So far no details are available on the development of the rabbinical academies which later on came to play an important role in the perpetuation of Jewish thought and life. It may, however, reasonably be assumed, that the study of the Law was pursued by the Jews in Babylonia.

In Schubert's opinion the concept of oral law was a special contribution of Pharisaism.⁴ Yet it should be noted that the Pharisees were not the only sect to have oral traditions. From the Qumran writings it is evident that the Essenes of Qumran had a legal tradi-

tion that had been stabilized since the second century B.C. Stricter interpretation of Pentateuchal laws appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Book of Jubilees. Concerning this matter Schubert wrote:

While the latter [i.e. the Dead Sea Scrolls], because of the proximate eschatological expectation of the priestly-apocalyptic circle that sponsored them, contain extra-ordinarily severe laws, the Pharisaic legal interpretation is distinguished by much greater mildness.⁵

The Pharisaic interpretation of the written Law was far more reasonable than that of the apocalyptic groups in Judaism. The Pharisees held that after the death of the last three prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, the Holy Spirit, that is, the gift of prophecy, had left Israel (Tos. Sotah 13:2; Yom. 9b; Sanh. 11a). According to the Pharisaic tradition oral tradition was part and parcel of the prophetic heritage. Thus Avoth i.1 of the Mishnah states: "Moses received the Law on Mt. Sinai and handed it on to Joshua; Joshua to the elders; the elders to the prophets, and the prophets handed it on to the men of the great Sanhedrin." By means of the concept of oral law the rabbis were enabled to establish a link between Moses and themselves. The rabbis went so far as to make the claim that their interpretation and additions had already been given orally to Moses on Mt. Sinai (Berakhoth 5a). According to one haggadic tradition the only reason that Moses had not been given the Mishnah was to prevent the Gentiles from obtaining it, which it was believed would have happened had the Mishnah been rendered into Greek. Johannon bar Nappaha, a third-century scholar, asserted: "The Holy One, praise be He, made the covenant with Israel solely for the sake of the orally handed-on word" (Gittin 60b).

In Schubert's opinion the idea of the development of the oral law may also be associated with the prohibition of writing, concerning which rabbinical tradition does not present a monolithic position. Some scholars hold that the injunction against writing was certainly not taken seriously by Sirach and the authors of the two books of the Maccabees who at the beginning of the second century B.C. composed their books. Since the Pharisaic movement came into being after the writing of Sirach, Ecclesiasticus cannot be considered a violation of the later Pharisaic prohibition. The laws, for example, that were composed by the Qumran community, were probably rejected by the Pharisees. Early Pharisaism was opposed to the writing of religious books. From the Mishnah (Sankedrin 10:1) it appears that the apocryphal writings were not to be read. This prohibition enabled the Pharisees to prevent the breakup of Judaism into a number of

divergent sects and helped Pharasaic doctrine to become normative Judaism after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.

Pharisees and Sadducees on Oral Law

The Tannaitic literature, as well as Josephus, claims that the Sadducees could not reject all oral law, for many matters had never been defined in the written law and were thus determined by custom, handed down orally from generation to generation. The great point of difference between the Sadducees and the Pharisees was the insistence of the latter that the oral law was just as binding as the written law, a stance which the Sadducees would not recognize. For the latter the written Pentateuchal laws were more binding than any oral law. It was the contention of the Pharisees that the written laws constantly needed to be changed due to new cultural conditions and the people's position. This stance was totally unacceptable to the Sadducees.

According to Zeitlin's understanding the passage of time forced the Jews to rewrite and redefine laws that were outmoded.⁷ During the period of the second commonwealth an institution was developed that made necessary revisions. This was the Sanhedrin, whose existence is traced back to 141 B.C. when it is referred to as a *bet din* ("court") and was invested with the power of changing Pentateuchal laws to meet new community requirements. Until the Hasmonean period the Jewish state had been a theocracy with the seat of authority located in the high priest. After the establishment of the second commonwealth nomocracy (rule by law) took the place of the high priest. The Sopherim, the Scribes of the Sanhedrin, introduced new laws as Rabbi Joshua is reported to have done in Tractate Tebul Yom 4:6. They emended many Pentateuchal laws as is evident from commands given in the Talmud when compared with the directives in the Pentateuch. According to the Pentateuch, levitical purity was not to be completed after sunset, but this arrangement worked a hardship for the Jews. The Scribes interpreted this rule in such a way that it applied only to the priests in the matter of eating of sacred food. According to the Pentateuch, cattle needed to be slaughtered before their meat could be eaten, but the method of killing was not defined. So the oral law defined ritualistic slaughter as cutting the throat. There were cases where the oral law was preferred to the written law. According to the Pentateuch, a fowl's blood was to be covered with sand, but, according to the oral law, anything at hand could be used to cover the blood. Changes in the written law were also made regarding civil matters by the developers of the oral law. The Mosaic Pentateuch has laws about damages and injuries, but there are no directives in it that distinguish between degrees of liability and

injury. The oral law attempted to answer the problems which arose in this situation. The oral law took cognizance of changed sociological conditions and endeavored to address them.

According to Jewish tradition, the term "Sopherim" is to be applied to the earliest group of Scribes working between the fifth century and the third century B.C. It includes the men from Ezra to Antigonus of Socho. The Scribes were followed by the scholars called Zugoth ("pairs" of textual scholars) from the second to the first century B.C., from Rabbi Jose ben-Joezer to Hillel. The scholars who lived from the death of Hillel to the death of Judah Hannasi after A.D. 200 are known as the Tannaim, which means "repeaters" or "teachers." The teachings of the Sopherim, the Zugoth, and the Tannaim are found in the Mishnah, the Tosefta, the Baraithoth and the Midrash. In these writings more than two hundred Tannaim are referred to, the majority having the title of Rabbi or Rabban ("our teacher").

Methods of Teaching the Oral Law

The earliest way of teaching the law was by means of Midrash, that is, a running commentary.⁸ An exposition of a Biblical text that yields a legal teaching was known as a Midrash Halachah; if it was a nonlegal, ethical, or devotional teaching it was called a Midrash Haggadah. The Midrash method was employed by the teachers who followed Ezra, the scholars whose activities terminated about 270 B.C. With the Zugoth scholars a new method of teaching was begun, which actually was a rival to that of the Midrash. The new method propounded oral law that was not based on Holy Writ. The advantage of this method, as stated by Epstein, was as follows:

This evidently represented a progressive method of teaching in that it enabled the teachers to put in order of the day any such subjects as they desired, without being tied to the sequence of biblical texts.⁹

The teachers who employed the new method might still have traced the subjects discussed to the Biblical text. The fact that they did not was due to the Sadducees, who used the written text of the Torah to attack the oral laws. Since the Scriptural basis for the oral law was removed, the laws were perpetuated by repetition. The word "Mishnah" means "repetition." The teachers that employed repetition as a method were called Tannaim. Although the repetition method became popular it did not oust the older Midrash method. The latter method was permitted to control the Haggadic field; yes, even in the Halachah its influence did not cease, so that both Midrash and Mishnah existed side by side as media for instruction in Halachah.

In the two centuries before the birth of Christ the Jewish reli-

gious leaders not only tried to interpret the Pentateuchal laws so as to bring them into harmony with contemporary life, but they attempted to turn some of the old *Halachoth* into written law, so that they might be employed as a basis for deducing new oral laws as new situations required them. With regard to the interpretation of Pentateuchal law and the *Halachoth* there arose two schools of thought. They were the Shammaites and the Hillelites; the former representing the more conservative among the Pharisees, and the latter the more liberal. These two groups were named after Shammai and Hillel, the last of the Zugoth or "pairs." They were the two leading scholars during the reign of Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.). Both men were leaders in the Sanhedrin. Although the Hillelites and the Shammaites were all Pharisees, there were differences on many points between the two schools of thought relative to the interpretation of the oral law. Through his grandson Gamaliel, Hillel became the ancestor of a line of patriarchs that were very influential in Palestinian Judaism during the early Christian centuries. Not much is known about Shammai; many sayings are attributed to his followers rather than to him. Shammai was more actively opposed to Herodian and Roman rule than was Hillel. The positions of these two schools of thought are important for understanding the teaching of Christ on divorce as stated in Matthew 5:31-32. According to Deuteronomy 24:1 Moses allowed divorce for "something indecent." The school of Shammai contended that meant adultery only; while the Hillelites understood the term broadly and included trivial causes, such as a wife burning her husband's dinner. Thus, when the question was put to Jesus: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for any cause?" Jesus was being asked as to whether Hillel was right or wrong.

The Compilation of Halachic Teaching

Efforts to compile the Halachic teachings in Mishnah form were made during the early stages of its progression. Epstein is convinced that there is strong proof that about 50 B.C. the schools of Shammai and Hillel possessed a codified body of Mishnaic lore.⁹ One of the outstanding collections was that of Rabbi Akiba who died a martyr's death in 135 A.D. Akiba's collection became the basis of the Mishnah of Rabbi Judah the Prince (ca. 110? - 175? A.D.), a work that incorporates a digest of the whole legal system governing the Jewish community as developed by the Palestinian schools throughout the periods of the Sopherim, the Zugoth, and the Tannaim up to the third Christian century. The materials in the Mishnah have some importance for textual criticism because of their numerous quotations of the Old Testament text, which sometimes differs slightly from that found in the Massoretic Bible.

Another type of Rabbinic material that arose between A.D. 100 and 300 was the Tosefta ("addition" or "supplement"). The Tosefta is a collection of teachings and traditions of the Tannaim which were closely related to the Mishnah. The Tosefta is supposed to contain that portion of Rabbi Akiba's original Mishnah that he omitted in his shortened form.

The Two Talmuds

The Talmud ("instruction") grew up between A.D. 100 and A.D. 500. It contains two main divisions: the Mishnah and the Gemara. The Mishnah ("repetition") was completed by about A.D. 200. It was written in Hebrew and constituted, as previously noted, a digest of the various oral laws, traditions, and explanations of the Old Testament then current in Judaism. The Mishnah was divided into six orders (*sedarim*) as follows: (1) Zeraim ("seeds") deals mainly with agricultural laws (7 tractates); (2) Moed ("appointed season") has laws concerning the sabbath, festivals, and facts (12 tractates); (3) Nashim ("women") has laws concerning marriage, divorce, and vows (10 tractates); (4) Nezekim ("damages") has laws pertaining to the sanctuary and sacrificial rites (10 tractates); (5) Kodashim ("consecrated things") has laws pertaining to the sanctuary and sacrificial rites (11 tractates); (6) Tohoroth ("cleanliness") has laws pertaining to ritual purity and impurity (12 tractates). Like the Mishnah, the Tosefta also contains six orders, but the material in the Tosefta is more diffuse than that in the Mishnah.

The language of the Mishnah is new Hebrew (i.e., Rabbinic Hebrew) as distinguished from Biblical or Classical Hebrew. This form of Hebrew developed during the time of the Second Temple (515 B.C. — A.D. 70), has Greek and Latin loan words, and reveals a marked Aramaic influence. While Mishnaic Hebrew is well suited to setting forth practical matters, scholars claim that it lacks the vigor and poetic grandeur of Biblical Hebrew.¹⁰

The period that followed the Tannaim was that of the Amoraim (plural of "speaker, explainer"). Their work was limited to explaining the assertions and teachings of the Tannaim. In Palestine there were five generations of Amoraim and in Babylonia seven generations who concerned themselves with the transmission of Tannaitic teachings. The teachings and disputes of the Amoraim are called the Gemarah ("completion"). The Gemarah is not, like the Mishnah, written in a form of Hebrew, but rather in Aramaic, with an Eastern Aramaic dialect employed in the Babylonian Talmud and a western Aramaic dialect in the Palestinian Talmud. Both Talmuds have with slight variations the same Mishnah, but they differ greatly in respect to the size and content of the Gemarah and its relationship to the

Mishnah. The Palestinian version has thirty-nine tractates, dealing with the first four orders. The Babylonian Talmud has thirty-six tractates (dealing mainly with orders 2-5), but it is nearly four times the size of the Palestinian. The Babylonian has about 2,500,000 words as compared with the 750,000 of the Palestinian Talmud.

The Mishnah is characterized by brevity, clarity, and comprehensiveness and was used as a textbook in the rabbinical academies. It was edited and became the standard book of instruction in Tiberias, Caesarea, Sepphoris, and Lydda in Palestine and in Sura, Pumbeditha, and Nehardea in Babylonia. As a result of learned discussions about the law the formation of two different Talmuds came about. Feinberg claims that the greater part of the discussion in the Talmud is in dialogue form. In the Haggadah lengthy digressions are often found. Two-thirds of the Talmud is of the nature of a commentary on the Mishnah.

One *Jewish Encyclopedia* article states that the Gemara proceeds by way of question and answer and generally follows the method of analogy and association, as a result of which a discussion may cover a wide range of subjects and often end up with a completely different subject than that with which it began.¹¹ Frequently a discussion by two rabbis concerning one point of law would result in an enumeration and explanation of all other differences between the two discussants. Of the importance of the Talmud the French scholar Darmsteter wrote:

The Talmud, exclusive of the vast Rabbinic literature attached to it, represents the uninterrupted work of Judaism from Ezra to the sixth century of the common era, the resultant of all living forces and of whole religious activity of a nation. If we consider that it is the faithful mirror of the manners, the institutions, the knowledge of the Jews, in a word of the whole of their civilization in Judea and Babylon during the prolific centuries preceding and following the advent of Christianity, we shall understand the importance of a work, unique of its kind, in which a whole people has deposited its feelings, its beliefs, its soul.¹²

Robert Travers Herford in *Talmud and the Apocrypha* has made a comparative study of the Talmud with apocryphal literature. Herford attempts to study these two types of religious literature and to account for their differences while documenting their emanation from a common source.

Books Dealing with Rabbinic Exegesis and the New Testament

Many publications have attempted to show the value of rabbinic studies to the interpretation of the New Testament. Wil-

liam Doeve, in *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen, 1954), pages 5-51, has recounted the history of rabbinic studies and their application to problems of New Testament interpretation. Claude J. G. Montefiore's *The Synoptic Gospels* (2nd ed., 2 vols.; London, 1927) is considered to this day by many to be a classic exposition. A volume published three years later, *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching*, supplements the 1927 book; the British scholar Israel Abrams compares the teachings of the rabbis to Christ's teachings. In this volume he defends the Pharisees' doctrines.

The Lutheran scholar Gustaf Dalman has shown that many parallels do exist in rabbinic writings that elucidate New Testament concepts. *Die Worte Jesu* (Leipzig, 1898) and *Jesus-Jeshua* (Leipzig, 1922) furnish the Christian exegete with an elaborate background of rabbinic materials. Both of these works have been translated into English as *The Words of Jesus*, translated by David Kay, and *Jesus-Jeshua* by Paul Levertoff (1929). David Daube, in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1956), has furnished New Testament students with illustrations of materials of a rabbinic nature which could help to clear up obscurities in the New Testament. Morton Smith, in *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels*, (Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, VI; Philadelphia, 1951), has provided detailed analyses of rabbinic materials useful for New Testament exegesis. Joachim Jeremias, in *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), deals with the Holy City in Jesus' time and investigates its economic and social conditions during the New Testament period. The book is replete with references to Mishnah and the two talmuds.

Paul Fiebig made a study of the parables in his *Die Gleichnisse Jesu im Lichte der rabbinischen Gleichnisse des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters* (Tübingen, 1912), and he investigated the miracles in his study, *Jüdische Wundergeschichten des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters* (Tübingen, 1911). Using rabbinical materials Fiebig made a study of the Sermon on the Mount in *Jesu Bergpredigt* (Göttingen, 1924). Between 1922 and 1928 two German scholars published a commentary on the New Testament which draws together in five volumes materials from the Talmud and Midrash that help one to understand many statements in the New Testament. When using this resource it must be borne in mind that much rabbinical material cited by Strack and Billerbeck is late and therefore does not reflect first-century Judaism. Some scholars claim that this commentary is an indispensable work for New Testament interpretation.¹³

Alfred Edersheim (1825-1889), of Jewish extraction and a convert to Christianity, was Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint at

the University of Oxford (1884-1889). He wrote a number of volumes in which he utilized materials from the Mishnah, the Gemara, and other rabbinical writings. In addition to *The Temple-Its Ministry and Services as They Were in the Time of Christ and Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*, there was his two-volume *magnum opus*, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*.¹⁴ Published nearly a century ago, it now is available in a one volume edition. Edersheim devoted seven years to the writing of this work, for which a number of his earlier books were a preparation. Wilbur Smith claimed that this book is "the most important general work on the life of Christ in our language." In setting forth and evaluating all the views of the life and teaching of Christ, Edersheim gives a reconstruction of Jesus' life and teaching in all their surroundings of place, society, popular life, and intellectual and religious development. He gives extensive quotations from many different rabbinical writings. Edersheim used the background of Jewish social life and tradition to illuminate the life of Christ and thereby endeavored to produce fresh insights into Jesus' acts and teachings.¹⁴

With Edersheim one should contrast the writings of Joseph Gedaliah Klausner, an ardent Zionist who in 1949 was a candidate for the presidency of Israel. He wrote two books dealing with New Testament topics, namely, with Jesus Christ and with Paul. His *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life and Times and Teachings* (Macmillan, 1925) was written originally in modern Hebrew and published in Jerusalem in 1922. Herbert Dancy translated this work, in which Klausner argued that Jesus was a Jew and not a Christian, setting forth a position which Julius Wellhausen had advanced earlier. Klausner's volume dealing with Paul was also written in modern Hebrew and was translated into English by William Franklin Stinespring as *From Jesus to Paul* (Macmillan, 1943). In it Klausner repeated a position expressed by other Jewish writers, namely, that it was Paul who was responsible for separating Judaism from Christianity. Klausner's tracing of the development of Christianity is based mainly on Jewish sources which Christian scholars should examine when they evaluate Klausner's erroneous characterization of St. Paul.

Foonotes

1. Solomon Zeitlin, "Talmud," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1963, 21:768.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 768.
3. Gleason L. Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1964), p. 63.
4. K. Schubert, "Talmud," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 16:923-924.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 923.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 924.
7. Zeitlin, *op. cit.*

8. K. Schubert, "Midrashic Literature," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 9:823-825.
9. I. Epstein, "Talmud," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 4:512.
10. Cf. K. Albrecht, *Neuhebräische Grammatik* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagshandlung, 1913), 136 pp.; M. H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), 248 pp.; M. H. Segal, "Mishnaic Hebrew and Its Relationship to Biblical Hebrew," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 20 (1908), 647-737.
11. Cecil Roth, *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1962), pp. 1786-1787.
12. *The Talmud*, p. 7, as quoted in the article "Talmud and Midrash," J. D. Douglas, *The New Bible Dictionary* (Grand Rapid, Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1926), p. 1237.
13. Herman L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagshandlung, Oscar Beck, 1922-1924), 5 vols.
14. These three volumes are published by Eerdmans Publishing Company of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Bibliography

- Ausubel, Nathan. *The Book of Jewish Knowledge*. New York: Crown Publishers, 1964. "Talmud," pp. 452-453.
- Bachert, W. "Talmud," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 10:160-165.
- Bernfeld, S. *Der Talmud. Sein Wesen, seine Bedeutung und seine Geschichte*. Berlin: Verlag von S. Calvary, 1900.
- Bokser, Ben Zion. *The Wisdom of the Talmud*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951.
- Cohen, A. *Everyman's Talmud*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1949.
- Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah, Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Davies, Ellyn. "Talmud," *Chamber's Encyclopedia*, 13:440-441.
- Deutsch, Emanuel. *The Talmud*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1896.
- Epstein, I. "Talmud," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 4:511-515.
- Fiebig, Paul. *Der Talmud, seine Entstehung, sein Wesen, sein Inhalt*. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer Verlag, 1929.
- Funk, S. *Die Entstehung des Talmuds*. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1910.
- _____. *Talmudproben*. Leipzig: C. J. Goschensche Verlagshandlung, 1912.
- Goldin, Judah. *The Living Talmud. The Wisdom of the Fathers with an Essay by Judah Goldin*. New York: New American Library, 1957.
- Gutstein, Morris A. "Talmud," *Collier's Encyclopedia*, 18:161.
- Margolis, Max L., and Alexander Mark. *A History of the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1927. Pp. 216-230.
- Mielzinger, M. *Introduction to the Talmud*. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1925.
- Moore, G. F. *Judaism in the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1927), 1.
- Oosterley, W. O. E., and G. H. Box. *A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinic and Medieval Judaism*. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1920. Pp. 4-140.
- Revel, Hirschel. "Talmud," *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, 10: 160-165.
- Strack, Herman L. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1931.

- Trattner, Ernest R. *Understanding the Talmud*. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1955.
- The Talmud of Jerusalem*. With a preface by Dagobert D. Runes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.
- Waxman, Meyer. *A History of Jewish Literature*. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1931. Pp. 59-84; 119-135.
- Werblowsky, R. J. Zei, and Wigoderg. *The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion*. Jerusalem. Massada P.E.G. Press, 1966.
- White, W. "Talmud," *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, 5:589-594.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. "Talmud," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 21:768-771.

Editions of the Talmud

- Epstein, I. *The Babylonian Talmud with Indices*. 36 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1961.
- Goldschmidt, L. *Der Babylonische Talmud*. 15 vols. 1897-1909.
- Schwab, M., *Le Talmud de Jerusalem traduit pour la premiere fois*. 11 vols. Paris, 1878-90.

God's Ministers, Their Calls, and Their Relationship To Each Other

Vernon H. Harley

The Lutheran Confessions identify the ministry of the Word with the Office of the Keys and call it "a power given by Christ to the Church for binding and loosing sin."¹ They also remind us that this office was not given to Peter alone, nor the apostles as apostles, not to them as holders of a special ministerial class, but to the Church, to Christians who as believers have received the Holy Ghost.² It is of this ministry of the Word given to all believers that the Apology says: "Of all acts of worship that is the greatest, most holy, most necessary, and highest, which God has required as the highest in the First and Second Commandment, namely, to preach the Word of God. For the ministry is the highest office in the Church. Now if this worship is omitted, how can there be knowledge of God, the doctrine of Christ, or the Gospel?"³ In speaking of the highest office in the Church, the Apology is not distinguishing between the ministry as carried out by the priesthood of all believers and by publicly called servants; rather, it is contrasting the ministry of the Word with other forms of worship, particularly with such offices and orders of worship set up by men but which are only indirectly connected with preaching the Gospel. These latter ministries are called "church polity and grades," "ecclesiastical orders," and "human traditions," while the "ministry of teaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments" is termed "the highest office."⁴

Our Confessions speak in this way because the Scriptures do. The apostles, for example, distinguish between "the ministry of the Word" (Acts 6:4) and serving tables and definitely consider the ministry of the Word the highest office. Ephesians 4:11f. and 1 Corinthians 12:28f. list various other ministries, not of the Word itself but auxiliary to it (e.g., caring for bodily wants), all gifts to the Church.

The Public Ministry

In this treatise we are concerned primarily with the *public* exercise of these offices, namely, how they are carried out by called servants in behalf of others (*von Gemeinschaftswegen*). Here it is essential to understand that the public ministry of the Word is never optional. It is a divine institution. This is not so with the public exercise of other ministries which we call auxiliary offices.

The public ministry of the Word embraces various forms or branches, such as apostles, preachers, evangelists, pastors, and professors. The original apostolic office embraced all of these; however, to none of the other branches has been given the exercise of the entire ministry of the Word or the Office of the Keys. Each person's function is determined by his specific calling (Eph. 4:10-13 and 1 Cor. 12:28f). Associated with the various divisions within the public ministry of the Word are usually other forms of ministry which may appear to be part and parcel of the "highest office," but which in reality are merely auxiliary offices (*Hilfsaemter*).

In his *Kirche und Amt* Dr. C. F. W. Walther makes these points among others: The holy ministry (or pastoral office as he calls it) is distinct from the priestly office of all believers; it is not humanly or arbitrarily, but divinely commanded and established; it is not set up above Christians, but is an office of service; its authority is spiritual and limited to preaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments; it is conferred by God through the congregation as holder of ecclesiastical power by means of the call; it is a public office through which common rights of the spiritual priesthood are administered in behalf of all; this ministry is the highest office in the Church from which, as its stem, all other offices in the Church arise.⁵

Some misunderstanding, however, seems to have arisen among Missouri Synod Lutherans to the effect that the parish pastorate has been identified with the total ministry of the Word, a position which is alleged to be Walther's. Some therefore have concluded that the pastor's office within a congregation is the only divinely appointed office and that the pastor, so understood, alone has supervision by divine right over all other offices in the Church. According to this view, all authority of the ministry stems from the local congregation, which is held to be the only divinely instituted entity in the Church. All workers called by synods, districts, and boards have their office only by delegation of authority from the local congregations.⁶ Some even hold that such workers, including professors of theology, unless called by a specific congregation, have no divine calls.

This position is usually supported with passages like Acts 20:28, Titus 1:5, and Matthew 18:17. But when we look at these passages, it is quite obvious that the conclusions drawn are faulty. We note that in the two first passages, as also in Philippians 1:1, the terms "elders" (*presbyterous*) and "overseers" (*episcopous*) are plural while "church" is singular. No one individual is overseer alone, or over other co-workers, but together they oversee and feed the flock of God. The same is true in the Titus passage.

None of these passages insists that one pastor must oversee the whole congregation. There may have been one congregation at each place with various elders, or various congregations with one or more elders. The point being made is that the whole flock should be properly cared for, not that one man must be overseer. The various terms — minister, elder, shepherd, overseer — are used interchangeably in the New Testament for those who feed God's flock and labor in word and doctrine. It is noteworthy also that in Ephesians 4:11 pastors and teachers are grouped together in fourth place after apostles, prophets and evangelists. Also in passages like 2 Timothy 1:11, Matthew 28:19, 2 Timothy 2:24, 1 Timothy 3:2, teaching is considered part of the ministry of the Word.

Some of the misunderstanding may come from Dr. Walther's use of the terms *Predigtamt* and *Pfarramt* in a wider sense for the total ministry of the Word, when we usually understand them to apply to the more narrowly defined pastoral office; misunderstanding may also be due to the fact that *Gemeinde* can be rendered either *Church* or *Congregation* in English. But Dr. Walther should not be interpreted against himself. Under Thesis VIII he writes:

Since incumbents of the public ministry have in their public office, for the sake of the common interests of their congregations, John 20:21-23, the administration of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, which the Church possesses originally and immediately, Matt. 16:19, 18:18, their office must necessarily be the highest office in the Church, and from it, as from the stem, all other offices must issue, inasmuch as the keys embrace the entire authority of the Church.⁷

In this same section Walther later distinguishes between those whom Scriptures call elders, bishops, rulers, stewards, and those who "do not labor in the Word and doctrine" and he identifies some of these latter as rulers, deacons, and administrators.⁸ He also mentions teachers, almoners, percentors, and calls them "aids to the ministry of preaching." Since teachers in our parochial schools do labor part of the time in Word and doctrine, it is only fair to understand Walther as thinking of that part of the teacher's office which has to do with teaching so-called secular subjects as "auxiliary."

In *The Ministry of the Lutheran Teacher* Dr. Arnold C. Mueller shows quite conclusively that the position many attribute to Walther and have called the Missouri position is not actually Walther's. This writer believes Mueller is correct and that Walther would agree essentially with Mueller as he presents a diagram of the ministry in the form of a tree. The roots make up

the priesthood of all believers from which the whole ministry grows. The trunk divides into three large branches designated *Parish, Synod and District*, and *Other Individual and Cooperative Ventures*, each with its own ramification of called and contracted workers.⁹ Mueller's illustration, however, lacks Walther's distinction between the actual ministry of the Word and auxiliary offices supportive of, but not essentially part of, the ministry of the Word. Walther seems to hold that auxiliary offices are part of Christian ministry *only in as much* as they are supportive of and connected with the Word. Otherwise they are purely secular and belong in the area of civil righteousness which even an unbeliever can perform. However, when done among Christians, motivated by and in support of the Word, they become auxiliary offices even though they are not essentially an exercise of the Office of the Keys.

We believe this distinction is essential since teaching of the Word on behalf of the Church is divinely instituted. There is, however, no divine mandate to carry out any auxiliary functions as a *public* ministry. Any such auxiliary ministry is a matter of Christian privilege and belongs among the "ordinances of men" which have no specific divine precept, but which, nevertheless, have divine approval when established and agreed upon among Christians (1 Pet. 2:13; Matt. 18:19-20). Unless this distinction is made, every individual responsibility would immediately become joint responsibility of the Church to be exercised in some form of public ministry. Thus, we must differ from Dr. Mueller's idea that the teaching of secular subjects by the parochial school teacher is conducted on the same basis as his teaching of the Word of God.¹⁰ We do not question, of course, the divine right of those appointed to these auxiliary offices to fulfil their duties any more than we would the divine right of government officials to rule once they have been elected. With Walther we would hold that those offices filled by Christians in support of the Word are Christian vocations.

This truth does not mean that Lutherans should abolish all distinctions between the sacred and the secular, nor that their public ministers should speak out on every secular issue, as writers like Harvey Cox advocate.¹¹ Ordinarily public servants of the Church have no authorization or call to speak and act in behalf of the church in civil affairs. The Augsburg Confession gives the Lutheran position: "Of Ecclesiastical Order they teach that no one should teach publicly or administer the Sacraments unless he be regularly called."¹² While this statement refers specifically to the ministry of the Word, it also indicates that a public servant of the Church should act in behalf of the church only when authorized

to do so. Do public servants of the Church, then, ever have a call to function as ministers in social and political affairs? To answer this question Lutherans would have to distinguish with the Augustana between the "power of the Church and the power of the sword," both being of divine right, but not to be confused with each other, each to remain in its own realm.¹³ Therefore the only authority which the Church *as Church* can confer upon its ministers is the Office of the Keys. Any other power or authority is not really ecclesiastical power, but is derived from other sources and follows other lines of authority.

Auxiliary Offices and Calls

We should recognize the fact, however, that seldom is anyone called exclusively to the ministry of the Word. Calls, even to be pastor, usually include obligations of the nature of those which Dr. Walther calls *Hilfsaemter*, that is, auxiliary functions (see Acts 6: 1f. & Rom. 12: 6f.). These, too, are the business of the church in as much as they are necessary for the orderly conduct of worship and extension of the Kingdom. But when Christians decide to confer administrative, musical, or other auxiliary responsibilities upon their pastors and other servants of the Word, they do so *not by divine command* but by privilege with the assurance of God's blessing.

Some assume that the terms "overseer," "bishop," and "elder" apply only to the parish pastor and that he therefore has the responsibility to oversee all other offices in the church. This simply is not so. Those terms describe the relationship of the ministers of the Word to the flock, not to each other. Rank among workers can quickly become a problem if this is not understood and if responsibilities are not clearly defined when the workers are called. Problems of this nature sometimes arise when congregations begin to work together, forming synods, calling professors, missionaries, editors, and officers. How do these relate to each other? Do they have divine calls? Or can all such offices in the church be dispensed with as long as the "pastorate" is maintained in the local congregation?

The New Testament certainly leaves no doubt about this matter. It presents our Lord training apostles, and giving prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, to the church (Eph. 4: 11f). It allows for new offices to be established as needs arise (Acts 6) and has the Lord providing gifts to the church for the benefit of all (1 Cor. 12), but expecting these gifts to be used for the edification of all in decency and order (1 Cor. 14). When new offices are established in the church, obviously the needs, the gifts supplied by the Lord, and the welfare of the "whole flock" are to be taken into consideration. All that is "wanting" is to be

supplied; but the church is at liberty to organize and distribute responsibilities, services, and manpower as God opens doors and provides the gifts to fill the needs. All, of course, is to be done by common agreement (Matt. 18:18-20, 1 Tim. 5:16). Essentially, the call is an authorization by the Church, through common agreement, to have a certain individual function in a specified capacity on its behalf.

The Form of the Church

But what about ministries established by church groups other than local congregations? Some appeal to Matthew 18:17 to prove that the local congregation is the only divinely ordained form of the church with the right to exercise the Office of the Keys and hence to call servants of the Word. Matthew 18, however, says nothing about the *form* in which believers must organize to do their work. It does make plain that where even two or three believers are gathered together in Christ's Name, He is among them. Their authority to function as Church does not rest upon some *form of organization* but in the Word itself. Even what we ordinarily call excommunication is here made the responsibility of the individual Christian ("Let him be unto *thee* . . ."). No functioning *form* — and that includes the congregation — is here given the right to become autonomous with no obligations other than to establish the ministry among and for itself. Matthew 18 gives Christians the right to agree upon what basis they can best organize as long as Christ's will as expressed in His Great Commission is kept in mind. We are to remember that the "Lord added daily to *the Church* such as should be saved" (Acts 2:47). The Bible does not say: The Lord added to a specific functioning form such as should be saved.

The right and duty to function beyond the limits of the local congregation are inherent in the priesthood of all believers. God's believers are His Church functioning, not merely when they do so on a congregational level, but also when they function in the name of the Lord to do His work on a wider level, as in synods. Our Confessions are in agreement with this position. The Smalcald Articles clearly recognize that "the decisions of Synods are the decisions of the Church"¹⁴ and that the "Church is to retain the authority to call, elect, and ordain ministers." No human power can wrest this right from the Church.¹⁵ That truth would apply also to any local congregation that began to assume dictatorial authority to its particular organizational form; for the Office of the Keys does not belong to any *form* of the functioning Church as such, but to the priesthood of all believers. The Altenberg Debate in which Dr. Walther was involved with Dr. Marbach

clearly shows this to be Walther's position. He did not argue that *only* a local congregation has the right to exercise the Office of the Keys, but that *even* this body of Christians separated from the Established Church of Germany also had this right.¹⁶

Conclusions

A number of conclusions need to and can be drawn from the above observation:

1) The divinity of the call is not determined by a particular form of the functioning church, but by the proper agreement between the calling group and the ones called. Where such agreement exists between God's people, a call, whether from a local congregation, a synod, a board, or even a conference for the duration of the conference, has the ingredients of a divine call.

2) Each particular functioning form of the church ought to respect agreements made with other functioning forms and not interfere with matters of the other. Synod does not call pastors for the respective congregations; neither does any *one* congregation call professors, executives, or district presidents for the whole church body. Each form exists to carry out responsibilities which the priesthood of believers has agreed to perform on that level, never to usurp authority over believers as a power unto itself. When St. Paul writes, "All things are yours" (1 Cor. 3:22), this implies that Christians have also the right to establish those forms that best suit them for carrying out Christ's Great Commission as long as this is done with proper regard to previous agreements with other Christians and in accord with Scriptural injunctions such as 1 Timothy 2:12 and 1 Corinthians 14:34-35.

3) Ministers of Christ ought to know by what authority they function. The only authority a minister of the Word — whether pastor, theological professor, or president of a synod — has *per se* is that of the Word (Heb. 13:17; 1 Thess. 5:12). When other lines of authority are established in the organizational church, they are part of this *world's order*, not of the Kingdom of Grace, as Jesus makes plain in Mark 10:12ff. Ministers of the Word are not lords over each other, nor over God's heritage (1 Peter 5:1-4). Servants of the Word ought not appeal to this world's order (e.g., rank of office) when calling for obedience to the Word.

4) Where various ministries are involved, calls by necessity are limited; and the extent of service is determined by the call. Together the called servants are to feed the whole flock, each respecting the other's call, not becoming a busybody in other men's affairs.

5) Ordination could theoretically be administered to all church-workers. But since the common understanding of the term makes

ordination the stamp of recognition which a church body places upon those certified to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments, such a practice would lead to confusion.

6) Synodical officials have their positions from the synod's entire constituency, not merely from congregations of a particular district, even less from a single congregation. By the same token, no congregation is a completely independent unit. When an individual or congregation severs relations from a church body for reasons other than doctrinal error or ungodly practice, this is serious separatism. By becoming partakers of the Gospel we are brought into fellowship with other Christians, and it is the Christian's responsibility to recognize and practice such fellowship in as far as this is feasible, except for the above-mentioned reasons.

7) The common understanding of the congregational bond is that regular preaching and teaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments is to take place at the congregational level. When these things take place at *ad hoc* gatherings (e.g., conventions, conferences, youth gatherings, etc.), it would appear that they occur by common consent of those involved, but should not be done in disregard of the primary relationships which we have in local congregations. Since district and synodical officers hold their positions by the call or consent of a larger body of Christians, it would appear totally out of place for an individual congregation to issue such persons another call just in order to keep that man on the clergy roster of Synod. The practice of referring disciplinary matters to a congregation for disposition instead of dealing with them on the level on which they arise appears to be not only frustrating but based upon a faulty understanding of the nature of the Church.

In conclusion, all ministers of the Word are to be reminded of the example of their Master who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and give His life as a ransom for many. Through their ministry He is gathering and sustaining His flock. In due time He will appear and they will receive their reward — a crown of glory that fades not away (1 Peter 5:1-4).

Footnotes

1. The Smalcald Articles, VII; *Concordia Triglotta* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 493. Unless otherwise noted all references to the Lutheran Confessions are from this edition.
2. S.A., Of the Power and Primacy of the Pope, p. 511.
3. Apology, XV, p. 327.
4. *Ibid.*, XIII, p. 311.
5. William Dallman, W.H.T. Dau, and Th. Engelder, *Walther and the Church* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1938), p. 71f.
6. "Report of the Interim Committee," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XXII, 2, p. 1f.

7. *Walther and the Church*, p. 78f.
8. *Ibid.* p. 79.
9. Arnold C. Mueller, *The Ministry of the Lutheran Teacher* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964), pp. 78-79.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 129-130.
11. Harvey Cox, *The Secular City* (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 246.
12. A.C., XIV, p. 49; Ap., XIV, p. 315.
13. A.C., XXVIII, pp. 84-85.
14. S.A. Of the Power and Primacy of the Pope, p. 521.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 523. Note: In discussing Matthew 18, Dr. Walther says; "No proof is needed to show that the Lord in this passage is speaking of a visible, particular, local church. However, when immediately after these words the Lord proceeds thus: 'Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,' v. 18, He manifestly delegates with these words *also to each* visible local church the keys of the kingdom of heaven, or that church power which, in Peter, He had given to His entire holy Church in Matt. 16:19" (*Walther and the Church*, p. 64; italics supplied). What Walther says needs no proof is precisely what many feel is not at all stated in the text. But even so, Walther does not deny that synods and other functioning forms of the church have the authority to call and exercise the Office of the Keys. He is arguing that the local congregation, regardless of how small, also has this power given to the "entire holy church."
16. Walter O. Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), pp. 524-525.

The author is pastor of St. Paul
Lutheran Church, Fairmont, MN.

The Case of the Lost Luther Reference

Bjarne W. Teigen

The authors of the Formula of Concord appeal especially to Luther to cast further light on what they are expounding. They speak of him as "This highly enlightened man" (SD VII, 28), and call him the "chief teacher of the Augsburg Confession" (SD VII, 34). They particularly appeal to his writings on the Sacrament of the Altar in connection with Article VII and VIII of the Solid Declaration. A careful reading of the Formula of Concord shows that the confessors wanted to confess completely the doctrine of Luther on the Lord's Supper and the Person of Christ because they were convinced that his doctrine expressed what the Word of God teaches.

The Solid Declaration, as a guide for the proper understanding "concerning the consecration and the common rule that there is no sacrament apart from the instituted use" (SD VII, 73), asserted the general rule which "has been derived from the words of institution: Nothing has the character of a sacrament apart from the use instituted by Christ, or apart from the divinely instituted action (that is, if one does not observe Christ's institution as He ordained it, it is no sacrament)" (SD VII, 85). The Formula, then, to show that its intention is to return to Luther's understanding of the Lord's Supper as opposed to that of the Sacramentarians, appeals to Luther: "It was against such papistic abuses that this rule was first formulated and explained by Dr. Luther" (SD VII, 87). It is, however, also evident that the rule was intended to guard against those who deny that it is the omnipotence of the Lord Jesus Christ who through His almighty Word achieves the presence of the body of Christ (SD VII, 90; SD VII, 74). There can hardly be any question that all that Luther said about the Lord's Supper, and especially the consecration, has a bearing on this part of the Formula because he is the chief teacher (SD VII, 73-90).

But a specific reference to Luther would be of great help in shedding light on this section of Article VII. Judging from the context, very evidently one must look for a passage of Luther that discusses the "use" or the "action" of the Lord's Supper and the time element during which the sacramental union takes place. The Tappert edition of the Book of Concord has been on the way of being more or less the official English translation since its publication in 1959.¹ As the source for the Lutheran reference in SD

VII, 87, it gives "WA 30, II, 254, 255; cf. Smalcald Articles, Pt. III, Article XV, 4." If one takes the time to look up the reference one finds that it refers to Luther's "Exhortation to All Clergy Assembled at Augsburg" (1530; LW 34, 9-61).² The Tappert footnote refers to the pages of this work where Luther describes superstitions rampant in the Roman Catholic churches, e.g., that only men (no women) could wash the corporals, the baptism and dedication of churches, bells, altars, pictures, etc. But there is nothing in the entire work about the "action" or "use" with regard to the Lord's Supper. The other reference which Tappert gives in this same footnote is to the Smalcald Articles. Here Luther in a concluding after-thought to his Confession says that he does not wish to have anything to do with the "Pope's bag of magic tricks which contains silly and childish articles," and he gives as examples the consecration of churches, the baptism of bells and altar stones, the blessing of candles, palms, spices and oats, etc. He asserts that they cannot be called blessings and they are nothing but mere mockery and fraud. Once again, there is no reference here to the "useful rule and norm derived from the words of institution."

Tappert, for the most part, took his supplementary notes from the Goettingen edition of the Book of Concord,³ and this particular footnote came lock, stock and barrel from the modern, definitive German edition of the Confessional books. But Tappert made one significant alteration in the text proper. The German version, after the reference to Luther, has in the text this reference, "Tom. IV, Jena." The reference to the Jena edition of Luther's works has fallen by the wayside in the English translation so that we have here a lost Lutheran reference in SD VII, 87. But then the Goettingen edition is not much help either, since the footnote in question has only the same references which Tappert reproduced. The unwary reader would be tempted to think that in "Tom. IV, Jena," there would be a reference to Luther's 1530 address to the clergy. Such, of course, is not the case. The Goettingen edition gives no information where this reference to volume four of the Jena edition could be found in modern editions of Luther. The Jena edition of Luther's Works is not found in the ordinary pastor's library; as a matter of fact, it probably is not in too many university and seminary libraries. After all, the German edition was first published in 1555 and the Latin edition in 1556. When one looks at the earlier editions of the Book of Concord, one finds the following: The 1580 edition of the Concord has it embedded in the text. The first Latin translation of the Concordia, done in 1580, gives the reference on the margin of the page, as it does all the other references. The reference also occurs in such recent editions of the Book of Concord as J. T.

Mueller's, the Caspari-Johnson Norwegian translation of the Book of Concord, and the Triglott.⁴ Those of us who were raised in the Triglott edition of the Lutheran Confessions were at least given the privilege of being curious as to just what Luther said about the useful rule and norm in volume four of the Jena edition, something denied the reader of the Tappert edition. Not that we ever heard or read any comment about what Luther said in volume four of the Jena edition. A cursory reading of the conservative theological material of the last hundred years does not yield any information as to what Luther said in this volume.

For one who is not familiar with all the facts surrounding the controversies which brought into existence the Formula of Concord, but who now looks at what the reference could mean, he will find two possibilities. The reference can be either to the German or the Latin edition. Volume four of the German edition contains Luther's German writings from 1520-1530. This writer has not had the opportunity to examine this volume, but Dr. Tom Hardt has. The only possible reference in the German volume four that he could come up with which might have some reference to the "common rule that there is no sacrament apart from the instituted use" was Luther's letter to Carlstadt, written on January 29, 1528. As Hardt rightly points out, however, it really does not have anything to say about the useful rule and norm.⁵ Yet this letter of Luther's clearly sets forth what is often contested in this regard; Luther teaches that the bread becomes the body of Christ at the consecration. But Luther makes it clear that neither he nor any true Lutheran would want to be drawn into the old argument from the Middle Ages as to the exact point in the syllables of the words of institution at which the body of Christ is present. Rather, Luther says, "We are simply content to believe with certainty that whatever God says happens or exists does happen." But Luther assumes that when the officiant speaks the words of institution in accordance with Christ's command, then there really takes place what the words declare. For Luther says specifically, "We are not curious about the time of the syllables or the moment at which it was done; and Lazarus was revived as the Word of Christ sounded, 'Lazarus, come out' (John 11:43). We leave it to the idle and to the boastful as to whether or not he revived him at the word 'come,' or 'out,' or 'Lazarus.' and there are many such things. And so here we say that bread is the body of Christ because Christ said, 'This is my body,' and we stay away from the other idle arguments, when they dispute about moments and syllables. For we are commanded to believe that the words of God are true, but not to investigate at what instant or how the words are true and how they are fulfilled."⁶ There can be no doubt that in Luther's mind the bread becomes the body of Christ at the

consecration. And it need hardly be stated that this letter to Carlstadt agrees dogmatically with what Luther said in 1526 in his "The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ — Against the Fanatics" (LW 36, 340-341) and in his "Confession Concerning Christ's Supper" (LW 37, 180-191).

Volume four of the Latin Jena edition remains to be examined. This volume contains the Latin writings of Luther from 1538 to 1547. Here, folio pages and following are obviously the reference to which the SD VII, 87, directs us. It is Luther's second letter to Wolferinus, July 20, 1543:

Grace and peace, Indeed, why should I not have been disturbed and saddened, my dear Simon Wolferinus, when I saw you two, living together in one town and the ministers of one church, agreeing completely in doctrine, but carrying on between yourselves with such a bitter spirit, because of a matter which you have neither examined closely enough, and which is not that important if it were examined more closely? Look at these propositions of yours, and see whether or not such a terrible outcry is in keeping with charity and brotherly love. I see that Satan is tempting you, by making a beam out of a splinter, or rather a fire out of a spark. You could have solved this by a meeting between the two of you, since it is not a matter of being against the madness of the papists, but against a colleague of yours in the ministry and in religion.

Indeed Dr. Philip wrote rightly that there is no sacrament outside of the sacramental action; but you are defining the sacramental action much too hastily and abruptly. If you do it in this way, you will appear to have absolutely no sacrament. For if such a quick breaking off of the action really exists, it will follow that after the speaking of the Words [of institution], which is the most powerful and principle action in the sacrament, no one would receive the body and blood of Christ, because the action would have ceased. Certainly Dr. Philip does not want that. But such a definition of the action would bring about infinite scruples of conscience and endless questions, such as are disputed among the papists, as, for example, whether the body and blood of Christ are present at the first, middle, or last syllable. Therefore, one must look not only upon this movement of instant or present action but also on the time. Not in terms of mathematical but of physical breadth, that is, one must give this action a certain period of time, in a period of appropriate breadth of time, as they say, "in breadth."

Therefore, we shall define the time or the sacramental action in this way: that it starts with the beginning of the Our

Father and lasts until all have communicated, have emptied the chalice, have consumed the Hosts, until the people have been dismissed and [the priest] has left the altar. In this way we shall be safe and free from the scruples and scandals of such endless questions. Dr. Philip defines the sacramental action in relation to what is outside it, that is, against reservation of and processions with the sacrament. He does not split it up within [the action] itself, nor does he define it in a way that it contradicts itself. Therefore see to it that if anything is left over of the sacrament, either some communicants or the priest himself and his assistant receive it, so that it is not only a curate or someone else who drinks what is left over in the chalice, but that he gives it to the others who were also participants in the body [of Christ], so that you do not appear to divide the sacrament by a bad example or to treat the sacramental action irreverently. This is my opinion and I know that it is also Philip's opinion too.⁷

This letter of Luther to Wolferinus gives the definition of the time or the action of the Lord's Supper. The writer examined volume four of the Latin Jena edition (published in 1583) in the rare book room of Concordia Theological Seminary Library, Fort Wayne. The temptation was strong to pursue a side-trail to discover the provenance of this particular volume, because the words that are underlined in the translation above were heavily underlined in the Latin text with a large "N.B." written on the margin. The pages were otherwise free from markings. Some theologian, apparently several hundred years ago, had caught the significance of this definition of the time or the action as set forth by Luther and referred to in SD VII, 87.

There can be no doubt that this is the lost Luther reference of SD VII, 87, because it clarifies beyond question what the authors of the Formula had in mind. It is difficult to understand why the scholarly Goettingen edition did not have in its footnote to SD VII, 87, the following notation, "WA, Br. 10, 348, 349." The Weimar edition of Luther's letters correctly gives the Wolferinus reference to the Jena edition as "Jen. 4, 585 b."

The question may arise why the folio number was not given in the original edition of the Book of Concord. If it had been, it may have encouraged theologians in later centuries to check on the reference. A probable explanation is that the Wolferinus letter at the time of the composition of the Formula was so well known to the theologians that it did not need more identification. A modern analogy by way of illustration, might be the resolution passed at New Orleans Convention of the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod in 1973 which sets forth as a guiding principle for a confes-

sional synod the proposition that false doctrine cannot be tolerated in the church of God, much less be excused and defended. Since this statement has been so hotly debated and has received so much publicity one would need to say no more than "Res. 3-09" or "1973 Convention Proceedings." One would not have to be an especially knowledgeable theologian to identify the reference.

An examination of the Solid Declaration in the 1580 Dresden edition reveals that some references are specifically identified, with the folio number also in the text. Sometimes there is a marginal reference to the Wittenberg edition of Luther's works (e.g., SD VII, 28), and sometimes there is a reference made to Luther and he is quoted as in SD VIII, 21, where the confessors refer to Luther's Great Confession and his remarks on Zwingli's *alloeosis*. The authors note that Luther called this the devil's mask and damned it to the depths of hell. In this quotation there is absolutely no identification of the exact source either in the text itself or in the margin. But there is no question that Luther's remarks on Zwingli's theory of *alloeosis* were so well known that knowledgeable theologians could find them very quickly. Similarly, the Luther-Wolferinus correspondence was quoted a great deal in the controversies that arose before the settlement of the Formula of Concord. To take a specific example from a book published in Erfurt in 1563 by the loyal Lutheran Erhard Sperber, it is significant to note that he appeals to the Luther-Wolferinus correspondence as a further explanation of the meaning of the rule, "Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum institutum" ("there is no sacrament apart from the instituted use"). He gives the source of the quotation, but without the folio number, "Er spricht aber der frome Lutherus in 4 Lateinischer Tomo / zu Jena gedruckt / in einer epistle / so er im 43. Jar an magistrum Wolffferinum geschrieben."⁸

The reference to "Tom. IV, Jen." entered the Solid Declaration via the Swabian-Saxon Concord, which chiefly authored by Chemnitz and Chytraeus. In May 1576 it was accepted into the Torgau Book. It is virtually impossible to conceive of the other four formulators of the Solid Declaration at Torgau not knowing what Chemnitz and Chytraeus had in mind when the Luther-Wolferinus correspondence was accepted into the Torgau Book. It is even more incredible to assume that, when the six men met a year later at Bergen Abbey to draft the final text of the Solid Declaration, they overlooked an oblique Luther reference which had inadvertently slipped into the Torgau Book the year previous. As a matter of fact, it is evident that they did scrutinize this particular sentence (SD VII, 87), because they made a slight change in it from the Torgau Book. The original sentence had

read, "Denn solchen papistischen Misbräuchen diese Regel erstlich entgegen gesetzt und von D. Luthero Tom. 4 Jen. erkläret ist." The Bergic Book substituted "anfanglich" for "erstlich" but left the rest of the sentence intact, including the reference to the Jena volume.⁹

In addition, there is further evidence that the Luther-Wolferinus correspondence was pivotal for understanding the intention of the axiom, "Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum a Christo institutum" ("there is no sacrament apart from the use instituted by Christ"). On July 28, 1619, the theological faculty of Wittenberg rendered a decision with regard to the question as to whether it is right for a pastor to take the remaining consecrated wine home for common use, since with the cessation of the action the sacrament ceases. The faculty gave a negative answer although granting that "quod cessante actione, cesset sacramentum" ("when the action ceases, the sacrament ceases"). But the faculty then insists that the sacramental action must be correctly defined.¹⁰ They insist that the three parts of the action must be done entirely together *in ipso usu sacramenti*; otherwise the sacramental action is not carried out. From this it follows that such action does not end until all that has been consecrated has been consumed. For this reason it is not proper to take consecrated wine home for common table use. Then excerpts from Luther's two letters to Wolferinus are quoted to support this decision, and the reference is precisely given, "Tom 4, Jenensi Lat. fol. 585 b." From the first letter of Luther to Wolferinus (July 4, 1543), they quote the following: "For you can do what we do here, namely, eat and drink the remains of the sacrament with the communicants, so that it is not necessary to raise these scandalous and dangerous questions about when the action of the sacrament ends, questions in which you will choke unless you come to your senses. For with this argument you are abolishing the whole sacrament and you do not have anything with which to answer those who are making false accusations, who say that in the action of the sacrament there is more cessation than action."¹¹ The faculty opinion then goes on to quote from the second letter, where Luther defines the time or the sacramental action. It is quite evident that when the formulators of the Solid Declaration added the specific reference in SD VII, 87, to volume four of the Jena edition of Luther's Works, it was not an occult reference. We do not realize today that the controversy between the Philippists and the Gnesio-Lutherans was far-reaching and very deep and that the so-called Saliger Controversy was only a small part of the controversy.

Luther's two letters to Wolferinus were occasioned by the fact

that there was a disagreement between Wolferinus and another pastor (Frederick Rauber) in Luther's home city, Eisleben, on the action in the Lord's Supper. Wolferinus, on the basis of Melanchthon's teaching, had been mixing consecrated and unconsecrated elements. An appeal had been made to Jonas at Halle (the superintendent) and to Luther at Wittenberg. It is evident that the practice had caused Luther great grief, and so in the first letter he writes to Wolferinus saying, "Perhaps you want to be considered a Zwinglian, and am I to believe that you are afflicted with the insanity of Zwingli?" Luther speaks even more harshly to him, "But the Lord whom you oppose will oppose you in return." And he then concludes that if the church were to follow the ideas of Wolferinus, "We would be forced to have a sacrament only in the action and not what happens in between, and finally time and the moment will be the causes of the sacrament, and many other absurdities will follow." Apparently Wolferinus continued to defend himself so that Luther felt compelled to send him the second letter.

A brief analysis of the Luther-Wolferinus correspondence yields the following conclusions and questions:

1. Luther and the Formula always turn to the Words of Institution for their doctrine of the Lord's Supper. While they make use of 1 Corinthians 10, it is always ancillary and it does not receive the emphasis that it does with many today. The useful "rule and norm" has been derived from the Words of Institution (SD VII, 85). Luther's exegesis of the Words of Institution (LW 37, 180ff.) demands that the command, "Do this in remembrance of me," refers to everything in the Words of Institution (LW 37, 187). Hence, Luther says, "Now let the whole world be judge between me and this spirit which bread must yield to the other. My bread has on its side the text 'Eat, this is my body,' and explains with emphatic words that this bread is the body of Christ" (LW 37, 189). Luther understands Christ's institution of the Lord's Supper to include the fact that the consecration effects the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the bread and that the sacramental action includes the eating of that which by virtue of the consecration is the body of Christ. For Luther those elements that come under the word "this" of the words of consecration spoken in the name of Jesus and at His command are the body and blood of Christ. Hence Luther writes in the second letter to Wolferinus, "For if such a quick breaking off of the action really exists, it will follow that after the speaking of the words [of institution] *which is the most powerful and principal action in the sacrament*, no one would have received the body and blood of Christ because the action would have ceased" (emphasis added). Luther reiterates his central thesis that the Word of God

when used at His bidding is an all-powerful Word that accomplishes what it says that it does. This is true not only of the Lord's Supper but also of Baptism and Absolution. The Solid Declaration accepts this exegesis of Luther, "For wherever we observe His institution and speak His words over the bread and cup and distribute the blessed bread and cup, Christ Himself is still active through the spoken words by virtue of the first institution, which he wants to be repeated. Chrysostom says in his *Sermon on the Passion*: 'Christ Himself prepares this table and blesses it. No human being, but only Christ Himself who was crucified for us, can make of the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ. The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but by God's power and grace through the words that he speaks, "This is my body," the elements set before us in the Supper are blessed'" (SD VII, 75b 76a). This is the reason that Luther defines the time of the sacramental action as he does in this letter. He is entirely consistent with what he has previously written and practiced and what he will write in his letter to Amsdorf in January 1546 regarding the Priest Besser who gave a communicant an unconsecrated Host instead of one that was consecrated and which had fallen to the floor.¹²

2. There is a difficulty, however, in this letter of how to understand Luther's words, "with the beginning of Our Father." The original Latin reads, "ut incipiat ab initio orationis dominicae." Hardt has examined the difficulties with this phrase. Luther never refers to prayer as effecting the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements. This is so evident it hardly needs to be mentioned. But Luther has discussed various liturgies and where to place the Lord's Prayer in the liturgy. In the *Formula Missae* the Lord's Prayer follows the Words of Institution. In the *Deutsche Messe* the Lord's Prayer comes before the Words of Institution, as in our liturgy. We know from Luther's letter to Carlstadt that he does not worry about which syllable effects the presence of Christ's body and blood. He only confesses that we know that the body and blood are present because Christ says, "this is my body." Hardt has brought together considerable evidence that medieval religious language still used the word *oratio* in its classic sense, meaning discourse, speech, speaking, etc. Although Luther generally uses the word *oratio* in the sense of prayer, there is evidence that at times he does revert to late medieval theological language in the use of this word. Then the sentence would simply mean that the sacramental action begins with the Words of Institution.¹³

3. Another difficulty arises as to how are to interpret Luther's references to Melancthon. He writes, "Indeed Dr. Philip wrote rightly that there is no sacrament outside of the sacramental

action; but you are defining a sacramental action much too hastily and abruptly." And a little later Luther says, "Certainly Dr. Philip does not want that." And then the further sentence, "Dr. Philip defines the sacramental action in relation to what is outside it, that is, against reservation of and processions with the sacrament; he does not split it up within itself, nor does he define it in a way that it contradicts itself." In view of Luther's positive view of Melanchthon in this letter of 1543, it becomes necessary to look at what Melanchthon really believed regarding the sacrament and when he began to believe it.

The whole question of what Melanchthon taught and when he taught it is just now being carefully analyzed. Wilhelm H. Neuser has published one volume on Melanchthon's doctrine of the Lord's Supper in its historical development from 1519 to 1530 (475 pages of text), and he has planned a second volume examining Melanchthon's doctrine from 1530 to 1560. Hardt has elicited from the Melanchthonian material some new insights into Melanchthon's doctrine of the Lord's Supper with particular reference to his views on the modes of Christ's presence.¹⁴ For a clearer understanding of the critical points where Luther and Melanchthon parted company and of which note is taken in the Solid Declaration, the following differences should be noted. These shifts in Melanchthon's doctrine occurred quite early in his career.

a. Melanchthon in a judgment on Zwingli's doctrine (made about July 25, 1530) identifies himself with Luther as confessing the Real Presence, but he identifies the sacramental presence with the general omnipresence. He identifies the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper with "that mode by which the person of Christ or the whole Christ is present in all creatures" (CR 2, 224).¹⁵ Melanchthon had already arrived at this position by March 1528, for he writes to Balthasar Thuring that he does not approve of the position that the body of Christ cannot be in many places, "because Christ is exalted above all creatures and He is everywhere. For he says, I am in your midst." (CR 1, 949).¹⁶ And in a letter to Oecolampadius in 1529, Melanchthon says, "You contend that the body of the absent Christ is, so to speak, represented as in a tragedy. But I see existing promises such as 'I am with you to the end of the world.' . . . Since this is so, I feel that in the Supper there is a communion of the body that is present" (CR 1, 1049).¹⁷

Luther, however, does not identify the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper with the general omnipresence of Christ or as the presence of Christ in the church, where two or three are gathered together. He says that the one body of Christ has a three-fold existence, or all three modes of being at a given place. Besides the

comprehensible, corporeal mode of presence as when he walked bodily on the earth, Luther says that there is "secondly, the uncircumscribed, spiritual mode of presence according to which He neither occupies nor yields space but passed through everything created as He wills He employed this presence when He left the closed grave and came through closed doors, in the bread and wine in the Supper, and, as people believe, when He was born in His mother." Luther clearly distinguishes this mode from the third mode, where "you must place this existence of Christ which constitutes Him one person with God far, far beyond things created, as far as God transcends them; and, on the other hand, place it as deep in and as near to all created things as God is in them. For He is one indivisible person with God, and wherever God is He must be also; otherwise our faith is false" (LW 37, 222-224). This doctrinal position of Luther has been taken over into the Formula (SD VII, 92-103).

b. According to Neuser, Melanchthon sometime after 1526 stopped speaking of the omnipotence of the Word with respect to the Lord's Supper, thus separating himself from the teaching of Luther. When Melanchthon speaks of the words of institution, he talks about them "according to the promise" or "according to the Word of Christ because Christ has so spoken."¹⁸ In January 1528, Melanchthon writes to Balthasar Thuring that in the matter of the Lord's Supper, the consecration, as they call it, had for a long time caused him offense. Also, Oecolampadius had been strongly pushing him with the question as to whether it was possible that Christ could be called down from heaven. Does this happen through the merits and prayers of the priest or the people, or, as they say, by the power of the words? (CR 1, 948). Neuser concludes that Melanchthon denied both the assertion that the sacramental presence is achieved through the prayers of the priest or the people and that it is achieved by the power of the Word (p. 363), because Melanchthon says later in the letter that he has finally come to the opinion that Christ gives us His body and blood not through the merits and prayers of the priest or the people nor by the power of the words, for that, as it is said, is magic.

Since Melanchthon identifies the general omnipresence and the sacramental presence, Christ is present in the sacrament through His general promises that He is in the midst of us and is with us always until the end of the world. Hence He is present in the sacrament when we believe His promises. One should consult Neuser for a fuller understanding of how Melanchthon reinterprets the words of consecration. The words of institution are words or promise; that is, they are directed to men. According to him, there is no particular sacramental word (*Sakramentswort*).

The words of institution in their entire extent are promise so that they are directed only to the faith of man and not to the elements (pp. 367-370).

Luther, it will be recalled, firmly clings to the doctrine of the sacramental presence through the powerful words of consecration. He had confessed this in 1526 against the Fanatics (LW 36, 341); and in 1528 (February), while Melancthon writes to Thuring, Luther is reiterating the truth in "The Confession Concerning Christ's Supper" that the sacramental presence is achieved through the consecration, but "of course, it does not reside in our speaking but in God's command, who connects His command with our speaking" (LW 37, 184). It is further evident that Luther's doctrine has been taken over by the Formula because the succeeding words from this book are embodied in SD VII, 78.

In the ensuing controversies that raged in the decades prior to the adoption of the Formula, one of the chief charges hurled against the Gnesio-Lutherans by the Philippists was that of "magic." Erhard Sperber in his book published in Erfurt in 1563 records an incident where a Philippist insists that it is "magic" ("eine Zauberey vel Magiam") to teach that through the Words of Institution that the officiant speaks the bread and wine are consecrated to be the body and blood of the Lord. The Gnesio-Lutheran answers that it is not *Magia* because what is done is done at the command and through the Word of God, and therefore what takes place, is precisely what God says. It would be different if evil people said something without the command of God. That might be termed the devil's magic, but there is no similarity of that with the institution of the Lord's Supper.¹⁹

Since this charge can still be heard today, it might be helpful to note Sasse's words, "We should never speak of the 'magic' of the Roman mass, as if the words of consecration which effect the Real Presence were a sort of magical incantation. 'Magic' is the attempt of man to compel the Deity to do something. A magical formula must always be the same, while words of consecration may be spoken in different languages and even in various forms, as happens to be the case in the Western and Eastern church. According to Thomas [Aquinas], the words are effective as the words of Christ. He refers to the utterances of the Fathers in which the power of consecration is solely attributed to the almighty words of Christ, and insists on the minister's being only the instrument of Christ in this case."²⁰

This is the doctrine of Luther which the Formula of Concord also takes over in SD VII, 73-90. The Sacrament of the Altar is "promise," for it is the Gospel, as Luther so often said (LW 36,

289; LW 38, 38). But it is so because we administer it on the basis of a divine command, *mandatum Dei*. This is why Luther asserts that it is a "man-made opinion" to think that God is here "performing some kind of hocus-pocus." Rather, "He has put Himself into the Word and through the Word He puts Himself into the bread also" (LW 36, 343). For Luther the reverse side of this theological fact is that where there is no *mandatum Dei*, one has only the work of man, and hence he ends the Smalcald Articles with the straight-forward statement that all such consecrations "cannot be called blessings, and they are not, but are mere mockery and fraud" (SA III, XV, 5). One comes to the conclusion that by 1543 Melancthon had drifted much farther from the Scriptural doctrine that an unsuspecting Luther could have imagined.

If we, in conclusion, assess the theological damage done because of the lost Luther reference, it is evident that by the omission of the Luther reference in SD VII, 87, in the Tappert edition, Luther's doctrine of the consecration has been seriously maimed. And then by supplying in the footnote to this passage totally misleading information as to Luther's doctrine with regard to a consecration done in accord with Christ's command, the Tappert edition has given this section of the Formula a definite Melancthonian twist. This may not be so serious for those Lutherans who today look upon the Book of Concord merely as an historically conditioned response to problems that confronted the Lutherans four hundreds years ago. But it should be of great concern to those who today make a *quia* subscription to the Book of Concord. They should be moved to make a fresh but careful, independent, objective study of the doctrine of the Book of Concord.²¹

Footnotes

1. Theo. G. Trappert, tr. and ed., *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
2. *Luther's Works*, ed. J. Pelikan and H. T. Lehman (Concordia Publishing House and Fortress Press), 34, 52; here note 104 observes that for a more detailed and complete listing of topics by Luther, one should consult WA 30 II, 249-255. Actually, Luther's "Exhortation to All Clergy" is found in Volume V of the German Jena edition and not in either the German or Latin Volume IV.
3. *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, 5th ed. (Göttingen, 1963).
4. *Concordia: Christliche widerholete einmütige Bekenntnis* (Dresden, 1580), fol. 301. *Concordia: Pia et Unanimi Consensu Repetita Confessio Fidei et Doctrinae* (Lipsiae, 1580), fol. 715. J. T. Mueller, *Die symbolischen Bücher der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, deutsch und lateinisch*, 8th ed. (Güttersloh, 1898), p. 666. C. P. Caspari and Gisle Johnson, *Konkordiebogen* (Decorah, Iowa: Lutheran Publishing House, 1899), p. 459. Fr. Bente, *Concordia Triglot* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1922), p. 1003.

5. Tom G. A. Hardt, *Venerabilis et Adorabilis Eucharistia. En Studie I Den Lutherska Nattvardsläran Under 1500 Talet* (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 9, 1971), p. 286f.
6. WA Br. IV, 367-388. The letter is also found in De Wette 3, 231, and Enders 6, 127. There is a German translation in St. Louis 20, 324f. I use the translation of E. F. Peters, *Extra Usus Nullum Sacramentum. The Origin and Meaning of the Axiom: "Nothin Has the Character of a Sacrament Outside of the Use" in Sixteenth-Century and Seventeenth-Century Lutheran Theology*. A thesis presented to the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, Department of Systematic Theology, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Theology, 1968, p. 198f.
7. Jena, Latin edition, IV (emphasis added). The edition the writer examined was reprinted at Jena in 1583. It is to be found in the rare book room of Concordia Theological Seminary, Ft. Wayne, Indiana. The Latin text is to be found in De Wette 5, 577, and in Enders 15, 182. There is a German translation in St. L. 20, 1604f. I use the English translation of E. F. Peters (see note 6), p. 209f. Hardt (see note 5), p. 286f. (including footnotes), supplies considerable information on the use made of the Luther-Wolferinus correspondence.
8. Erhard Sperber, *Christliche und notwerdige verantwortung Erhardi Sperbers wider die grewliche bezichtigung und beschwerliche Aufflag der Sacramentirer und Rottengeister zu Dantzic* (Erfured, 1563), fol. 14b, 206f. Duplicated copies of this book are available in the libraries of Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mankato, Minnesota and Concordia Theological Seminary, Ft. Wayne, Indiana.
9. Heinrich Heppe, *Der Text der Bergischen Concordienformel, verglichen mit dem Text der swäbischen Concordie, der schwäbisch-sächsischen Concordie, und des Torgauer Buches* (Marburg: Druck und Verlag von John. Aug. Koch, 1857), p. 139.
10. This Faculty Censura is to be found in *Redekin: Thesauri Conciliorum*, I (Hamburg, 1671), p. 585.
11. English translation by E. F. Peters, p. 208 (see note 6).
12. Adam Besserer, a young assistant of Amsdorf, had given an unconsecrated wafer to the last communicant. Later a woman found the original consecrated wafer laying on the floor. Besserer put it back with the unconsecrated bread, since, as he later explained, he was not sure whether it had fallen to the floor before or after the consecration. When Besserer became aware of what had happened, he was reported to have stated that there was no difference between a consecrated and an unconsecrated wafer. Superintendent Amsdorf had him put in jail while he wrote to Wittenberg for advice on how to handle such a situation. Luther, after consulting with Bugenhagen, writes back that it was not necessary to jail him, but that he must be excommunicated, "Let him go to his Zwinglians" (*vadat ad suos Zwinglianos*). Luther writes in this way because he regarded the act as not mere indifference but as something evil (*sed nequitia*). At a later hearing Besserer exonerated himself by saying that as a young, inexperienced assistant he was so nervous that he had not realized what he was doing. The original letter in Latin is to be found in WA Br. XI, 258f; De Wette, 5, 776f.; there is a German translation in St. L. 21b, 3179f.; there is a Danish translation in C. J. Holt, *Udvalgte Breve of Dr. Martin Luther* (Copenhagen, 1923), II, 428f. Regin Prenter discusses the letter in some detail in his *Kirkens Lutherske Bekendelse* (Fredericia: Hovedkommission Lohses Forlag, 1978), p. 116f.
13. Hardt, p. 230.
14. Neuser, Wilhelm, *Die Abendmahls-lehre Melanchthons in ihrer*

- geschichtlichen Entwicklung (1519-1530)* (Neukirchener Verlag, 1968); see esp. pp. 363-371, "Die Weise des Gegenwärtigwerdens (Consecratio)." Hardt (see note 5), pp. 89-99.
15. The reference is to Bretschneider, *Corpus Reformatorum* (Halle, 1834-1879): "... sed illo modo quo Christi persona seu totus Christus praesens est omnibus creaturis."
 16. "Christus enim exaltatus est super omnes creaturas, et adest ubique. Inquit enim: *in medio vestrum sum*."
 17. "Vos absentis Christi corpus, tanquam, in tragoedia representari contentitis. Ego de Christo video exstare promissiones: *Ero vobiscum usque ad consummationem seculi* Quod cum ita sint, sentio, in illa Coena praesentis corporis Koinonia esse."
 18. Neuser, pp. 364-369.
 19. Sperber (see note 8), fol. K2.
 20. Sasse, Hermann, *This is My Body*, rev. ed. (Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1977), p. 35.
 21. Samuel H. Nafzger has again forcefully reminded us that "a pastor (or professor or teacher) of a confessional church body subscribes unconditionally to the doctrinal content of the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 'because,' in the words of C. f. W. Walther, 'he recognizes the fact that it is in full agreement with Scripture and does not militate against Scripture in any point, whether that point be of major or minor importance . . .'" ("The Future of Confessional Lutheranism in the World," *CTQ*, July 1978, p. 221.)

The author is President-emeritus
of Bethany Lutheran College
and Seminary, Mankato, MN.

The State of Evangelism in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod

Erwin J. Kolb

On a recent airplane journey the man sitting next to me saw me reading an article on EST in *Sky*, the Delta Airlines magazine, and asked, "What do you think of EST?" "I don't know much about it," I said, "but doesn't it involve some kind of brain-washing techniques?" "Oh, no. It really works. There has been scientific evidence for that, just as there has been for TM." I asked more and discovered that this man was involved in TM, meditating fifteen minutes every morning and every evening, repeating his Mantra. He started when a friend of his died of a heart attack at thirty-five and he said to himself, "I've got to do something with my tension, or I'll go the same way." I suggested that the church could also help people deal with their tensions and other problems. He was a Christian, he said, having grown up in the United Church of Christ. He agreed that personal devotions and living with a confident trust in the presence of God could do for me the same thing that TM was doing for him, but he asked, "Why isn't the church reaching the masses like these other mind-related movements are? Maybe the church can help people cope with their problems, but it isn't."

That question haunts everyone who is involved in helping the church communicate the Gospel of Jesus Christ to people, so that by the power of the Spirit of God people can have what Jesus intended, "life in all its fullness" (John 10:10). That is what this paper is dealing with, what we in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod are doing in the way of evangelism. We want to look at where we have been and where we are now, and at the same time take a look ahead. We want to examine both attitudes and practices. We will mix them all together — past, present, future, attitudes, and practices — under five summary statements:

1. We are adding evangelism to missions.
2. We are distinguishing mission, means, and goal.
3. We are replacing manipulation with motivation.
4. We are struggling with some faulty assumptions.
5. We are winning people for Jesus Christ and His Church.

Several more comments are in order before we begin to examine these statements more closely. These statements are personal observations that are intended to reflect various areas of the church. They are more true of some areas than of others. I have,

however sought to base them on my observations made in the course of visiting almost all of our thirty-eight North American Districts in the last six and a half years. Also notice that each statement is cast with an "are" and with an "-ing." These are intended to indicate that there is change and movement.

I. We Are Adding Evangelism to Missions

The Missouri Synod has always been mission-minded. Some of our forefathers came to this country to convert the Indians. Congregations have for years had mission festivals to raise money to send missionaries to foreign countries. But this mission-mindedness largely involved sending professional clergyman to some other countries. We did not send lay-people to China or India. We were not sufficiently concerned about telling our neighbor about Jesus Christ or sharing the Gospel in our own community. What I see is that some thirty to forty years ago we began to add some new dimensions to the mission-mindedness that we might call "evangelism." These dimensions include:

1. Adding local witnessing to foreign missions.
2. Adding lay witness to clergy witness.
3. Becoming more open to personal response as well as the objective response.

In Acts 8:1 we read that the early church, because of persecutions, was scattered from Jerusalem to other towns throughout Judea and Samaria, all "except the apostles." They stayed in Jerusalem at this time. Then Acts 8:4 tells us that wherever this scattered church of lay people went they "preached the Word" (*euaggelizomenoi ton logon*), or as Michael Green¹ put it, "they gossiped the Gospel" with their neighbors and friends. This is being emphasized today more and more by all churches as we realize that if the Gospel is to be preached in "all the world," (Mark 16:16) it will have to be done by lay people. There just are not enough professionals to accomplish this end. But then what is the task of the professional clergy? According to St. Paul its task is to "equip" the saints for their work (Ephesians 4:11-12). Elton Trueblood coined the phrase that the pastor is to be the "playing coach," a term that is common today in evangelism programs such as the *Evangelism Explosion* of D. James Kennedy. The coach is to motivate his team, help each player find his position, develop his skills to play that particular position, point him to the goal, and develop the strategy; and in addition the pastor-coach plays the game with his team.

This addition of laity to clergy in personal evangelism is still developing and by no means complete. According to the *Study of Generations*,² only ten percent of Lutheran people do "considerable witness", measured in terms of talking to someone about

their faith, making a visit, giving someone a tract, inviting someone to church. Forty percent of Lutherans witness in these ways sometimes and fifty percent never do. That was in 1972. In a 1977 poll Gallup asked the question, "Have you ever tried to encourage someone to believe in Jesus Christ?" In response fifty-seven percent of the Lutherans polled said "Yes." The national average was forty-seven percent and the Protestant average fifty-eight percent.

The third aspect of adding evangelism to missions is the adding of the personal to the objective. This addition is difficult for Lutherans, who have always emphasized the objective truth of the Scripture. We have stressed the intellectual aspects of faith, understanding the catechism and accepting it with our mind. But when we witness to our friends and neighbors, we need to say not only, "This is what the Bible says," but also, "This is what I believe"; "This is what Jesus has done in my life." We have begun to find a place for personal testimony also within our church structures — namely, in small sharing-groups. One of the programs that has helped our clergy and lay-people verbalize their faith has been the Renewal Retreats which stress small "support-groups" which study the Scriptures and help each member of the group evaluate how he is growing in his faith and sharing it with others. The program was developed with the concept that the best "sowing" happens when there is healthy "growing."

II. We Are Distinguishing Mission, Means, and Goal

August Suelflow in a convention essay prepared for the 125th anniversary of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, "Recounting His Mercies," saw in our history a tension between what he called "twin focal points" which were to preserve and to proclaim the Gospel. At times we emphasized one over the other in the concept of mission which guided our church activities. We still struggle with the proper balance of those two focal points, but it seems to me that the tension today is seen more between missions, means, and goal. What is our mission? What is the goal we seek to accomplish? What is the means by which to reach that goal. The problem is illustrated when we read convention resolutions which begin, "Whereas the primary purpose of the church is to preach the Gospel to all nations . . ." Likewise, in an essay presented at a theological convocation this statement was made, "The primary mission of the church can be described as the faithful use of the means of grace." Both of these statements stress "means" and "mission" but overlook the "goal."

What is the "goal"? Jesus gave it to the church in the Great Commission, "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of

the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age" (Matt. 28:19-20). As you know, there are four verbs in the basic commission: "go," "make disciples," "baptizing," "teaching." And which is the imperative? "Make disciples." The others are participles which indicate the means needed to carry out the command, by "going," "baptizing," and by "teaching." The emphasis is not on the participles, but on the imperative. The same goal can be seen in the other occurrences of the "Dominical Commissions." In Luke it is that people "repent" and receive the "forgiveness of sins" (Luke 24:44-48). In Mark it is that they be baptized and "be saved" (Mark 16:15-16). In John Jesus prays for the unity of the church so that "the world may believe" (John 17:21). Our forefathers expressed this concern in our constitution when they listed as Object Two of the Synod, "The joint extension of the Kingdom of God." A Task Force has suggested as a substitute object, "Extend the Gospel witness into all the world." I think that this phraseology tends to place the emphasis on the means instead of the goal.

To summarize, the Church is sent on a mission equipped with means to accomplish the goal. The goal is to make disciples of all nations. The means to accomplish that goal is the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments, what Walther called "the infallible marks of the church." A resolution of our Anaheim Convention in 1975 (1-02A) stated it like this: "Evangelism has as its goal the conversion of the whole world."³ To use Suelflow's language, we need to "preserve" the Gospel in order to "proclaim" it. Or in our terms, we need to keep our mission clearly in mind and to use the *means* to accomplish the goal. The means are not to be used as ends in themselves.

One of the results of a confusion of means and goal can be the identification of a function of the church, such as teaching, worship, fellowship, or nurture, with the goal. These become ends in themselves, and the mission and goal are clouded. In an article entitled "Evangelism" in *Circle* (December, 1973) Oscar J. Ice quotes a pastor as saying, "My sole pastoral mission is to care for those already within the church." Pastoral care may be "a mission," or a function which uses the special gifts given to a pastor, but the overarching goal is still to "make disciples." Every pastor, every member of the church has a responsibility to that goal. The functions of education or worship that the church carries out must be related to that goal.

Another result of confusing means and goal is reflected in the statement, "Our job is to sow the seed. We do not worry about the results. We leave the harvest to God." It is true that our job is to

sow the seed and that God produces the results, but we need to be very concerned about the harvest. When Jesus saw the crowds in his day he said, "The harvest is plentiful, but the laborers few; pray therefore the Lord of the harvest to send out laborers into his harvest" (Matt. 9:37-38). We are the laborers, the reapers. St. Paul could say that "No one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit" (I Cor. 12:3), but he could also say, "I have made myself a slave to all, that I might win the more" (I Cor. 9:19). And four more times he says, "I win" — the Jews, those under the law, those outside the law, and the weak (I Cor. 9:19-22). The Christian, in a unique kind of synergism, is the channel by which the Gospel, as the power of God, is brought to people; he is the instrument which God uses. My goal then in witnessing is not merely to sow the seed but to help it develop into a healthy fruit-bearing plant. In practice this principal means a strong emphasis on such things as sponsoring, integrating, and assimilating new members. Our goal is not to get a person to make a decision to receive Christ or to join the church, but to help a person become a fully functioning disciple within the Body of Christ.

III. We are Replacing Manipulation with Motivation

By manipulation I am referring, first of all, to the way in which we seek to move people to give for missions or to witness to their faith. As I have listened to mission or evangelism sermons over the years, the appeals I have often heard were to fear, guilt, duty, pity, obedience, example, and sometimes love and gratitude. Many of these kinds of approaches to motivating people are manipulating people to do what they really do not want to do. They are forcing people with Law rather than moving them with Gospel. Hopefully we are moving away from these manipulative approaches to motivation with the Gospel. The Anaheim evangelism resolution puts it like this, "The motivation for all evangelism is the baptized Christian's Spirit-born compulsion to share the Gospel."⁴ Sydral says that motivation for missions is "not an imposed task or program, but the natural overflow of a redeemed nature that has within it the same love nature that Christ has."⁵ That "compulsion" is created by the Spirit through the Gospel and needs continual nurture and direction.

The second problem that this statement of "replacing manipulation with motivation" addresses is the problem of seeking a commitment in a witnessing situation. The problem arises especially when Lutherans use methods of evangelism which come from other sources without changing them in any way. Most of these methods come out of Reformed theology and are based on assumptions which are incongruous with Lutheran theology. The result often is that we use methods which involve

sales techniques and other subtle devices which can manipulate people into the right responses. Recent research has indicated that skilled persuaders can exert tremendous influence on people with purely human techniques. Not only can a person be made "religious" through hypnosis, but psychologist James McConnell says, "The time has come when if you give me any normal human being and a couple of weeks . . . I can change his behavior from what it is now to whatever you want it to be, if it's physically possible. I can't make him fly by flapping his wings, but I can turn him from a Christian into a Communist and vice versa."⁶

One of the areas where this phenomenon becomes a concern for Missouri Lutherans is in using methods like "The Four Spiritual Laws" of Campus Crusade or the *Evangelism Explosion* of D. James Kennedy, as the witness seeks to obtain a commitment. People can be from one "yes" to another until they are brought to their "prayer of commitment" in a way which looks very similar to a method of persuasion which psychologists call a "cognitive consistency" model. When a person says one "yes" he is under pressure to be consistent and to say it again. And the danger is that the prayer of commitment is treated as a means of grace. The impression is given that the individual makes the decision to accept Christ of his own free will. About fifty percent of the congregations of the Missouri Synod are using some type of "Kennedy" method, either the original material or an adaptation of it. Some of the Lutheran adaptations in use are *Speaking of Salvation* by Steve Biegel, *Presenting the Gospel* by Armand Ulbrich, and *Dialog Evangelism* by W. Leroy Biesenthal.

Speaking of Salvation is a private endeavor by a young pastor in Michigan. He developed his adaptation while a student at Concordia Seminary, Springfield, now Fort Wayne. *Presenting the Gospel* is the method the Synod's Board for Evangelism published and is farther away from the original Kennedy than the others. It offers more options, and suggests that the material be studied in small groups. *Dialog Evangelism* is by far the most widely used. Pastor Biesenthal put his adaptation in a three-ring notebook which is used at his clinics and then used to teach the method to lay-people in the parish. He is now the Associate Secretary for Evangelism and is continuing to conduct clinics on the basis of this method.

All of these methods involve the use of some of the basic principles which Kennedy emphasized:

1. The use of diagnostic questions to determine a person's understanding of the Christian faith so that the Gospel can be applied to that person's needs.

2. A memorized outline of the Gospel which is the basis on which a person presents the Gospel in a logical and complete way.

3. Seeking a response after the Gospel has been presented, often called the "commitment."

4. The use of "on-the-job" training over a period of about sixteen weeks.

5. A sharing-time in which the callers can evaluate the visits and support each other.

One of the variations which developed in the use of the original Kennedy method was to drop the last section on commitment while using the rest of the program as outlined in *Evangelism Explosion*. The commitment section has presented problems because of the fear of being synergistic and because of the uneasiness of being so personal as to speak about faith. As a result we have had considerable discussion of this matter in our circles. Generally we have suggested the following principles:

1. The emphasis should be on presenting the Gospel.

2. We can expect the Spirit of God to work through the Gospel.

3. We should determine whether The Spirit has worked by asking simple questions as to whether the person understands and believes.

4. If the person indicates some faith, we can acknowledge that the Spirit has worked and provide a means of expressing that faith in conversation or prayer or both. Here is the place for a prayer of commitment, thanking God for the faith He has created, asking Him to continue to nurture that faith, and offering oneself to the service of God.

Our Commission on Theology and Church Relations studied this question and concluded that an individual would have no desire to speak a prayer of commitment prior to conversion and that any attempt to lead him to do so would be synergistic. But a prayer recognizing the presence of faith and asking for growth therein is valid. As such it becomes "an act of sanctification rather than conversion."⁷

IV. We Are Struggling with Some Faulty Assumptions

I see four faulty assumptions in particular which hinder our evangelistic efforts:

1. Some people suggest that our members will spontaneously share their faith if we motivate them properly with the Gospel. The conclusion then is that we do not need any program of evangelism. Ideally this principle should hold true. But, in reality, we have problems because we have a tradition of not witnessing.

If an individual desires to serve and praise his Lord he sees too many Lutheran models who do not talk to others about their faith. We need programs to direct the motivated, to equip people to listen, to understand people, to verbalize the Gospel, and to apply it to the needs of people.

2. The second faulty assumption is that everyone can be reached with spontaneous witnessing and that consequently, we do not need any evangelism program. The problem is that this assertion is just not true. Kennedy says that he did not talk to a Christian until he was an adult, or at least not to anyone who admitted that he was a Christian. In Shawano, Wisconsin, in a Lay Witness Workshop we surveyed the area around the church, which at that time was the largest church in the Missouri Synod, and we found an old man within a block of that church who said that he had been waiting for years for someone from that church to come and invite him. We have often deliberately by-passed Jewish people in our witness because we were afraid, thought it was hopeless, or that they did not need it.

3. The third faulty assumption that at times plagues the churches is that service is evangelism. We must be concerned about the physical needs of people, but feeding the hungry or parading for social change is not evangelism. The word "evangelism" means to share the Good News of the Gospel, and that involves communicating the facts of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection. That communication cannot be done without words.

4. The fourth faulty assumption which at times prevents witnessing is that people can be saved in some other way than through Jesus Christ. Lutherans have been ambivalent about this matter for some years. In the *Study of Generations*,⁸ for instance, seventy-five percent of the Lutherans said that all religions (such as Buddhism, Hinduism) lead to the same God. Yet, seventy-two percent said that a person must believe in Jesus Christ to be saved. Forty percent agreed that one should not try to change someone else's religion.

When the Missouri Synod at its Dallas Convention in 1977⁹ affirmed the position that all people need the Gospel of Jesus Christ, including the Jews, there was an outcry of protest from the Jewish community which led to dialogues, review of our materials, and some bad press. But there was also some strong protest from what I like to think was a small minority of Missouri Synod pastors and lay-people. The protestors were struggling with the desire to have good relations with the local rabbi and their Jewish neighbors and rationalized that somehow the Jews could be saved through their own covenant. The Missouri

Synod's position is clear in its resolution, and our brochure indicates that, while we want to be loving and sensitive to the unique place of the Jews, we cannot compromise what we believe to be the commission given to us by the Lord to make disciples of all nations, or the truth of His own words, "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by Me" (John 14:6), and of Peter's words, "There is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12).

V. We Are Winning People for Jesus Christ and His Church

Our congregations are using many different approaches and styles of evangelism — some prepared and offered by the national office and publishing house, some developed by individual districts, and some stemming from other sources. For example, one of the independent agencies which offer programs and materials to congregations is Ongoing Ambassadors for Christ (Wichita Falls, Texas) with a teenage witness training program. The Missouri Synod reached its peak in total baptized membership in 1971 and since then the baptized membership has dropped a little each year down to 2,766,958 in 1977. The communicant membership, however, continued to rise steadily until 1977 when it dropped slightly for the first time due to the fact that there were 120 fewer congregations reporting. The increase has come through internal growth, by confirming our own children. We equalize those who come to us from other Lutheran churches with those who leave for other Lutheran churches at about 15,000 people annually. We gain about 26,000 members a year by adult baptism or confirmation and reclaim about 10,000 former members, which makes a congregation of 700 each week. At the same time we lose by defection a congregation of 1,000 each week. There are people whose names are removed from congregational rosters because they became inactive, moved away, or were excommunicated. One important factor is that twenty-seven percent of our congregations win no adults each year by baptism or confirmation, and another ten or eleven percent gain one adult.

While we have concerns and challenges in outreach, we rejoice that the Lord uses our congregations to win people for faith in Jesus Christ. There is an interest in many congregations and a desire to learn how to witness and make calls. Increased attention is being given to the Church Growth movement, analyzing why a congregation is or is not growing, and studying the community and seeking ways to serve it. Gallup says that the search is on. Americans are searching for meaning and purpose in life and are trying to find it in every movement that comes along. He describes the challenge which confronts the church when he says that the next few years will determine whether the churches will become

only sterile institutions. You know what I am praying for, and I hope you join me in that prayer.

Footnotes

1. Michael Green, *Evangelism in the Early Church* (Erdmann, 1970).
2. Merton P. Strommen, et. al., *A Study of Generations* (Augsburg, 1972), pp. 182-185.
3. Resolution 1-02A, "To Affirm a Lutheran Understanding of Evangelism," *Convention Proceedings, 51st Regular Convention, The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Anaheim, California, July 4-11, 1975*, p. 79.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Rolf A. Syrdal, *To the End of the Earth* (Augsburg, 1967), p. 17.
6. Quoted by Marvin Karlins and Herbert Abelson in *Persuasion* (Springer, 1970), p. 1.
7. Adopted in January 1975.
8. Strommen, *A Study of Generations*, pp. 169, 368, 442.
9. Resolution 2-27, "To Encourage Evangelism Among the Jews," *Convention Proceedings, 52nd Convention, The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Dallas, Texas, July 15-22, 1977*, p. 122.

The author is executive secretary
of the Board for Evangelism, LCMS.

The essay was given as a
lecture sponsored by the Department
of Practical Theology.

An Application of Case Grammar to Two New Testament Passages

Theodore Mueller

I. Mark 1:4. The Baptism of Repentance

What is a "baptism of repentance," an expression which occurs several times in the Gospels and Acts? In a baptism of water, water is the means used for the sacred act; in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, we understand the outpouring of the Holy Spirit; and in the baptism of John, John is the agent performing the sacrament. But repentance does not fit into any of these categories; it cannot be the means or the agent of baptism. The interpretation centers around the genitive *metanoias* which modifies the noun *baptisma*. What is the nature of this modification?

Commentators¹ and traditional grammarians² have labelled the genitive as a qualitative or descriptive genitive: "a baptism connected with repentance,"³ "symbolic of, and accompanied by repentance."⁴ Further elaborating on the genitive, Lenski makes it a "condition"⁵ for baptism, an obligation of man before receiving forgiveness. Such an emphasis, however, introduces synergistic overtones. The resultant translations reflect this interpretation: "Turn away from your sins and be baptized and God will forgive your sins" (Good News); "a baptism in token of repentance, for the forgiveness of sins" (New English Bible); "baptism as the mark of a complete change of heart and of the forgiveness of sins" (Phillips). In these translations man's acting precedes the forgiveness, the same relationship as when mother says: "Eat your carrots and you'll get some cake."

The well-known linguist Eugene Nida describes his analysis as a process of transforming an expression back into the presumed "underlying kernel or core structure."⁶ In reference to the expression under discussion he states: "A possible combination of kernels which might be adequate for transfer to some receptor language could be formulated as: *John preached that the people should repent and be baptized so that God would forgive the evil they had done.*"⁷ In this analysis note how forgiveness is predicated on man's repentance through the conjunction *so that*. Nida's interpretation, nevertheless, rests on the same grammatical analysis as that of the traditional grammarians.

Recently a form of linguistic scholarship known as Case Grammar has taken a somewhat different approach to language analysis. It assumes that specific syntactic relationships are fundamental to every expression. Furthermore the words we read may be the result of transformations which hide or obscure the particular relationship. These basic relationships and their transformations will first be illustrated from clear and uncontroverted Greek passages and then from English before applying this knowledge to the passage under discussion. Scripture states that God justifies the sinner and stresses His grace, Christ, His redemption, or His blood as the *cause* or the *motive* for the acts of justification, a syntactic relationship which is expressed through the dative (Rom. 3:24), through *dia* plus the genitive (Rom. 3:24), or *en* plus dative (Rom. 5:9). Man receives justification by faith as the *means* or the *instrument*, a relationship expressed through the dative (Rom. 3:28), or by *ek* or *dia* plus the genitive (Rom. 3:30). While the preposition *ek* may place more emphasis on the *circumstances* under which, rather than the *means* by which, man is declared righteous, yet by linking the two prepositions St. Paul equates the two expressions in their *instrumental* relationship, just as Luther accumulates the prepositions "mit, durch, and unter" to express the same syntactic relationship for the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. These examples illustrate the *fundamental syntactic relationships* between the verb and the various noun phrases describing the act of justification. It is at this point that grammar and meaning coincide, that is, that grammar is the tool expressing the relationship of the various concepts contained in the words. These relationships are linguistic universals, that is, relationships which are common to all languages, and make a translation from the one to the other possible.

Greek can transform these fundamental expressions in two ways. The governing verb is often changed into a noun, *dikaioō* to *dikaioōnē*, while the same prepositional phrases are retained under the governance of the noun and express the same basic relationships. Thus the instrumental relationship of faith is expressed by *ek* or *dia* plus the genitive: *dikaioōnē dia pisteōs* (Rom. 3:22), *hē ek pisteōs dikaioōnē* (Rom. 10:6), an expression which has become a formula for righteousness. Secondly, Greek can transform a noun plus a prepositional phrase into a noun plus a genitive, *dikaioōnē tēs pisteōs* (Rom. 4:11). The genitive phrase no longer expresses the fundamental relationship explicitly, as did its foregoing prepositional phrase, but merely indicates a vague dependence on the noun. To the reader at that time such genitive phrases presented no difficulty; no doubt, he readily

assumed the fundamental relationship as the native speaker of English does in his language, as will be shown subsequently. In the parlance of linguistics, the fundamental syntactic relationships are called the *deep level structure*, while by contrast the *surface level structure* consists of the sequence of spoken or written words which may or may not express the precise syntactic relationship depending on the various transformations which have been applied to it. While the deep structures are language universals, the surface structures are said to be language-specific; that is, each language has its own peculiar ways of expression.

These concepts will be illustrated once more from English. Expressions like *shoe sale*, *garage sale*, *fire sale*, *promotion sale*, *charity sale*, have the same surface structure, a governing noun "sale" plus a dependant noun. Yet it is obvious that a "garage sale" does not sell garages, nor does a "fire sale" sell fire, as might be inferred from "shoe sale." On the deep level the syntactic relationship differs in the various expressions. They are assumed to be transformations from more explicit phrases, such as a sale selling shoes, a sale occurring at a garage, a sale because of a fire, a sale for the purpose of charity or promotion. A foreigner, of course, unfamiliar with English, will have difficulty understanding the former expressions, particularly if his language does not permit the same nominal structure at the surface level. He fails to see the precise syntactic relationship at the deep level. Together with the exegetes we experience the same difficulty with similar Greek expressions.

After this grammatical digression, what is the meaning of "baptism of repentance," or better, what is the specific syntactic relationship presumed to exist for the genitive at the deep level? John gives the key in Matthew 3:11, *baptizō en hudati eis metanoian, for the purpose of, or, with the result of, a change of attitude (repentance)*; a purpose or a result relationship is expressed through the preposition *eis*. The genitive *metanoias*, viewed as a transformation from *eis metanoian*, has, therefore, the same relationship as the subsequent prepositional phrase *eis aphesin hamartiōn*; both a change of attitude and the remission of sins are stated as the purpose or the result of baptism and preaching. While not a very common relationship, a purpose or result relationship is found in a number of genitive phrases as the context or other parallel expressions suggest: *dia loutrou paligenesias* (Tim. 3:5) is the washing *for the purpose of*, or *resulting in regeneration*. Likewise in *eis anastasin zoes* (Jn. 5:29) the genitive *zōēs* expresses the purpose of the resurrection. In Luke 19:42 the expression *ta pros eirēnēn* states the purpose relationship through the preposition *pros*, an expression which St. Paul

has transformed into a genitive phrase *ta tēs eirēnēs* (Rom. 14:19): *the things which result in peace.*

Interpreting the genitive *metanoias* as a purpose or result relationship, moreover, fits into the context of the Gospels, which preaching and baptism are said to produce a change of attitude, and of Acts 19:4 where baptism alone is linked to it. The passage under discussion, then, may be translated into English thus: "John preached and baptized for (the purpose of) a change of attitude and the forgiveness of sins." A better and freer translation might be this: "John preached and baptized to achieve repentance and convey the forgiveness of sins."

Traditional grammar analyzes the surface phenomena. It tries to attach a meaning to the case in which the word appears: "What is the meaning of this genitive?" Case grammar analyzes the syntactic relationship, that is, its deep structure, a relationship which may not be apparent on the surface level: "What is the precise relationship for which the genitive case merely indicates a vague dependence on another noun?" From Matthew 3:11 a purpose or result relationship is inferred. This approach leads to a meaning more in line with Scripture: conversion and forgiveness result from Word and Sacrament.

II. Luke 2:14. The Hymn of the Angels

When scholarship established what is believed to be the original text for the angelic choir, that is, when the dative *anthrōpois* of the Textus Receptus was replaced by the prepositional phrase *en anthrōpois*, and the nominative *eudokia* by the genitive, the meaning of what the angels sang became a problem for us speakers of a modern language. Commentators⁸ interpret the prepositional phrase *en anthrōpois* as a modifier of *eirēnē* indicating to whom peace is extended. The word order makes this analysis most plausible to us, speakers of a language in which word order is an essential syntactic signal. The genitive *eudokias* is seen as a qualifier (genitive of quality) modifying *anthrōpois*, and specifying what kind of men receive His peace. Alford states it succinctly: "The only admissible rendering is *Among men of God's good pleasure*, i.e. among the elect people of God."⁹ The various translations follow this interpretation, summarized in the RSV rendition: "Peace among men with whom He is pleased."

A theological problem, however, arises if the genitive "limits" *anthrōpois*.¹⁰ Just as the expression "all people who believe" refers to a group of people characterized and set apart from the others by their faith, so here the people who have God's favor indicates a group of people separate from the rest of humanity,

"the elect."¹¹ And indeed this is the interpretation of the Editorial Committee of the United Bible Society Greek New Testament as Metzger records it: "At the birth of the Saviour God's peace rests on those whom He has chosen in accord with His good pleasure."¹² Such a limiting genitive, however, implies a denial of God's universal grace which, according to Scripture, is extended to all people through Christ (Tit. 2:11, John 3:16).

It appears more reasonable, in fact, to associate the prepositional phrase *en anthropois* with *eudokias* and to interpret the genitive as standing in an origin-cause relationship linked to *eirēne*. We have already seen that associating a prepositional phrase with a governing noun is a common occurrence and that Greek frequently transforms a verb and its complement into a noun which retains the same complementation as the verb. The verb *eudokeō* governs a prepositional phrase consisting in *en* plus the dative as its complement: *en soi eudokēsa* (Luke 3:22: "I am well pleased with You"), the voice of the Father at the baptism of Jesus. From this construction the nominal transformation *eudokia en tini* is inferred, meaning "good will for some one."

Such a nominal transformation is assumed to be the basis for the Greek phrase under discussion. It does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament but is found in the LXX; Sirach 39:18 has *en prostagmati autou pasa hē eudokia*, "his entire delight with His commandment." Thus, the meaning of the phrase in Luke must be: "[God's] good pleasure with mankind."

Linking the genitive *eudokias* with *eirēne* as an indication of cause or origin is admittedly not a common relationship. However, it was the interpretation of Origen. Alford, who reports this fact, calls it a "curious connection" which "might be admissible as a matter of mere construction."¹³ It is a transformation from the noun plus a prepositional phrase with *apo*. For instance, the phrase *eirenē apo theou* (Rom. 1:7), "peace from God," a frequent greeting in the epistles, is the equivalent of *eirēne tou theou* (Phil. 4:7), usually translated as "the peace of God." However, if the genitive just mentioned were a qualifier to peace, its meaning would be "the divine peace," that is, a peace which is not a human experience, which is obviously not the case. Other genitive phrases indicating origin-cause relationships can be found in the New Testament: *hupakoēn pisteōs* (Rom. 1:5) is "the obedience which springs from faith."¹⁴ In 1 Thess. 1:3 three such genitives occur in the same verse: "work coming from faith, labor originating in love, and endurance resulting from hope."

On the basis of the foregoing grammatical discussion, it is sug-

gested that the message of the angelic choir should be translated as follows:

Glory to God in the highest

And on earth peace coming from His good pleasure with mankind,

a freer rendering of the last line would be: "And on earth peace because He is well pleased with mankind." This interpretation can also be defended from an artistic point of view. The hymn of the angels is poetry and is printed as such in Aland's edition of the Greek New Testament. There is a chiastic word order: *doxa* corresponds to *eirēnē* and *ev hupsistois* parallels *epi gēs*. Furthermore, to *theō* in the first line corresponds *en anthrōpois eudokias* in the second, a goal relationship which is parallel to a source relationship. And *theos* is a necessary echo in *eudokia* since admittedly it is God who shows good will towards men, regardless of the grammatical interpretation.

Language is the only means by which God has revealed His thoughts to us. It is also the only way by which we communicate with each other. Communication may break down just as much through our ignorance of how language works as our lack of knowledge of uncommon words. The concept of transformation from an underlying structure to what is written offers a fresh approach to some of the difficulties we may find in the wording of Scripture.

The author is professor at
the University of Kentucky
and has served as a guest
professor at the seminary

A Reformation Hymn

Douglas Judisch

*The Word of God abides forevermore,
Though Satan and his whole demonic band
Against it wage fierce battle without end,
The Word of God shall always stand.*

*All flesh is grass which withers in a day,
Its glory is a flower soon grown wan,
Which falls and dies — not so the Word of God,
It does not wear as years wear on.*

*So on this rock alone we take our stand
And of its living waters life imbibe,
So that to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
Eternal praise we shall ascribe.*

Text: Isaiah 40:6-8; I Peter 1:24-25

Opinion of the Department of Systematic Theology

DR. PAUL G. BRETSCHER'S "THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT": AN EVALUATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY OF CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, FORT WAYNE, INDIANA — JUNE, 1979.

In the nature of the case this Opinion must focus directly on the doctrinal content of the essay. The latter contains also fine and worthy thoughts as well as a great deal of confused and rhetorical argumentation, to the point of pathos. Such and similar matters cannot be pursued here, but are best taken up in the course of collegial dealings especially on the part of those who official duty that is. Since Dr. Bretscher himself admits, and even insists, that his position is contrary to the official doctrinal stand of the Missouri Synod, that question too need not detain us. The essay poses two main issues: (1) the doctrine of Holy Scripture, as developed in the bulk of the essay (Part II) and (2) the doctrine of the church, developed in Part III. The question is whether the essay's position on these matters is in harmony with the Lutheran Confessions and with Holy Scripture itself.

Ad (1)

The essentials of Dr. Bretscher's argument may quite objectively be summed up like this: In the Bible the term "Word of God" means not the Bible itself, but first of all Christ, and secondly the message about Him. To call the Bible as such ("as a book"), the Word of God, therefore, is not only wrong but is Satanic "pseudology" and "a falsified meaning of 'the Word of God'" (pp. 13, 18). The Bible may still, however, be called "Word of God" provided this is meant to refer to the Bible's Gospel — content, not to its divine authorship or inspiration. The Synodical controversy has come about because the Bible has been called the "Word of God" in both the true and the false senses, without adequate definition and distinction. The result was that "we in the Missouri Synod have been trying to carry two incompatible 'theologies' at the same time. Our behaviour, in consequence, has been what psychologists would call schizophrenic, and self-destructive" (p. 9).

But if the Bible is "Word of God" not by virtue of divine authorship but only because of its Gospel-content, *it necessarily follows that the Bible is no more and in no other sense the Word of God than any other good book or sermon which conveys the Gospel-*

message! Dr. Bretscher himself explains that when Scripture says that "The Word of the Lord came" to the prophets, this was really nothing different from what happens to us today, when God enlightens "us with 'dots of light' as his gift, forming us into theologians, or, in the Bible's words, 'prophets'" (pp. 6-7). There is then no essential difference between biblical and non-biblical books, provided they all proclaim the Gospel.

This radical reduction of Holy Scripture to the level of all other books which contain the Gospel is totally incompatible with the very bedrock axioms of the Lutheran Confessions. To cite only the Formula of Concord, the whole point of the introductory section on "Rule and Norm" is that the church's creeds and confessions of the Gospel, though salutary and necessary, are altogether subject to Holy Scripture as sole judge, rule, and norm of all teachers and teachings (Ep. 1, 7; SD 1, 3, 9). Nor is the absolute supremacy of the Bible an arbitrary hermeneutical decision on the part of the Formula. Scripture must be accepted as sole final judge simply because it is God's Word, "to which no man's writings may be regarded as equal, but to which everything must be subjected" (SD 9). And the distinction between "God's Word" and "man's writing" is not a distinction between Gospel and non-Gospel; for the human writings in view here are the creeds, the Augsburg Confession, Luther's Catechisms, and the like. The difference is simply that Holy Scripture is divinely inspired, whereas these other writings, though full of Gospel, are not. The Latin of SD par. 9 defines the difference quite clearly, as one "between divine and human writings" (*inter divina et humana scripta*).

It is noteworthy in this connection that elsewhere Dr. Bretscher frankly admits that what he regards as the disastrous confusion of the two meanings of "Word of God" can be "traced back into our Confessions, where the 'inspiration meaning' is quite evident as a heritage of medieval piety."¹

The question remains whether perhaps, despite the Lutheran Confessions, Dr. Bretscher's claims could be sustained from the Bible itself. He insists that he has "found no Biblical text . . . which defines the term 'Word of God' to mean the holy, inspired, divinely authored Bible" (p. 9).

It is true of course, as the Lutheran Reformation in particular never tired of insisting, that the whole Bible has as its basic theme, scope, and centre God's full and free gift of salvation in Jesus Christ (Lk 24:44-47; Jn. 5:39). It is also self-evident that no references to our complete Bible can be expected in texts written before the various parts of the Bible were collected and combined

into one unified whole. But that "no Biblical text" calls the Scriptures "the Word of God", is patently false. Psalm 119, for instance, repeatedly speaks of "Thy word" or "Thy words" in the sense of the concrete biblical text (note synonyms like "judgments," "testimonies," "law," "precepts"). It is interesting that Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (TDNT) cites many verses from just this Psalm as making it "clear that the author is thinking esp. of the Pentateuch as the written Word of God" (IV, 100). And Kittel's *Theological Dictionary* certainly carries no brief for any traditional orthodoxy.

In Is. 8:20, the "Word" is clearly God's and is identical with the concrete, written "law" and "testimony." Indeed, Kittel's TDNT describes as follows the significance of the introductory formula, "The Word of the Lord (YHWH) which came to . . .," often used by the Old Testament prophets (e.g. Hos. 1:1, Mi. 1:1; Zeph. 1:1):

It certainly *implies* that the whole book is regarded as DBR-YHWH[Word of the LORD]. In the written form no distinction is made between the divine voice in the prophet and its expression in poetry, saying, and address. We have here a transition to the final view that not merely the prophetic book, but in the last resort the whole of the OT, is the Word of God. The element of revelation is plainly present in the concept of word. For it is as revelation that the books are collected (IV, 96).

Under the heading "The Old Testament Word in the New Testament," Kittel's TDNT states:

The NT quotes the OT either as Scripture or as Word In many cases mention of the divine subject is facilitated by the fact that the OT passage quoted is itself an I-saying (Mt. 22:31 f. and par.: "I am the God of Abraham . . .") or a statement which the OT narrative sets on the lips of God, e.g. the promise to Abraham (Ac. 3:25). But the examples go further by quoting sayings from the prophets and Psalms as spoken by God (Mt. 1:22; Ac. 4:25; Hb. 1:5 ff. etc.). They show that God Himself is firmly regarded as the One who speaks in Scripture (IV, 109, 111).

Certainly St. Paul's expression, "the oracles of God" (*ta logia tou theou*) in Rom. 3:2 must refer to concrete, ascertainable texts, hence to God's Word or revelation in written form. And how could the identity of Scripture and God's Word be put more strongly than by calling "all Scripture . . . God-breathed (*theopneustos*)" (2 Tim. 3:16)? Again, the Lord's own dispute with the Pharisees in Mt. 15:1 ff. implies that there is an authoritative divine revelation in documentary form, by which mere

human tradition can and must be judged. "Most interesting, finally, is St. Paul's expression in I Cor. 15:54: "the word which is written" (*ho logos ho gegrammenos*). Here "the Word" is precisely the written biblical text. Indeed the *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament* by Coenen, Beyreuther, and Bietenhard cites this text as an instance in which *logos* (the word) means "*das Schriftwort*" (the word of Scripture) (II/2/425).

Dr. Bretscher attempts to weaken the force of John 10:35, "Scripture cannot be broken", by suggesting that the real appeal is to the specific and direct pronouncement of God quoted from Ps. 82:6, rather than to Scripture as such, "as a book" (p. 10, footnote). This is quite false. Not only direct quotations from God, but even the "connecting writing" of Genesis 2:24 is attributed by Our Lord directly to God Himself (Matt. 19:4.5). St. Paul moreover identifies God and Scripture so completely that he can say that "the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up" (Rom. 9:17), and that "the Scripture, foreseeing (!) that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed" (Gal. 3:8)! "Scripture says" means quite the same thing as "God says".

And what applies to the Old Testament, applies if anything even more to the writings issuing from the very fulness of Pentecost itself (John 14:26; 15:20; 16:12-15; 17:20; 20:31). The Apostles therefore claimed divine authority for their writings (I Cor. 2:12.13.16; 14:37; 2 Thess. 2:15; 3:14, etc.). Indeed for the later books of the New Testament the earlier ones were already "Scripture" (I Tim. 5:18 and Lk. 10:7; 2 Peter 3:15.16).

For a good overview of the massive biblical evidence in this matter the reader is referred to P. E. Kretzmann, *The Foundations Must Stand*.

As for Dr. Bretscher's repeated suggestion that Christ and the Bible somehow exclude each other as foundation of faith (pp. 13, 16), this is refuted by Eph. 2:20, where Christ is the Foundation precisely *through* His chosen Apostles and Prophets, and not in some abstract way apart from them! This text also teaches, in the clearest possible terms, the vast difference in principle between the inspired Apostles and Prophets and everybody else: the former are "foundation," the latter "building".

A final word needs to be said about Dr. Bretscher's view of historical criticism in this context. Briefly, he welcomes "the invasion of historical-critical study" because it "has forced [the Missouri Synod's] ambivalence into the open, so that it is tearing

us apart" (p. 8). He emphatically rejects the Synod's understanding that historical criticism is the "enemy" of faith (pp. 4, 14). Not surprisingly, Dr. Bretscher rejects "the inerrancy of the Bible as book" (p. 13).

These judgments rest on some very basic misperceptions. On the one hand historical criticism is vastly over-rated. As Dr. Bretscher wrote in another article: "For as a Lutheran preacher Bultmann submits altogether to the authority of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God."² Virtually the whole world knows better. On the other hand, the importance of biblical facts and history is vastly under-rated. Thus Dr. Bretscher sharply rejects as an error the Missouri Synod's confession that "the historical framework . . . in Scripture is an essential part of the Word of God."³ Elsewhere Dr. Bretscher distinguished sharply between "the historical reality of Scripture" and "the theological," and assigned issues like "the historicity and facticity of persons and events" to the former only: "it is not appropriate therefore, to approach such questions by appealing to the Bible's inspiration and authority."⁴

This radical severance of facts and history from faith and theology does violence not only to particular aspects and details, but to the very nature of the Gospel of the *Incarnate* Redeemer (Matt. 26:13; I John 4:3)!

Ad (2)

While Dr. Bretscher's rhetoric is particularly imprecise and emotive in the third part of his essay, it is clear at least that the Missouri Synod is meant to be seen as "a falsified church." The reason for this is said to be the Synod's false doctrine of the Word: will not the falsified Word, through the misbelief it summons, create also a falsified Church? . . . The clearest evidence of a falsified Church in our 1943 Catechism is its doctrine of "the true visible Church" (Q. 184).

A conflict is then alleged between the Synodical Catechism and the Confessions, particularly CA/Apol VII/VIII:

This Catechism does not catch the insight of the Confessions that the Church is *visible* by its "outward marks," and "believed" because the Word and Sacraments are believed. Therefore, the 1943 Catechism calls the Church "invisible" (p. 19).

The main object of the attack is the whole idea of doctrinal orthodoxy, and of church-fellowship bound and delimited by it. It is alleged that the pure preaching of the Gospel demanded by CA VII is one thing, and the Synodical insistence on the "entire doctrine" quite another.

What is meant here is not the preaching of the Gospel in its purity, but the set of "distinctive doctrines" (1943 Cat. Q. 183) which comprise the denomination's doctrinal system. Thus the denomination is boasting in the completeness and perfection of its man-made doctrinal formulations. It "has" this "entire doctrine" in its possession as no other Church "has" it. This doctrinal system is what it teaches and confesses. On this ground, then, the denomination declares itself before God and men to be "the true visible Church," and the measure of the falsity of other churches.

The essay appears to advocate a broad and all-inclusive church-fellowship which would embrace not only the L.C.A. and the LWF (p. 4), but all external Christendom: "If the unclean and the false do not enter, it is not the city's walls *but their own walls* that keep them out (Rev. 21:22-27)" (p. 25, emphases in original).

The decisive features and thrusts of Part III of the essay thus reflect the ecclesiology of the modern Ecumenical Movement, which is diametrically opposed to that of the Lutheran Confessions.

Specifically, the essay comes into conflict with the Confessions at two points. In the first place, the objection to the Catechism description of the church as "invisible" — if substantive, not merely terminological. — amounts to an attack on the Apology's distinction between the church in the proper sense (par. 28) and the church in the larger sense (par. 10). What Dr. Bretscher criticises about the 1943 Catechism, viz, the definition of the church as believers only, and therefore invisible, is precisely what the Apology teaches:

But when we come to define the church, we must define that which is the living body of Christ and is the church in fact as well as in name. We must understand what it is that chiefly makes us members, and living members of the church . . . the kingdom of Christ is the righteousness of the heart and the gift of the Holy Spirit . . . we maintain that the church in the proper sense is the assembly of saints who truly believe the Gospel of Christ and who have the Holy Spirit (par. 12. 13. 28).

This church, though "recognizable" (par 5) in its outward marks, "has not yet been revealed" but remains in this life "hidden under the cross" (par. 17. 18). Nor does the term "assembly" in Apol. VII/VIII 29 mean to suggest that the church is essentially visible; for this "assembly" is "made up of true believers and righteous men scattered throughout the world" (par. 20).

In the second place, the Lutheran Confessions do not share the

modern Ecumenical Movement's embarrassed distaste for a normative orthodoxy. Quite the contrary in fact. The Confessions do not understand the Gospel in some pietistic, undogmatic sense which could be played off against detailed doctrinal definitions as such. Rather, the Gospel is understood as something which must be preached "unanimously according to its pure understanding" (CA VII, 2), and which may be summed up in a number of "articles," such as the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession (CA, conclusion. Cf. LC, Creed). The doctrinal definitions of the Book of Concord are meant not as sectarian peculiarities but as correct statements of the revealed, divine truth itself, hence as confessions of the one evangelical faith of Christ's one holy and universal church (Preface to the Book of Concord: FC SD Rule and Norm). This "pure doctrine of the holy Gospel" (FC SD Intro. 3) divides the church of the Augsburg Confession "from the papacy and from other condemned sects and heresies" (FC SD Rule and Norm 5) hence also from the Reformed deniers of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar (FC SD VII, 33). There must be agreement "in doctrine and in all its articles" as well as in "the right use of the holy sacraments" (FC SD X, 31). Contradictions of this doctrine "cannot be tolerated in the church of God, much less be excused and defended" (FC SD Intro. 9). The confessors are "minded by the grace of the Holy Spirit to abide and remain unanimously in this confession of faith and to regulate all religious controversies and their explanations according to it," and to implement their doctrinal consensus "through diligent visitation of churches and schools, the supervision of printers, and other salutary means" (Preface to the Book of Concord, Tappert, p. 14).

The biblical basis of the Lutheran Confessions' doctrine of the church is clearly indicated in Apol. VII/VIII. Suffice it here to point out that the biblical Gospel is not a simplistic, minimalistic slogan compatible with every wind of doctrine; it is an organic whole by which God Himself creates and defines His church, Mt. 28:19, 20; Acts 2:42; 15:1ff.; Rom. 16:17; Gal. 1:8,9; Eph. 2:20; I Tim. 6:3-5; II Tim. 2:2; 3:14-17; Tit. 1:9-11.

The point of orthodoxy is not, as Dr. Bretscher thinks, to assert a "superior rightness" (p. 21) and to "exclude tax-collectors and sinners" (p. 24). An orthodox church is not a perfect church. The point rather is to prevent the loss or pollution of that divinely-given means, the holy Gospel, by which alone tax-collectors and sinners can and do receive life and salvation. And to imagine that the doctrinal issues at stake in world Lutheranism and Christendom today are peripheral and leave Christ's Gospel intact, is to

misread the situation tragically. Surrender of the sacramental Presence, for instance — as practised for generations in European Lutheran state churches through church-fellowship with Reformed and Union churches, culminating today in the Leuenberg Concord — is not a minor disagreement about interpretation but a radical violation of the Gospel itself, and an act of robbery against the people of God. And the historical-critical destruction of the authority of the Bible rampant also in the ALC and the LCA attacks the very central Christian mystery, that of the divine-human Person and Work of the Redeemer. To accommodate such things under the hospitable umbrella of a “reconciled diversity,” as the Lutheran World Federation does officially, is to renounce the central affirmations of the Lutheran confessions at their very roots.

Conclusion

The essay’s doctrines of Holy Scripture and of the Church cannot be squared with the Lutheran Confessions’ understanding of the Word of God.

It should be pointed out that Dr. Bretscher’s essay abounds in false antitheses. Complementary aspects of the truth are set in opposition to each other, with disastrous consequences. Typical examples are “oneness of our theology” vs. “the formulation of documents” (p. 7), Bible as Gospel vs. Bible “as a Book” (pp. 9 & passim); Word of God vs. “outward forms of religion and doctrine” (p. 11); “the Bible as Book” vs. “Christ alone” (p. 13); “living ‘Word of God’” vs. “formulations of doctrine . . . visible things . . . forms . . . wineskins” (p. 16); the purely taught Gospel of CA VII vs. “the *entire doctrine* of the Word of God” (p. 20). This mischievous tearing asunder of what God has joined together appears to be inspired by a tendency to denigrate concrete, outward particulars in favour of undefined and undefinable Spirit-absolutes. This spiritualizing tendency — most clearly evident in the fateful cleavage between historical fact and theological faith (*After the Purifying*, pp. 86-87) — runs directly counter to the central biblical reality of the Incarnation itself. It reveals a mode of thought which is typical not of Lutheran realism, but of Docetism, Nestorianism, Calvinism (*finitum non capax infiniti*), and Barthianism. It is a species of enthusiasm which should cause us all to take to heart again the sobering words of the Preface to the Book of Concord:

Such an explanation must be thoroughly grounded in God’s Word so that pure doctrine can be recognised and distinguished from adulterated doctrine and so that the way may not be left free and open to restless, contentious individuals, who do not want to be bound to any certain

formula of pure doctrine, to start scandalous controversies at will and to introduce and defend monstrous errors, the only possible consequence of which is that finally correct doctrine will be entirely obscured and lost and nothing beyond uncertain opinions and dubious, disputable imaginations and views will be transmitted to subsequent generations (Tappert, p. 13).

Finally, we append to this Opinion a set of theses written by Dr. Bretscher in 1959, which indicate a good grasp of what is at stake. In our estimation those 1959 theses reflect a clarity and sobriety which *The Sword of the Spirit* sadly lacks. We plead for a return to that earlier position.

Notes

1. Paul G. Bretscher, "An Inquiry Into Article II," *Currents in Theology and Mission*, October, 1974, p. 42.
2. Paul G. Bretscher, "The Baptism of Jesus, Critically Examined," *Biblical Studies Series* (LC-MS, CTCR, 1973), p. 5.
3. Paul G. Bretscher, "An Inquiry," p. 41.
4. Paul G. Bretscher, *After the Purifying* (River Forest: Lutheran Education Assn., 1975), pp. 86-87.

Propositions on Scripture

1. It is misleading to distinguish between faith in the Word about Christ, and faith in Christ; or to define historical faith as faith in the former, and true faith as faith in the latter. Faith in Christ is indistinguishable from faith in the Word that proclaims Him. Therefore the proposition that Jesus is the Word should not be construed to minimize, but to maximize the importance of the Word of Scripture.
2. The distinction between a formal and material principle in Lutheran theology is invalid, if it is used to subordinate either to the other.
3. The truth or relevance of any proposition contained in Scripture is not to be determined by our success at fitting it into our dogmatics, but by its significance in the text and context in which it occurs. This includes the testimony which Scripture gives concerning itself.
4. If it is his conviction of verbal inspiration of the Scripture as a Book, which makes a man unevangelical, then Christ, St. Paul, and Luther were unevangelical. Any unevangelical tendency in our Church is not to be traced to its insistence on verbal inspiration, or to its use thereof in defining Scripture's authority.

5. Though we grant that the doctrine of verbal inspiration can lead and has led to a mechanical view of Scripture and to failure to appreciate its true humanness, to attack it on this ground is to attack essentially a straw man. When the straw man is slashed to ribbons, the simple truth remains untouched, that God has revealed Himself and the nature of His actions, not by astute theological deductions or stirrings in the inner Spirit, but by Words; and that He "has caused all Holy Scriptures to be written for our learning."
6. Any method of resolving or dismissing the tension of the inerrancy of Scripture also in historical, geographical, scientific, etc. matters, which affords to the speculative theologian the implicit license to demonstrate the disunity of Scripture in the name of intellectual honesty, must be rejected.
7. To explain prophecy in the OT and NT as a spiritualized post-event reconstruction and interpretation of an historical occurrence, is to destroy the true significance of revelation and to undermine the Covenant itself. God's self-revelation in history consists in this, that He attaches His express Word to His action, both before, in, and after the event. The divine quality of the event stands on the Word that completely circumscribes it; the Word is never a mere deduction from the act. It is this "before, in, and after" Word, which establishes even the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ as being God's act. Luke 24.
8. The issue of Scripture cannot be fought through merely in the locus of Soteriology. What a man does with Scripture is determined not only by what he thinks of Christ, but also by what he thinks of Scripture. The giving and the preserving of the record of His historic acts and of their significance is, within the scope of its own purpose, as essential an historical and soteriological act of God, as was the crucifixion and resurrection of His Son.

As a final point, may I acknowledge my indebtedness to my father by quoting from a recent letter:

9. "It is not easy to take Scripture for what it says of itself. There are, as Cullmann points out, many 'skandals' connected with interpreting Scripture. Here are some: the text itself, the canon, the cruxes of exegesis, interpretation itself, translations, the differing accounts of witnesses in the NT. Every interpreter is aware of these 'skandals' and would like to remove them in some fashion, whether by allegory, or by assuming interpolations (Bultmann), or by existential interpretations. In short, every interpreter would so much like to

fashion Scripture according to his own mental image. The Christian interpreter suffers under these 'skandals' more so than the non-Christian interpreter. But he lets them stand. He realizes that Scripture as we have it is nevertheless the Word of God. He is intent to glorify God for the fact that in spite of the 'skandals' God still speaks to His children in all the words of Scripture. Therefore he keeps on reading and meditating on the Word of Scripture, and feeds the hungry flock on that Word. For only that Word is able to cast down the proud and haughty but also to raise up the truly repentant to the glories of heaven."

10-29-59

Paul G. Bretscher
Valparaiso, Indiana

*This Opinion of the Department of Systematic Theology
was originally prepared by Prof. Kurt Marquart.*

Homiletical Studies

THE FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT

Romans 13:11-14

December 2, 1979

In verse 11 "this" refers to "love your neighbor as yourself" (v10). "To awaken from sleep" finds a close parallel in thought to 1 Th 5:5ff. The argument there is: "you are sons of the day; live like it, so that the Day does not catch you sleeping and unawares." The preferred reading is: "our salvation is nearer." This clause refers to the Parousia, which draws ever closer. "Salvation" here refers to the consummation of our salvation in Christ, the first fruits of which we have received already. It is parallel in thought in Php 3:12-14. See also 1 Th 5:8 for a future sense of "salvation"; there it is the "hope of salvation." For another reference to the nearness of the Parousia as a source of comfort and motivation, see Php 4:5, "the Lord is near." In verse 12 "the day is at hand" is a reference to the Last Day. See Ro 2:5,16; 1 Cor 1:18; Eph 4:30, 6:13; 1 Th 5:2, 4. With respect to "the night is almost gone, and the day is at hand" see 1 Jn 2:8 for a close parallel in thought. The phrase "the armor of light" in this verse is parallel to "the Lord Jesus Christ" in v14. With the words "put on . . ." Paul urges the Christians in Rome to appropriate and to use for themselves that which they already possess. We read in Gal 3:27 that those who have been baptized into Christ *have put on Christ* (aorist middle). To put on the armor of light is a close parallel in thought to Eph 6:11-17, where the Ephesian Christians are exhorted by Paul to put on the whole armor of God; see also 2 Cor 6:7, the "weapons of righteousness," and 2 Cor 10:4, "the weapons of our warfare."

Introduction: Have you ever prepared for an event in your life that was so big that everything you did was centered around it, even though it had not yet happened? That is how we Christians should view the second coming of our Lord Jesus. And the day of His coming is getting nearer. Paul tells us in this text,

The Day Is Fast Approaching!

I. Remember that it is getting close.

A. Salvation has belonged to us since we first believed (v11).

1. We believed through the Word which we received, through baptism, or through hearing.
2. The Holy Spirit moved us to respond in faith and to trust in Jesus alone for forgiveness of sins.

B. But now the fullness of salvation is approaching; we await the hope of salvation (1 Th 5:8).

1. It will be the end of trials for us.
2. We will receive the crown of glory, the prize at the end of the race (Php 3:12-14).

Transition: Yes, it is getting close. And it means so much that we want to be prepared right now. Therefore, we

II. Live as though the Day were already here.

A. Put aside the deeds of darkness.

1. Recognize such deeds for what they are; deeds of *darkness*, not of the light.
2. Reject them, consciously, in the power of the Spirit; repudiate them forever.

B. Put on the Lord Jesus Christ.

1. He is ours already, now and forever.
2. Use His power to live in the light, to love our neighbor.

Conclusion: The Last Day will be a day of rejoicing for us, the day when we begin to enjoy the full blessings of the salvation that is already ours through Christ's work. That day is getting close! Live today as if it were already here!

Jeffrey Gibbs
Scappoose, Oregon

THE SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT

Romans 15:4-13

December 9, 1979

This pericope ends the discussion begun by Paul in 14:1 of the Christian's duty and privilege of accepting his brothers and sisters in Christ without prejudice over questions which are truly adiaphora. The verb "accept," found twice in v7, occurs in 14:1, 3 and Phm v 17, and these are the only uses of this verb in all of the Pauline literature. On "for our instruction in v4," see also 2 Tm 3:16. On "hope" see Ro 4:18; 5:2,4,5; 8:20,24; 12:12. "Hope" is an inherently future concept; it is the attitude that looks confidently to the future on the basis of what has been promised or fulfilled in the past. In v5 "to be of the same mind" does not refer purely to doctrinal concerns. It is also a plea for mutual esteem and forbearance, a plea begun at 14:1 and continued through this section. In v6 "with one accord" and "with one voice" place strong emphasis on unity as the end desired by Paul, which will result in the glory of God among men. According to v8 — Christ became a servant for two reasons, which illustrate (in this context) the perfect example of acceptance which the Romans are to emulate. Christ fulfilled the promises given to the (Jewish) fathers, and he caused the Gentiles to glorify God along with the Jews. The quotations in vv9-12 are cited according to the Septuagint. Verse 13 is to be regarded as the final summation of the whole section that began at 12:1. It repeats the concept of hope mentioned in 15:5, but is related to 15:4-12 only by virtue of the placing of 15:4-12 in the large section.

Introduction: One of the biggest problems in our world today is prejudice; people pre-judge other people. In the text Paul speaks eloquently about

Accepting One Another

I. Christ gives us the example of acceptance.

A. He did not please himself (v3).

1. This is our problem; we want to go our own way.
2. But look at Christ, who sacrificed and suffered for us.

B. Christ became the servant of all.

1. He brought together the most diverse groups of people in the ancient world — Jews and Gentiles.
2. He takes us from every walk of life and brings us close to God and to one another.

Transition: So we have the example. But we need more, we need the power to go against our selfish nature and to do the thing that Christ has shown us.

II. God gives us the power to accept one another.

A. It is only through the gift of God that we can be of one mind (v5).

1. We cannot achieve spiritual unity by ourselves.
2. With Paul, we constantly beseech God to grant it.

B. God's acceptance of us is the key.

1. Paul gives us the motivation and the power: "Accept one another, for Christ has accepted you!"

2. The parable of the unforgiving servant (Mt 18:23-34): Servants of God who have experienced His acceptance are able to accept others.

Transition: So we strive for the goal. Sometimes we succeed. It is important to remember the result.

- III. God's name is glorified when we accept one another. "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven."

Conclusion: Our life together is to be marked by acceptance. We can learn to deal lovingly with one another, bearing with each other's faults and foibles. We have the example, Christ. We have the power from God, through Christ. We know the result — God's name is glorified.

JG

THE THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT

I Corinthians 4:1-5

December 16, 1979

Factionalism is a problem that often plagues Christian congregations. At Corinth Paul was confronted with petty rivalries, jealousy, and strife. Some boasted of following Paul; others, Peter; still others, Apollos. Each faction exalted the man they followed and detracted from the others. Paul had to remind the congregation of the proper God-pleasing attitude they should have toward their leaders. In v1 Paul exhorts them to regard him and his co-workers, Peter and Apollos, as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God. "Servant" refers to a lowly obedient slave, while a "steward" is a slave who has been given the dignified position of responsibility over his master's valuable possessions (Lk 12:42-48). These possessions are the "mysteries of God" or gifts of salvation offered in the Gospel (Eph 3:1-6; Col 1:27; 2:2; 4:3). V2: Faithfulness to these "mysteries of God" is required of every steward (1 Pe 4:10; 1 Cor 9:16-17; Lk 12:42). V3: Some within a congregation will judge their pastor according to human standards. Paul is not going to concern himself with that. V4: Paul does not deny that he is a sinner, but he affirms a clear conscience with regard to his faithfulness as a steward of God's mysteries (2 Cor 1:12; Ac 23:1). Yet this is not the basis of Paul's final acquittal on Judgment Day. Paul does not speak of his justification in Christ, of which he is absolutely certain, but of rendering an account of his faithfulness. The Lord alone is the one who examines him. V5: Men judge by external means. God sees into the heart. On Judgment Day all shall be revealed (1 Cor 3:13; 2 Cor 10:16-18; 1 Th 2:3-4). The hidden motives of men's hearts will be brought to light. Any praise that is due will come as a gift of God's grace.

The central thought of the text is that Christ alone has the final word on examining the faithfulness of his stewards as they deliver the saving mysteries of God in Jesus Christ.

The problem in the hearers' lives is that they often unjustly judge God's stewards on the basis of mere human wisdom and expectation. The goal is that the hearers would highly value the called ministers in their midst for the faithful work they do in bringing to them the mysteries of God.

It Is Faithfulness That Counts!

- I. Pastors do well to remember this.

- A. The Lord requires that pastors be found faithful stewards (v2).

1. A steward is entrusted with the master's valuable possessions. Lk 12:42.

2. Pastors are entrusted with the mysteries of God (v1).

- a. A mystery is something that is hidden.
 - b. The mysteries of God are revealed in the Gospel. Eph 3:1-6; Col 1:27; 2:2; 4:3.
- B. The Lord gives various opportunities to his faithful stewards. 1 Cor 3:5-6.
 - 1. Every pastor has his own unique capabilities from the Lord. 1 Cor 12:4-11; 28.
 - 2. A pastor uses his capabilities as a servant of Christ (v1).
 - a. It is tempting for a pastor to set himself up as master instead of servant over his congregation.
 - b. He is to serve faithfully in a spirit of lowliness even as the Lord faithfully served. Jo 13:12-17; 1 Pe 5:3.
- C. A faithful servant and steward has no cause to be ashamed (v4).
 - 1. Not that a pastor is sinless and never fails.
 - 2. But a clear conscience comes from serving faithfully under the forgiving grace of Christ.
- II. Congregations do well to remember this.
 - A. As a servant and steward of Christ a pastor is responsible to Christ alone (vv3, 4).
 - 1. Congregations often unfairly judge their pastors according to human standards and peculiar whims.
 - a. They make unfair comparisons with other pastors.
 - b. They thereby criticize the Lord of the church for His wisdom in granting a congregation its pastor.
 - 2. Inasmuch as a congregation possesses the Word of Christ it has the responsibility to examine the faithfulness of its pastor to that word (v4b).
 - a. To "test the spirits" is a God-given right of every congregation. 1 Jn 4:1.
 - b. Every congregation should follow the example of the Bereans. Ac 17:11.
 - B. When the Lord comes again He will examine all men to see if they have been faithful (v5).
 - 1. The inner motives of the heart now hidden will be brought to light (v5).
 - a. Now it is impossible to know with certainty a person's reasons for service rendered to the Lord.
 - b. The proper motivation to serve the Lord faithfully is always God's grace in Jesus Christ. 1 Pe 4:10-12; Php 4:13.
 - 2. Faithfulness will be graciously rewarded, according to God's grace (v5).
 - a. The Lord will praise those who have served him faithfully. Mt 25:23.
 - b. The Lord's praise will far outweigh any human praise now.

David P. Johnson
Midland, Michigan

THE FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT

Philippians 4:4-7
December 23, 1979

Verse 4: "Rejoice," says Paul while sitting in a cold, dark dungeon. Clearly, Paul has more in mind than outward laughter. Joy is paradoxical, for it can exist in the midst of sorrow and persecution. Joy is "in the Lord," in all that a rela-

tionship to Him means. V5: "Forbearing Spirit" might best be described as yielding in gentleness and kindness to others and not demanding one's legal rights even when wronged or persecuted. The same term is used to refer to the gentleness and kindness of Jesus in 2 Cor 10:1 and Mt 11:29. This yielding in gentleness is produced by the expectation that "the Lord is near." Christians are people who are on their way to heaven. That makes a difference in the way they live on earth. V6: To "be anxious" means literally "to be of a divided mind," as Martha was anxious about much (Lk 10:41). "Prayers and supplications" both refer to the privilege of coming to God and calling upon Him. These two things are the heart-throb of the Christian faith. "Requests" are the specific, concrete, individual petitions which are the content of our prayers and supplications (1 Jn 5:15). Prayer is made with "thanksgiving," which is the attitude of all true prayers. V7: The "peace of God" is the objective peace that exists as a condition between God and man through the reconciliation accomplished by Jesus Christ (Eph 2:13-17). This peace "passes all comprehension," which does not mean that we cannot understand it. It means literally, "exceeding all mind." God's peace is the remedy for man's worries and anxiety. The human mind is not capable of giving lasting peace. The "heart" is the center of human personality. Included in it is the "mind" which produces a man's thoughts, feelings, desires, and actions. The peace of God guards and protects the heart and mind from those things that cause anxiety.

The central thought of the text is that the peace of God in Jesus Christ gives us cause for rejoicing; it creates peace between people; and it gives peace of mind and heart. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers would live as people who are at peace with God, themselves, and others. The problem in the hearers' lives is that they are frequently filled with doubt, anxiety, and strife. The means for overcoming the problem is the peace that has been given to us in Christ.

Introduction: Peace is an elusive thing in our troubled times. Just when the world thinks it has achieved peace, conflict breaks out once again. Peace can also elude us in our daily lives. We need to be reminded again of the peace that is ours.

The Peace Of Advent Makes A Difference In Life

- I. It prompts us to rejoice again and again (v4).
 - A. All people desire joy and happiness in this yuletide season.
 1. Some seek it in the things and circumstances of this world. Lk 12:16-21. But true joy eludes them.
 2. In our lives there are things and circumstances which are anything but joyful.
 - a. Paul was suffering as a prisoner when he wrote his epistle of joy.
 - b. True joy is paradoxical — it is maintained even in the face of affliction. 2 Cor 7:4-16, 1 Th 1:6, 2 Cor 6:10.
 - B. The Christian's source of rejoicing is "in the Lord" (v4).
 1. We rejoice because our Prince of Peace came to establish peace between God and men. Lk 2:24, Ro 5:1, Eph 2:13-17.
 2. The peace which Jesus gives is not the peace which the world gives. Jn 14:27.
- II. It enables us to be at peace with others.
 - A. We can let our forbearance be known to all (v5a).
 1. To forbear with someone is to yield to them in gentleness and mercy.
 2. We can be harsh and unmerciful at times with others.
 - B. The nearness of the Lord's second advent moves us to be gentle with those we know and love (v5b).

1. Those who live only for this life care only for themselves.
 2. The peace of knowing our citizenship is in heaven gives us grace to be gentle and forbearing.
 - a. We remember how mercifully gentle our Lord has been with us. 2 Cor 10:1, Mt 11:29.
 - b. Our relationships with those around us can thus be a reflection of the relationship that reaches into heaven above us.
- III. It enables us to be at peace with ourselves (vv6, 7).
- A. Our lives are full of anxiety and worry (v6a).
 1. Such things try to rob us of our advent peace.
 2. Worry is nothing less than unbelief regarding God's fatherly care.
 - B. In anxious moments we can go to the Lord in prayer (v6b).
 1. We can ask Him anything and everything. 1 Pe 5:7, Ps 55:22.
 2. We pray in a spirit of thanksgiving, knowing that He hears us.
 - C. The advent peace we have in Jesus Christ will see us through anxious moments (v7).
 1. This peace is beyond anything that our minds can do to rid us of worry.
 2. This peace will guard and keep our hearts and minds from being drawn away by the cares of the world.

DPJ

CHRISTMAS DAY, THE FEAST OF THE NATIVITY OF OUR LORD

Titus 2:11-14

December 25, 1979

That St. Paul is quite concerned that Titus speak to the concerns he has listed in chapter 2 is shown in 2:15. The primary emphasis of Titus 2 is ethical in nature with instructions for various groups of people in the congregations (e.g., the aged or the young). Paul cannot, however, bring these concerns to Titus' attention apart from the gospel which he puts forth as the reason for adorning "the doctrine of God our Saviour in every respect" (2:10).

The text itself has a strong two-fold nature, with both justification and sanctification being spoken of in these verses. The Christmas flavor of this text is found in the words, "... the grace of God has appeared" (v11). For similar thoughts tied specifically to Jesus cf. Tt 3:4 and 1 Tm 1:10. The idea of v11 is that one may see the grace of God in Jesus' birth. There is also an important thought expressed in the words "for all men" (v11 RSV). Jesus' appearance was not for the benefit of a select few. All those to whom Titus was to speak (cf. 2:1-10) were to benefit from His appearance.

The phrase "training us to . . ." (v12 RSV) may be taken in a two-fold sense. It expresses the reason for Jesus' teaching ("training us that we might . . .") as well as the content of that message ("training us to . . ."). Part of the indicated instruction in the text is that one is to look for the appearing of the "glory of our God and Savior, Christ Jesus" (v13). In these words St. Paul refers to the final coming in glory of Jesus at the eschaton. Jesus is further identified as the one who gave Himself for us, thus indicating His vicarious suffering and death. Neither His first appearance as the Babe of Bethlehem nor His final appearance as the Judge coming in glory may be separated from His vicarious satisfaction.

The central thought of this passage is that God's grace has appeared in Jesus, and through that appearance He has called us to live sensibly in this age.

Introduction: It is not often that we receive a gift or offer of some "special opportunity" without any strings attached. We may even wonder if God has attached any strings to His offer in Jesus. We might well ask,

Why Did God Show His Grace In Jesus?

- I. So that He might bring salvation to all.
 - A. Jesus was born for the sake of all men.
 1. Some people may feel that they have little need for this infant lying in the manger. They have even less need for the Savior of the cross.
 2. This "grace" has appeared for all men. Even those who "have no need for Christ" are objects of God's love in Jesus.
 - B. He brings this salvation to us by His act of redemption.
 1. Jesus' birth cannot be separated from His death. Jesus' birth would be meaningless without His death and resurrection.
 2. In death Jesus "bought us back" from our captor. He has paid for every lawless deed. Jesus laid down His life to ransom everyone who needs ransom.

God had a purpose in showing His grace in Jesus. He wanted to bring salvation to all men. In doing so He made us His own . . .

- II. So that we might live sensibly in this present age.
 - A. By denying worldliness and ungodliness.
 1. Keeping our minds fixed on this world and its allurements is not such a denial. That is precisely when the message of Christmas gets lost.
 2. Saying no to sin and being zealous for good deeds *is* such a denial.
 - B. By looking for the blessed hope of God's glory.
 1. A blessed hope is one that does not disappoint. It must have a firm base. It must be well-founded.
 2. We have such a hope in Jesus. He will come once again. Before His birth men longed for His coming. He did not disappoint them. Since His death and resurrection men have looked for Him. He will not fail to keep His promises.

Conclusion: When we deny worldliness and ungodliness such as is common at Christmas-time, we are living sensibly according to God's standards. There are no strings attached to God's show of mercy in Jesus. He did show His mercy in the birth of this child, but He had no hidden agendas or ulterior motives. God showed His mercy in Jesus to bring salvation to all men, and to teach us to live sensibly. In short, God wants the very best for you. We can be thankful that He did show His grace in Jesus.

David L. Bahn
Vernal, Colorado

THE SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS

Galatians 4:1-7

December 30, 1979

Paul fiercely battles against the notion of salvation through the Law (especially relative to circumcision) in his letter to the Galatians. In 3:1-4:31, Paul sets down the facts which show the doctrine of justification by faith to be far superior to the teaching of the Judaizers who were troubling the Christians at Galatia.

In speaking of this superiority, Paul shows how God's sending forth of His Son did away with that which held man in bondage (especially the ceremonial law). This pericope is intimately tied to the statement that those who belong to Christ are "Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise" (3:29). There is a distinction between being a minor (under supervision and bondage) and coming of age (when the position as son is enjoyed). Just as the minor may not perform any act except through his representative, so Israel was bound to work through the mediation of the priests and to be subject to the Law of Moses. Paul equates the pre-Christian state of the Galatians with childhood (v3).

The birth of Jesus — the Messiah appointed by God — is seen to be anything other than happenstance by the words of v4, "in order that." Jesus was sent *in order that* He might redeem those under the law; thus the purpose of Jesus' being sent forth was not left to the impulse of the moment. Through Him we are adopted as God's sons. The fact that is established in 3:29 (that we are sons) is seen to bring with it specific privileges. Those who are sons by adoption are no less privileged. These are given the Spirit of His Son.

The central thought of this text is summed up in the words, "Therefore you are no longer a slave, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God" (v7 NASB).

Introduction: There is nothing quite as exciting as learning that you may be an heir to a large fortune. But usually only the close relatives of those who pass away are selected as heirs. Unless you are closely related to someone with a great fortune you may never experience such an excitement. As Christians we can lay claim to a different kind of inheritance. But the basis of this inheritance is not changed. Therefore, we can be glad that

God's Son Makes Us Sons Of God

- I. Because of this we are no longer held in bondage.
 - A. We were in bondage to the elemental things of the earth.
 1. The law, sin, and our own selfish desires all tie us to this world. They all hold us in bondage to themselves.
 2. This is a pernicious bondage. It does not easily give up its captive. This bondage prevents us from enjoying our inheritance as God's sons.
 - B. Jesus came to redeem us from this captivity.
 1. He was born under the law — under the same rules and regulations to which we are subject. As a man He knew the limitations of our flesh and the harsh requirements of the Law.
 2. He underwent all this to live and die as our substitute — buying us back from our bondage. He paid the price to redeem us — His own innocent life.
- II. Because of this we may now enjoy our full inheritance.
 - A. We have the gift of the Spirit of Jesus.
 1. We have this gift because we have been redeemed and are now God's sons by adoption. Without Christ's redemption we could not enjoy this blessing.
 2. As adopted sons we enjoy the blessing of calling God our Father as Jesus Himself did (although, of course, in a different sense).
 - B. All things that God has are now ours.
 1. We no longer need to be under guardians and managers as we enjoy God's many blessings. He freely gives them to us — life, health, prosperity, and hope.
 2. We also may look forward with confidence to the full enjoyment of all of God's bounty — the mansions of heaven. He gives it all to us as His own sons and heirs.

Conclusion: You may never fall heir to an earthly fortune of great proportion. That excitement may never be yours. Yet as Christians we all enjoy the blessings of being heirs of God. This comes about through Jesus whose birth we celebrate. He is God's Son who has made us sons of God; and because we are sons we are also heirs to His great fortune. Thank God that He sent forth His son to adopt us as His sons!

THE EPIPHANY OF OUR LORD

Isaiah 60:1-6

January 6, 1980

In Isaiah 59 the prophet says that all the earth, including Zion, is wicked and helpless in that condition. God, however, takes upon Himself to secure salvation and promises that a Redeemer will come to Zion (59:20). The text moves from this promise to the future time, with the prophet exhorting Zion as if the Redeemer had already come. Epiphany reminds us that the promised Savior has indeed come for all people.

Zion (God's people) is told to "arise" and to "shine," to become plainly visible. They now can, for they are no longer in darkness with the rest of the nations; the promised "light," the "glory of the Lord," has come to them (v1). "Glory of the Lord" denotes God's presence or holiness, often depicted as fire or light (Ex 24:17, 40:34, 1 Kgs 8:11, Lk 2:9, Ac 7:55). The Hebrew *zarach* ("has risen") is the word used to describe the rising of the sun (Mal 4:2). As the sun rises and brings light to the land, so also has Jesus appeared bringing spiritual light.

In vv2-3 the future is again used. The earth lies covered in the darkness of sin (59:9-10). The nations turn to Zion for light, but Zion herself does not produce it. The Redeemer, Jesus Christ, is the Light and the Glory of the Lord (Lk 1:79, 2:32, Is 49:6, Mt 4:16, Jn 1:4, 8:12). The nations can come to Zion's light (vv3-4) because the Savior's coming has changed Zion from darkness into light (2 Cor 3:18). Having been transformed, Zion is to be a beacon to all the world (Mt 5:14).

In vv4-6 people from all the earth turn to the light of Zion. God's people rejoice as others join them in God's light. Treasures are brought to Zion to be used in the praise of God (vv5b-6). The "wise men from the east" (Mt 2:1ff) were among the first to fulfill this prophecy, turning to the Savior of Israel and giving Him gifts.

Introduction: The church does not appear splendid, for churches consist of ordinary people who struggle and often fail. Yet Christians have a radiance; they can and do shine. The prophet urges:

People Of God, Rise and Shine

- I. Rise and shine for His light has entered your darkness.
 - A. The Light of Christ has appeared amid the darkness of the world (vv1-2a).
 - B. His glory has become His people's glory (vv2b-3). In and through Him God's people are holy and righteous.
- II. Rise and shine, that all the world might see your light.
 - A. The Redeemer saves not only Zion, but all the world through Zion (vv3-4).
 - B. God's people beam out what God has done for them and for all people in Jesus Christ.

Conclusion: Appearances notwithstanding, the Christian church is beautiful and glorious because Christ is our light. Let us be the church.

Robert C. Zick
Monroe, Wisconsin

THE FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Romans 12:1-5

January 13, 1980

Paul has just finished explaining to the Romans (1-11) the salvation of God. He has concluded with the doxology: "For from Him and through Him and to

Him are all things. To Him be the glory forever" (11:36). Salvation from sin is the merciful work of God alone (11:22, 30-33). Romans 12 details man's proper response to his gracious God.

In v1 the response is designated as worship. God is to be worshipped not only at certain places on certain days; but a Christian's entire life is to be "a living and holy sacrifice, well-pleasing to God." The rest of the text, and most of chapters 12-15, goes on to explain this total and true worship.

Throughout Epiphany the Gospel readings show Jesus revealing Himself as the Son of God. When men understood who He was they worshipped Him (the wise men, the disciples at the Transfiguration). So in the epistle to the Romans, Paul's delineation of who Jesus is provides the impetus for worshipping Him.

"By the mercies of God" refers to all that God has done for us in Christ. Spiritual worship consists in conforming our life to the holiness of Christ. Since Christians are transformed, new people in Christ, to conform to the world would be a contradiction of their new nature. With the use of their minds, they are to grasp more clearly what God has made of them and what God's "good and acceptable and perfect" will is. "The grace given" to Paul (v3) is his apostleship. In that grace he does not lord over the body of Christ but serves it by admonishing against any self-righteous conceptions. The faith in which each Christian stands has been given to him by God. There is no cause for boasting. Every Christian is what he is by his connection to Christ; apart from Him "none is righteous" (3:10). No one in the body of Christ is any more worthy than another. All should serve one another as Christ serves them.

Introduction: Worship is found wherever people pay homage to a higher being or power. Christian and non-Christian alike worship. But not all worship is alike. Paul in the text directs us to

True Spiritual Worship

- I. Such worship is possible only by the mercies of God (vv1,3).
 - A. A person who senses no need of God's mercy cannot worship God properly. People naturally think too highly of themselves.
 - B. When God's mercy covers our sin, our worship is acceptable to God.
 1. God has revealed His mercy in Christ.
 2. Faith too, which grasps Christ, is a work of God's mercy.
 3. Connected to Christ by faith, we Christians are able to carry out true spiritual worship.
- II. Such worship is practiced by living according to God's will (vv2, 4-5).
 - A. We are to live as transformed people.
 1. Not living as the world lives.
 2. But understanding and doing that which is good and acceptable and perfect in God's sight.
 - B. We are to live like Christ, nor lording it over one another, but serving one another according to the will of God.
 - C. We are to live so as to perform a unique function in the whole body of Christians.

Conclusion: There is more to worship than attending a church service. The service is indeed the high point of our weekly worship. But worship should radiate from the church service to all of life. To worship is to live as Christians by God's mercy.

THE SECOND SUNDAY AFTER THE EPIPHANY**Romans 12:6-16****January 20, 1980**

The first eleven chapters of Paul's letter to the Romans spell out in beautiful detail the central doctrine of the Christian religion — justification by faith alone. Self-righteousness and smugness on the part of the Roman Christians because of their relationship to God have been condemned by the apostle. What, then, should their attitude be? Chapter 12 provides the answer. They are to "present [their] bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God" (v1). They are, by the grace of God, one body in Christ. Paul proceeds to outline for them the manner in which the members of this body should behave toward one another.

The central thought of the text is that Christians can express their God-given unity in many ways. Not only is this unity a result of God's grace, but the manifestation of the unity is made possible only by the grace of God.

God's Gifts Are To Be Used

- I. They are to be used with the awareness that they differ.
 - A. Each Christian is to use the particular gift or gifts which he or she has been given.
 1. It may be the gift of expounding God's Word, serving, teaching, exhorting, giving, helping, acting mercifully (vv6b-8).
 2. As we Christians live together, we can learn to appreciate our different gifts (v6a) and how these can contribute to our wholeness in Christ's body.
 - B. Each Christian is to use his or her gifts as fully as possible.
 1. Not only are we Christians by the grace of God but also every gift we have is by grace (6b).
 2. The nature of the gift itself (6b-8) indicates how it can best be used.
- II. They are to be used with genuine love.
 - A. In ways that show we empathize with our fellow Christians.
 1. Rejoicing with them in their joy and weeping with them in their sorrow (v15).
 2. Associating with the lowly (v16).
 3. Honoring our fellow Christians (v10b).
 - B. In ways that show we care about their total persons.
 1. Practicing hospitality.
 2. Zealously serving both their bodily and spiritual needs.

Conclusion: To express our God-given unity by using the gifts God has given us in a great privilege which we Christians have.

Rolf Preus
Clear Lake, Minnesota

THE THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY (TRANSFIGURATION)**2 Peter 1:16-21****January 27, 1980**

The words of this text remind us that God's Word is no myth (v16). The Good News of Jesus Christ was not dreamed up by a committee in a smoke-filled room. The historical facts of the Gospel are supported by eyewitnesses (v16). Peter even had the special privilege of witnessing the transfiguration of his Lord and hearing the testimony of God from heaven (vv17-18). All the events witnessed by Peter and the other apostles confirmed the message of the prophets in God's Old Testament Word (v19a). This should surprise no one because the God

who cannot lie is the true Author of the Scriptures. Although Peter does not explain all the mechanics of how this takes place, he makes it very clear that God is responsible for the words of the Scripture (vv20-21).

Since God's Word is true and only God's Word brings the Good News of Jesus, it is like "a lamp shining in a dark place" (v19b). As we wait for our Lord's return, God's Word is the only Word we can trust. It alone will sustain us "until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts" (v19b).

The central thought of the text is that the Word of God, in which we discover the Good News of Jesus Christ, is completely reliable. The goal of the sermon is that the hearer pay careful attention to God's Word as a light to guide us through this life.

Introduction: Many books have been written on many different subjects. These books may be interesting and informative. Only one book deserves our undivided attention — God's Word, the Bible.

Pay Attention To The Word

- I. Only God's Word is completely true.
 - A. The Gospel is not some fabricated story.
 1. There is much fiction in our world.
 2. God's Word is not fiction (v16).
 - a. Men who were eyewitnesses recorded the Gospel (v16).
 - b. The historical facts confirmed the truth of the prophets (v19).
 - (1) This is what Jesus taught His men (Lk 24:25-27).
 - (2) This is what His men taught others (Ac 3:18).
 - B. Men have no right to sit in judgment over God's Word.
 1. God is the Author.
 - a. The prophets did not speak by their own impulse (v21).
 - (1) False prophets spoke in this way (Eze 13:3).
 - (2) Their message was worthless (Eze 13:6).
 - b. The prophets spoke at the direction of the Holy Spirit (v21).
 2. No man has the right to question God (Job 38:1-2).
- II. Only God's Word brings us the Good News of Jesus Christ.
 - A. It shows us Jesus as Lord.
 1. There have been other great men in other books.
 2. No other man is like Jesus.
 - a. No other man displays power like His.
 - (1) We see His power at the transfiguration.
 - (2) We see other examples of His power (Ro 1:4).
 - b. No other man uses his power for our good the way Jesus does.
 - (1) His power saves us (Ro 1:16).
 - (2) His power sustains us (Mt 11:28).
 - B. It shows us Jesus as the beloved Son.
 1. Jesus was the only One to please God the Father fully.
 - a. We see this at the transfiguration (v17).
 - b. We see this at other times (Mt 3:17; Jn 12:28).
 2. Jesus is the only One who can truly please us.
 - a. Other people may disappoint us.
 - b. Jesus never disappoints us (Jn 6:35).

Conclusion: Let us direct our attention to God's Word. It is truly a lamp shining in a dark world.

Lawrence W. Mitchell
Beech Grove, Indiana

SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY

1 Corinthians 9:24-10:5

February 3, 1980

When Paul spoke of competing in a race and running for a prize, the Corinthians understood him (9:24). Every three years Corinth hosted the Isthmian Games (similar to the Olympic Games). Athletes trained very hard so they could run in a race where the prize was perishable — a pine wreath (9:25). Today, some people exhaust themselves in a race where the prize is the best car, the best house, the best furniture, etc.

Christians are in a race of which the prize is imperishable (9:25). This prize of heavenly life with treasures that can never be taken away (Mt 6:19-20) has already been won for us by Jesus. He won it by completing the cruel race to the cross. Because He received the crown of thorns, we have the crown of life. Why, then, must we run for a prize already won by Jesus? The answer is that the prize is only for those who keep the faith.

The central thought of the text is that we must always strive to keep the faith and so win the crown of life. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers remain faithful throughout life.

Introduction: Many people are running and jogging for their health. Some claim that this kind of running can prolong life. However, there is another kind of running that yields another kind of life. This is running in a race where the prize is heavenly life.

Run For Your Life

- I. We are in a race.
 - A. Some people run after perishable prizes (9:25).
 1. The Greeks did.
 2. People today still do.
 - B. Christians run for an imperishable prize.
 1. It is more valuable than any other prize (Jas 1:12; Re 21:4).
 2. It is God's gift to us (Ro 6:23).
 - a. The prize has been won for us by Jesus.
 - b. The prize is for those who complete the race in faith (Re 2:10).
- II. We need training to compete in the race.
 - A. Athletes must condition their bodies so they can compete.
 1. A race demands all the energy of an athlete.
 2. Only the best-trained win (9:25).
 - B. We must train our spiritual muscles for the race.
 1. Our race is exhausting.
 - a. It is longer than any marathon. It lasts all our life.
 - b. There are many obstacles along the way (1 Pe 5:8).
 2. Only rigorous training will prepare us.
 - a. It may hurt for a while (9:27; Jas 1:2-3; Col 3:5, 8, 9).
 - b. God will make us strong through Word and Sacrament (Ro 1:16; Php 1:6).
- III. We can never relax in our race.
 - A. Past performance is no guarantee of future success.
 1. Athletes cannot rely on their past triumphs.
 2. The Israelites could not rely on their past experience.
 - a. They were greatly blessed (10:1-4).
 - b. Nevertheless, many of them died in the wilderness (10:5).
 3. We cannot rely on the past.
 - a. We have been blessed (1 Pe 2:10).

- b. What lies in the past is not important (Php 2:13-14).
- B. We must constantly strive to win the race.
 - 1. This was the concern of St. Paul (9:27).
 - 2. This must be our concern (He 12:1).

Conclusion: May God grant us the strength and determination to run the race for life so we can finally say with St. Paul: "I have finished the race, I have kept the faith" (2 Tm 4:7).

LWM

SEXAGESIMA SUNDAY

2 Corinthians 11:19-12:9

February 10, 1980

Paul is speaking to the Corinthians, who were exposed to the boasting of some supposedly "super-apostles" (11:5). These false teachers (11:13) could not say enough good things about themselves and were bold enough to take advantage of the Corinthians (11:20). They boasted of their heritage and of their service to Christ (11:22-23). Perhaps they also boasted of visions and revelations from God. However, these men did not boast of their own weaknesses or of the sustaining power of God. As Paul defends his ministry against these "super-apostles" he refuses to be like them and boast of his own greatness. Instead, he boasts of his own weaknesses and humiliating experiences (11:24-33; 12:7-8). This kind of boasting is really confession. It is an admission of weakness. Through this kind of boasting Paul shows that God's strength is so great that He can accomplish His purpose by using weak men (12:9).

The central thought of the text is that only God's strength counts in a world that prefers to rely on its own greatness. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers would trust in God's power and not their own personal strength.

Introduction: There are many examples of boasting in our world. All this boasting may impress other people but it does not impress God.

Boasting That Counts

- I. There is a kind of boasting that counts in the eyes of the world.
 - A. It emphasizes personal strength.
 - 1. This is how the false teachers at Corinth boasted (2 Cor 11:5; 21-23).
 - 2. This is how some people boast today.
 - B. It denies the importance of God.
 - 1. This kind of boasting gives all the credit to men.
 - a. People who depend on God are seen as weak.
 - b. People who are self-made are seen as strong.
 - 2. This kind of boasting turns a man into a fool (Lk 12:16-20).
 - a. Human achievement has no lasting value (Ps 49:16-20).
 - b. God will judge the proud (Is 2:11-12).
- II. There is a kind of boasting that counts in the eyes of God.
 - A. It is a confession of personal weakness.
 - 1. This is what St. Paul did.
 - a. He could have boasted like the false teachers.
 - (1) He had more reason to boast of success than they did.
 - (2) He chose to boast of his humiliating weaknesses (11:30).
 - b. He knew he had no reason to boast of his own greatness.
 - (1) He was a sinner (I Tm 1:13, 15).
 - (2) God's grace in Jesus forgave him (Eph 2:4-9).
 - 2. This is the only kind of boasting we can do.
 - a. We are sinners like Paul (Ro 3:23; I Jn 1:8).

- b. We are saved by grace like Paul.
 - (1) It is God's free and undeserved gift (Ro 3:24-25).
 - (2) We can only confess our unworthiness.
- B. It praises the power of God (2 Cor 10:17).
 - 1. God's strength is most clearly seen when we are weak (12:9).
 - a. This was the experience of St. Paul.
 - b. Today, weak men give great testimony to the power of God.
 - 2. God's strength will not fail us (Is 40:28-31).

Conclusion: We have no reason for boasting of our own strength. The only boasting that counts gives glory to God.

LWM

QUINQUAGESIMA SUNDAY

I Corinthians 13:1-13

February 17, 1980

Coming exactly fifty days before Easter, as its name implies, Quinquagesima Sunday serves as "an orientation toward Lent," which starts on the following Wednesday. Lent, whatever else it may be, is the story of the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. Fortunately in English the word "passion" has a double meaning: great suffering and great love. Both concepts are discussed in the readings which set the mood for Lent (sometimes called *Passionszeit* in German). The Gospel (Lk 18:31-43) is a narrative account of Christ's determination to go to Jerusalem, even if this journey means suffering and death, for love allows him no other alternative. This sacrificial love of the Master becomes the source, norm, and motivation of Christian living, as Paul reminds us in the Epistle, which, in the words of Edward T. Horn III, is nothing less than "a classic of poetic prose and sets forth the ideal of love and its superiority"

Introduction: The text quickly makes clear that Paul is discussing *agape*-love, not sensual (*eros*) or even fraternal love. His model throughout is nothing less than that of the Master, for this "more excellent way" (1 Cor 12:31) could be fulfilled by none other than Him who was "the Way."

Paul's Hymn To Love

- I. Love: the Motivation (vs 1-3).
 - A. Of knowing.
 - 1. Speaking ("tongues of men and angels," i.e.) known languages).
 - 2. Teaching ("prophetic powers").
 - 3. Understanding ("all mysteries"). Without love these things are naught.
 - B. Of doing.
 - 1. Believing ("as to move mountains").
 - 2. Giving ("all I have").
 - 3. Dying ("my body to be burned," martyrdom). Without love these things are naught.
- II. Love: a Definition (vs 4-7).
 - A. By elimination. Since love is "patient and kind," it is *not*
 - 1. Jealous or boastful.
 - 2. Arrogant or rude.
 - 3. Insistent on its own way.
 - 4. Irritable or resentful.
 - 5. Ready to rejoice at wrong, (but rather is ready to rejoice in the right).

- B. By affirmation.
 - Since love is "patient and kind," it
 - 1. Bears all things.
 - 2. Believes all things.
 - 3. Hopes all things.
 - 4. Endures all things.
- III. Love: The Consummation (vs 8-12).
 - A. Of the life of the Church.
 - 1. Its teaching (prophecy).
 - 2. Its speaking (tongues).
 - 3. Its knowing (understanding).
 - B. Of the life of the saint.
 - 1. His growth.
 - 2. His understanding.

Conclusion: For Paul, the enduring triad is "faith, hope, love . . . these three" (v 13). Others have been suggested, as Plato's triad of "the good, the true, and the beautiful." But Paul's has power, for the love he praises was lived, by *the* Person, in history, even the same Jesus who now lives, in eternity, for us — His Church. The love that made possible the incarnation, the crucifixion, and the resurrection is the same love that will bring about the final transformation of heaven and earth. Because of Jesus, Paul can say, "the greatest of these is love."

C. George Fry

THE FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT (INVOCAVIT)

2 Corinthians 6:1-10

February 24, 1980

Lent's forty days have as precedents the forty days of Moses on Sinai (Ex 24:18), Elijah on Horeb (1 Kgs 19:8), and Jesus in the desert (Mt 4:2). Like the saints of old, in this season we seek to clarify our calling. For that reason Lent has a four-fold purpose: (1) the preparation of the Christian for Easter and the celebration of the central mysteries of the Faith (the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ — by some this is done through fasting (*Fastenzeit* is an old German name for Lent); (2) the proclamation of the Gospel of the cross to the world through preaching (reflected in the American custom of "special services" held during the season and directed toward "outsiders"); (3) the education of the catechumens in the Faith through teaching, in anticipation of their confirmation (often on Palm Sunday; today's catechumens are usually children; in the Ancient Church they were usually adults being prepared for baptism on Easter eve); and (4) the imitation of Christ by the believer through serious reflection on our calling — growth in grace ("Lent" is derived from the Anglo-Saxon term for "lengthen," referring to the longer days of spring; but there can be a happy application to our growth in grace in this season) and service.

The last idea prevails in the lessons for today. Both Epistle and Gospel "are concerned with the proper orientation of the Christian life." By a strange coincidence, the very name of the day, *Invocavit* ("he called," or, more correctly, *Invocabit*, "he shall call"), suggests the notion of "calling" in the double sense of prayer and service. The Collect asks God "to defend us" in our Christian walk. In the Gospel the temptation of Christ is recounted, how Christ fulfilled his calling in spite of demonic opposition. In the Epistle the afflictions of Paul are described, indicating how Paul led a victorious life in spite of the work of the adversary. The Epistle, like the lesson from the Apostle for last Sunday, reads like a "prose-poem," a veritable litany of the Christian life — in all conditions, by all means, as God's elect.

Fulfilling Our Calling

Introduction: Paul begins with a magnificent affirmation of the Lutheran doctrine of the "universal priesthood of believers" (vs 1-3), and then urges us to fulfill our calling.

- I. In All Conditions (vs 4-5).
 - A. Physical conditions.
 - 1. In much patience.
 - 2. In afflictions.
 - 3. In necessities.
 - B. Social conditions.
 - 1. In distresses.
 - 2. In stripes.
 - 3. In imprisonments.
 - 4. In tumults.
 - C. Spiritual conditions.
 - 1. In labors.
 - 2. In watchings.
 - 3. In fastings.
- II. By All Means (vs 6, 7, 8a, b).
 - A. Moral means.
 - 1. By pureness.
 - 2. By knowledge.
 - 3. By longsuffering.
 - 4. By kindness.
 - B. Spiritual means.
 - 1. By the Holy Ghost.
 - 2. By love unfeigned.
 - 3. By the word of truth.
 - 4. By the power of God.
 - C. Social means.
 - 1. By the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left.
 - 2. By honor and dishonor.
 - 3. By evil report and good report.
- III. As God's Elect (vs 8c-10).
 - A. For social blessing.
 - 1. As deceivers, and yet true.
 - 2. As unknown, and yet well known.
 - B. For physical blessing.
 - 1. As dying, and behold, we live.
 - 2. As chastened, and not killed.
 - C. For spiritual blessing.
 - 1. As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing.
 - 2. As poor, yet making many rich.
 - 3. As having nothing, and yet possessing all things.

Conclusion: Paul's litany is reminiscent of his great affirmation in Ro 8:25-39 in response to the question: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" The response? Nothing "shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" and prevent us from fulfilling our calling as God's servants.

THE SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT (REMINISCERE)**I Thessalonians 4:1-7****March 2, 1980**

The readings for the Second Sunday in Lent fall into the pattern of the old Gospel hymn, "Trust and Obey." The Gospel, the story of the Syrophenician woman (Mt 15:21-28), is a compelling account of trust (Jesus said to the woman, "Great is thy faith"). The Epistle, from one of Paul's earliest writings (if not, indeed, his very first known letter), is concerned with the obedience that follows up faith. The Collect refers to both lessons, asking that God would defend us "From all adversities which may happen to the body, and from evil thoughts which may assault and hurt the soul . . ."

Commentators variously describe this Pauline passage as "a plea for marital ethics," "the duty of purity and love," "and 'the call to personal purity.'" It was originally included in the pericopes of the Church as an example "of the purity of life expected of the Neophytes to be received by baptism at Easter." Because Paul bluntly admonishes the Thessalonians that they "cannot be Christians and be sexually loose," we can see that this Scripture is as relevant to our modern permissive society as it was to the decadent days of the Caesars.

How We Ought To Live**I. An Apostolic Exhortation (vs 1-3).****A. To live right.**

1. As you ought ("how you ought to live").
2. As you want ("to please God").
3. As you can ("as you are doing").
4. As you will ("you do so more and more").

B. By divine might.

1. Through divine instruction ("what instruction we gave you through the Lord Jesus").
2. Through spiritual motivation ("this is the will of God").
3. Through moral dedication ("abstain from immorality").

II. An Apostolic Admonition (vs 4-6).**A. For holy matrimony.**

1. Which is God's intention ("take a wife").
2. Which has God's commendation ("holiness and honor").
3. Which carries God's protection ("the Lord is an avenger").

B. Against sexual immorality.

1. Which is an offense against personality ("like heathen").
2. Which is an offense against the family ("transgress").
3. Which is an offense against the community ("wrong his brother").
4. Which is an offense against the Deity ("the Lord is an avenger").

Conclusion: Though not implicit in the passage, evident from the context is God's desire to forgive and restore the penitent, to strengthen the tempted, to perfect those striving for purity and justice. For where there is condemnation of sin, there is also the promise of benediction for the repentant.

CGF

THE THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT (OCULI)**Ephesians 5:1-9****March 9, 1980**

The discrepancy between confession of the lips and confession of life is a bane with which we must contend. To bring our lives into conformity with God's will is something for which we constantly strive. The desire and will to be an imitator

of God comes only from our new life through the Gospel. Paul appeals to the "Beloved," to those to whom Christ has shown love, that they become imitators of Christ. Once you were darkness, i.e., the natural condition of death which is opposed to life. We are light, light itself, not a lamp, by virtue of the fact that we are children of light, of God Himself. Paul urges us to be what we are, lights, using Christ as our model.

Introduction: Typically children mirror the actions and attitudes of their parents. They do so because they want to be like those whom they love. As children of God, children of light, we are to be imitators of Him. We are to be

Shining Lights

- I. We cannot be shining lights if we continually give into our sinful nature.
 - A. Our "old" nature tries to pull us down into darkness (v8).
 1. It tries to pull us down into immorality, greed, and covetousness.
 2. It is a constant battle to resist this pull into sin.
 - B. Knowing that the wrath of God comes upon the disobedient deters us from sinning (vv5-6).
But what moves us even more to avoid sin and to pursue holiness is the knowledge that
- II. We are children of light.
 - A Through Christ's death and resurrection God has become our loving Father.
 - B. In our baptism we became partakers of the life only God can give — of goodness, peace, and power.
- III. Now we live as children of light.
 - A. The light of Christ affects our whole being — our plans and goals, desires and decisions.
 - B. As long as we remain attached to Christ, we will be able to shine.
 - C. We will shine with Christ's light in public and in private (v8; Eph 4:32; Ga 6:2; Ro 12:16-17, 19, 21), walking in love and righteousness and truth.

Conclusion: Our sinful nature, as well as Satan and the world around us, are working hard to drag us down into darkness. But we do not have to give in to them. In Christ we are new people — shining lights.

NHM

THE FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT (LAETARE)

Galatians 4:21-31

March 16, 1980

The pericope confronts us with the question, "Since we are free from the bondage of the law, why do we insist on going back into slavery?" This question Paul addressed to the Galatian Christians. He uses an allegory to point to the issues, to the implications, and to the only answer for the Christian.

Introduction: Booker T. Washington, in his powerful autobiography, *Up From Slavery*, depicts his struggle to realize freedom in his station in life. We who were born slaves of sin have been born again through faith in Jesus Christ. One of the strange paradoxes of life is that we must constantly battle against the temptation to go back into the slavery from which Christ delivered us. Paul reminds us what it means for us that we have come

Up From Slavery

- I. It means that we have been born free as children of promise.
 - A. Our natural birth brought us into slavery (vv23-24).

1. We were in bondage to sin and to the law.
 - a. We were spiritual children of Hagar, who represents Sinai and the legalistic, servile attitude.
 - b. Whenever we try to make ourselves right with God by keeping the law we are reverting to the slavery into which we were born.
2. We cannot by ourselves escape this slavery and inherit eternal life.
- B. The new birth God gave us in baptism makes us beneficiaries of God's promises.
 1. His promise is that salvation is a free gift by faith without the deeds of the law.
 2. In this second birth we became spiritual children of Sarah who represents Calvary and the forgiving grace of God in Christ.
 3. Our freedom was gained by Christ in whom Abraham already believed.
- II. It means that we can live free as heirs of God.
 - A. Free from the law.
 1. From the curse and punishment of the law.
 2. From the demands of the law that we must keep it to be saved.
 - B. Free to endure persecution.
 1. Persecution will come (v29).
 2. We can endure the cross like Christ "who for the glory that was set before him endured . . ." (He 12:2).
 - C. Free to look for our inheritance.
 1. As God's children, our inheritance is sure (vv30-31; 1 Pe 1:4).
 2. We can have a long-range view. How freeing it is to know that whether we live or die, we are the Lord's.

Conclusion: Why should we want to be slaves again when God has made us free?

NHM

THE FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT (JUDICA — PASSION SUNDAY)

Hebrews 9:11-15

March 23, 1980

The text reminds us that the whole Scripture bears witness to and focuses on Jesus, the Christ. The writer of Hebrews takes us back into the heart of the ceremonial law which is a prefiguration of the revelation of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. In preparing the sermon on this text, the preacher may want to read the Old Testament background and review the meaning and significance of the various sacrifices and offerings, especially those to which the text refers. The preacher will also be concerned to fathom how this Old Testament prefiguration was fulfilled in Jesus Christ in that unique, one-of-its-kind, once-and-for-all redemptive act upon the cross.

Introduction: We are familiar with the role of the mediator in labor-management disputes. He tries to get both sides together. A mediator was likewise needed to get both sides together in the dispute between God and the human race. Not God, but human beings caused this estrangement. But it was God who brought about reconciliation through the mediating work of His Son, Jesus Christ. The text reminds us that

Christ Is Our Mediator

- I. The mediator of a new covenant.
 - A. The old covenant.
 1. The covenant God made with His Old Testament people was acted

out and celebrated in the ceremonial sacrifices of the tabernacle and temple worship which reached their climax in the Day of Atonement (Lv 16:14-16).

2. These sacrifices were types of Christ.
- B. The new covenant.
 1. The covenant established by God with His New Testament people reached its climax in the redemptive act of Jesus Christ.
 2. Christ entered into the tabernacle not made with hands, (incarnation) and into the very throne room of God (v11). Taking with Him His own blood (v12), He offered the unique sacrifice, once for all (He 10:10-12; 10:14).
- II. The mediator of greater things.
 - A. Who secured for us an eternal redemption (v12).
 1. He "redeemed us from sin, death, and the power of the devil" (Luther).
 2. The forgiveness, which He secured for us is perfect and complete (v15).
 - B. Who urged us from dead works to serve the living God (v14). Luther: "To live under Him in His kingdom and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness."
 - C. Who gained for us an eternal inheritance.
 1. "He is risen from the dead, lives and reigns to all eternity." (Luther).
 2. The life now begun reaches fulfillment in heaven (v15).

Conclusion: Jesus is the greatest. Through Him we have bold and free access to God.

NHM

THE SIXTH SUNDAY IN LENT (PALM SUNDAY)

Philippians 2:5-11

March 30, 1980

Introduction: As a way to confess His faith, a business man put this sign on his desk for all who came in the office to see — and then to ask the meaning: "I am Number Three." The explanation was always the same. God is number one in my life; others come second; I am in third place. That is a lesson we can learn from this text.

I Am Number Three

- I. Jesus is Number One.
 - A. He was God from eternity (Jn 1:1).
 - B. He became a man of humble station (vs 6-8).
 - C. He died and rose for us (v8). Whoever believes in Him has eternal life (Jn 3:14-15).
 - D. God has highly exalted Him.
 1. God has given Him a position of supreme honor (v9).
 2. He is Lord of all (vs 10-11).

Illustration: As a father and his son were driving with the car window open, a bee flew in. The boy became almost hysterical, for he was allergic to bee-stings and could go into convulsions. The father slowed down the car and as he did so was able to reach out and grasp the bee in his hand. He kept his fist closed long enough to feel the sting and then said, "Don't be afraid, son. The stinger is now in my hand. The bee can't hurt you." Jesus took the sting of our sin upon Him (was made a curse for us, was made sin for us) — we are free and have new life.

II. Others are Number Two.

- A. We learn as new persons in Christ to think as He thought. The reason that St. Paul wrote this great section on the humiliation and exaltation of Christ was to hold up this example of Christ as a pattern for the Christians at Philippi to follow (v 5).
- B. We learn obedience to God (v 8). In Gethsemane Christ could have called in twelve legions of angels, but He prayed, "not My will but Thine be done."
- C. We learn humility (v 8).
- D. We learn to put others before ourselves. "Do nothing from selfishness or conceit, but in humility count others better than yourselves" (v 3).

Illustration: Two sisters who had lived apart in different cities for several years came to live together again. After a time, one said, "I don't know what happened to you, but you are a great deal easier to live with than you used to be." She had become a Christian and was learning to say, "I'm number three."

III. I am Number Three.

- A. I learn when I die and rise as Jesus did. In my baptism my sinful self died and a new person came out of the water (Ro 6:3-4). As I daily renew my baptism the old man is drowned and the new comes forth (Small Catechism IV:4).
- B. I learn when I confess Jesus is my Lord. He "... is my Lord ... that I may be His own and live under Him in His kingdom and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness" (Small Catechism II:2).

Erwin J. Kolb

MAUNDY THURSDAY

I Corinthians 11:23-32

April 3, 1980

Maundy Thursday changes the mood of Holy Week from somberness to celebration, as we change the altar color from violet to white. We celebrate the institution of the Lord's Supper, the Sacrament which is central to the life of the Christian and the Christian church. It is a time of celebration. It is a time to remember, for that is how we celebrate. Jesus said it twice, (vs24, 25) "Do this in remembrance of me."

Introduction: The family of a ten-year-old girl was moving to California from the Midwest. This meant that she would be separated from her playmates, and one who was especially close to her. Before she left she gave her special friend her best bracelet and said, "Keep this to remember me by. Every time you look at it think about me." So the girl in the Midwest looks at the bracelet on her arm and remembers her friend thousands of miles away in California. She remembers her love and friendship and the good times they had together. Jesus said to eat bread and drink wine with which you eat My body and blood, and as you do it to remember Me.

It's Time To Remember

I. Remember the broken body and shed blood.

- A. This is more than a sentimental remembrance of which Jesus spoke. Holy communion is not just a memorial meal. Stanford University in California, renowned for its scholarship and magnificent buildings, was built by parents in memory of a son whom they had lost. Today no one thinks of the son when they hear of Stanford University.
- B. Christ's body was broken and His blood was shed on the cross. No bone

- was broken, as with the pascal lamb, but His body was tortured, beaten, hung limp to die. The blood flowed from His head, His hands, His side.
- C. We receive Christ's true body and blood in the Sacrament (v 27: "... in an unworthy manner . . . guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord"; v 29: "... judgment upon himself"). It is not necessary to understand how this can be in order to receive them. Only believe. At the Marburg Colloquy Zwingli said, "Then you believe that your teeth are chewing and your stomach digesting the body of Christ?" Luther replied, "That is what Paul implies. Would you trample God's Word because you cannot understand it? My faith does not make the sacrament; it merely accepts it."
- D. We receive the forgiveness of sins in the Sacrament (Mt 26:28). That is why He died. As we eat and drink the broken body and shed blood, we receive forgiveness, life, and salvation.
- II. Remember the New Covenant.
- A. The New Covenant is built on God's grace and the sacrifice of Christ. "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (v 25). The Old Covenant was fulfilled. We live under the grace of the New Covenant, receiving continual forgiveness.
- B. We wait for his coming. "Proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (v. 26). People in the Old Testament celebrated the Passover annually to remember their deliverance from bondage in Egypt as they waited for the coming of the Messiah. In the New Covenant we celebrate the Lord's Supper often to remember our deliverance from sin by the Lord's death as we wait for His coming again. As we eat and drink we remember Him and we tell each other that He is coming again — soon.

EJK

GOOD FRIDAY

Isaiah 52:13-53:12

April 4, 1980

Introduction: On Good Friday, April 14, 1865, a long procession of mourners passed the casket of the assassinated Abraham Lincoln. In the vast throng was an elderly Negro woman with her four-year-old grandson. As they came to the casket of the great emancipator, the aged woman stood motionless for a long time, looking down at the lifeless form with hot tears running down her cheeks. Then she lifted the little grandson so that he too could see the body of the dead President. Wiping the tears from her eyes, she said to the little boy, "Honey, take a long look at that man. He died for you." On this Good Friday, in a much truer sense, we want to take a long look at the one who died for us.

The Son Is A Servant

- I. God's Son became a Servant.
- A. God speaks through the prophet Isaiah.
1. To the people of Israel (Israel was suffering oppression from heathen powers, Assyria and Babylon; God gives them hope through a promise of final victory through the words of the prophet Isaiah).
 2. To us today as we read the same words, now in the light of their fulfillment some seven hundred years after they were spoken.
- B. God calls the promised one "My" Servant (52:13; 52:11). Twice He mentions "the will of the Lord" (v 10). Jesus was conscious that He was sent to do the will of the Father. In Gethsemane He said, "Thy will be done."

- C. Jesus is identified as the Son — before Caiaphas (Mt 26:63-64), by Paul (Ga 4:4; Col 1:15-16).
- II. God's Son became the Savior.
- A. He was sacrificed as a lamb.
1. Sin demands a penalty. The Old Testament system of sacrifices was based on the principle, "Without shedding blood, there is no forgiveness."
 2. The sin of mankind demanded the a human lamb without spot or blemish. Jesus became the "Lamb of God" (Jn 1:29).
- B. He willingly offered Himself as our substitute.
1. He offered Himself (53:7: "opened not his mouth . . ."; 53:10: "offering for sin"; Mt 26:62: "Answerest thou nothing?"; 53-54: He could have had twelve legions of angels, but He wanted the Scripture to be fulfilled).
 2. He became our substitute. The biggest words in Scripture are "for our," 53:4-5 ("our griefs, our sorrow, our transgressions").
 3. The Servant-Savior fulfilled the Scripture. Think of the scene of Jesus on the cross on Good Friday and listen to the words of Isaiah's dramatic, descriptive poetry; read 52:14; 53:2-3; 52:4-5. Justin Martyr, who was converted from paganism to become a leader in the early church, said, "To declare a thing should come to pass a long time before it has come into being, and to bring it to pass, this or nothing is the work of God."
- III. We become servants.
- A. God exalted His Servant (52:13; Php 2:9). *Illustration:* The despair of the cross becomes a sign of victory. When one is visiting Lincoln's Memorial in Washington, D.C., a guide may point out that there are two ways of looking at the face of Abraham Lincoln. From one direction he looks cheerful and jovial, but from the other is he downcast and disheartened. We can see the cross from two perspectives.
- B. God makes us sons and servants (53:5, "made whole," "healed").

EJK

THE FESTIVAL OF EASTER

I Corinthians 5:6-8

April 6, 1980

Verse 6: "Your glorying" means the thing you boast about. The Corinthians gloried in things which they ought to have been ashamed of, like not disciplining the incestuous man, going to court against a brother, desecrating the Lord's Supper. "Not good": *Agathos* means noble. Paul uses *litotes*; he means "the thing of which you are boasting is detestable." "A little leaven": A little yeast soon permeates the mass; so sin unchecked permeates an individual's life and the life of the congregation. V.7: "Therefore" is missing in the best manuscripts. "Purge out": The most essential Jewish regulation was the absolute putting away of every trace of leaven at the time of the Passover (Ex 12:18-19). This is a type of sanctification. "Old" means belonging to the unregenerate condition. The Christian is to cast out the old leaven by daily contrition and repentance. "Leaveneth the whole lump": Leaven works secretly and corrupts. "Unleavened" means purged from old sins (2 Pe 1:9). Christians are pure for the sake of Christ's atonement (Jn 15:3). "For even Christ": A paschal victim has been offered for us. Now the angel of death passes over us (Jn 1:29; 19:36; 1 Pe 1:9). V.8: "The feast" refers to the Christian feast of Christ's resurrection. We are to keep it continuously. *Kakia* means wickedness, malice, spite. *Poneeria* means the active exercise of a

vicious propensity. "Sincerity" means free of all admixture, all that corresponds to an unsullied, uncontaminated, and genuine Christian character. Luther: "Let us continually live properly, as at an eternal Easter festival."

Introduction: Easter day long ago was a great day of joy all around: Mary, the Emmaus disciples, the eleven. The text seems to encourage us to celebrate Easter every day.

Let's Celebrate Easter Every Day

I. In faith.

A. Christ is our passover.

1. He was slain as the passover lamb to deliver us from death (Ro 5:19-21).
 2. On the third day He rose again.
 - a. To show the Father's acceptance of His sacrifice (Ro 4:25).
 - b. To declare His victory over our enemies (I Cor 15:55-57).
- ##### B. By faith in Christ we are pure (unleavened).
1. In Christ we have the forgiveness of sins (Eph 1:7; Col 1:14).
 2. In Christ we have eternal life.
 - a. Now in fellowship (Jn 10:15; Jn 8:12; 9:5).
 - b. Eternally (Jn 11:25; Re 7:9ff.).

Let us reflect everyday on what Christ did for us and on who we are by faith, children and heirs (I Jn 3:1-3; Ro 8:17).

II. In godly living.

A. Let us cast out the old leaven.

1. Malice and wickedness too often, like leaven, get into our lives (Ro 7:19ff.).
2. Let us cast out the old leaven.
 - a. Lest it permeate the whole being (cf. David and Bathsheba; Judas).
 - b. By daily contrition and repentance (cf. the prodigal son; David, 2 Sm 12:1ff.).

B. Let us seek to live in sincerity and truth.

1. Bringing forth the fruits of faith (Mt 5:16; Eph 2:10).
2. As children of the new life (Eph 5:8).

Conclusion: Let us celebrate Easter every day, rejoicing in the victory over sin and death which Christ won for us on the cross and guaranteed to us in His resurrection. Let us reflect our joy by drowning the Old Adam and putting on the new man.

HJE

THE FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

I John 5:4-10

April 13, 1980

Verse 4: "Born of God" is equivalent to begotten of God (Jn 6:37, 39; 17:2). "Overcomes": The same verb occurs in both the present indicative and the aorist participle. Christ won the victory over the kingdom of darkness, and we share in that victory. In conversion, we also receive new spiritual powers to fight against and overcome the temptations of the world. V.5: The true faith is to acknowledge that Jesus is the Son of God and that God is gracious to us for Jesus' sake. The heretic Cerinthus said that the divine *logos* that came upon Jesus at His baptism left Him at His passion. V.6: "This is He": The eternal Son of God is identical with the historical person, Jesus. "Came by water and blood" — TCNP: "He it is whose coming was attested by means of water and blood." The foundation of our faith is firm, since it rests on the powerful testimony of

God Himself. "Water and blood" refer to Christ's baptism by which He formally entered upon His work and to His death by which He accomplished our salvation. "The Spirit bears witness": It is the work of the Spirit to testify regarding the truth, to teach the truth. He bears witness to the divinity of Christ (Jn 14:17; 15:26; 16:13). V.8: "There are three that bear witness" — NEB: "These three are in agreement." The Holy Spirit is the chief witness. He works faith. He teaches the value of Christ's baptism and His suffering and death. The three witnesses all point to Christ as Savior. V.9: "The witness of God is greater" — NEB: "Surely divine testimony is stronger." The apostle shows with what confidence we ought to accept the testimony of the Gospel. The Gospel is the testimony of God Himself. "For this is the witness of God," — Weymouth: "For God's witness is what He has testified about His Son." V.10: "The record" is the testimony. The Holy Spirit assures the believer that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Savior. Unbelievers are both foolish and blasphemous. They are without excuse for rejecting the witness of God's Spirit.

Introduction: Is Jesus the Son of God? This is an important question because our salvation rests upon the answer. Many see in Christ only a man, a great moral example, a great teacher. But He is more. We confess: "I believe that Jesus Christ, true God . . . true man . . . is my Lord." The text gives witnesses to this truth, and

All Three Witnesses Agree That Jesus Is The Christ Of God

I. Water

- A. At His baptism Jesus formally entered upon His work as prophet, priest, and king.
- B. At His baptism, the Trinity witnessed to Christ's divinity.
 - 1. The Son was baptized to fulfill all righteousness (Lk 3:22).
 - 2. The Father spoke from heaven: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Mt 3:17).
 - a. The preexistence of the Son (Jn 1:1, 14).
 - b. Sent by the Father to redeem the world (Jn 3:16).
 - 3. The Spirit descended on Him (Jn 1:32-34).
 - a. Also according to His human nature Jesus had the fulness of the gifts of the Spirit (Lk 4:18).
 - b. Empowered by the Spirit He did His work. What a powerful witness to Christ's divinity (v9).

II. Blood

- A. Christ shed His blood.
 - 1. The world needed redemption because of sin and death.
 - 2. Christ died for sin and for sinners.
- B. But Christ also arose from the dead.
 - 1. To prove that He is the Son of God (Ro 1:4; Jn 2:19).
 - 2. To give us the assurance of His victory over sin and death (I Cor 15:55-57).
 - 3. To guarantee heaven to us (2 Tm 1:10).

How sure we ought to be in our faith in Christ as the Son of God and our Savior.

III. The Spirit

- A. He calls.
 - 1. Through the Gospel (Re 22:17).
 - 2. He offers the treasures Christ won.
- B. He enlightens: He brings to saving faith.
 - 1. Some indeed refuse the invitation and make God a liar (v10; Jn 1:11).
 - 2. He brings us to faith in Christ (vs5, 10; 1 Cor 12:3; Ro 8:16).

- C. He sanctifies: He gives new spiritual powers.
 - 1. In the world we still face temptations (1 Pe 5:8).
 - 2. Faith overcomes the world.

Let us use our faith every day. Let us live in it and die in it.

HJE

THE SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

1 Peter 2:21-25

April 20, 1980

Verse 21: "Hereunto" — Goodspeed: "This is the life to which you have been called" (1 Th 3:3). Peter gives the inspiring example of Jesus. Suffering for Christ is a part of the believer's calling (Ac 14:22). The meekness, patience, humility, and endurance of Christ should encourage the Christian to bear the Cross. "For us" — not only in our behalf, but also in our stead. "Example" is, literally, something provided by a writing or drawing master which was to be exactly reproduced by His pupils. "Follow" means to follow His steps one by one (Mk 16:20; 1 Tm 5:10, 24). V.22: "Guile": In both His actions and words Jesus was blameless. "Did no sin": John 6:46. "He threatened not": Instead He prayed: "Father, forgive them." V.23: "Reviled not again": Is 53:7. He did not seek His own revenge. "Committed Himself" — Weymouth: "Left His cause in the hands of the righteous (just) judge." Cf. examples from the passion history. V.24: Here St. Peter shows the meaning of Christ's patient suffering. "Bare our sins": took our sins away by taking them upon Himself and suffering the punishment (Mt 8:17). *Autos* is emphatic — "He Himself." "Being dead to sin" — Weymouth: "That we might break with sins." We died to sin in our baptism (Ro 6:2-11; Ga 2:19-29), and we must die to sin every day. The secret of the Christian's ability to bear the cross lies in this verse. "Heal": Is 53:5. V.25: "Going astray" — NASB: "Continually straying" (Is 53:6). "Returned": This return happened in our conversion.

Introduction: Instinctively we try to avoid suffering. Peter's hearers were suffering persecution because they were Christians. We are subject to this kind of persecution every day.

How To Handle Suffering As A Christian

- I. Recall Christ's suffering for you.
 - A. He bore our sins (v24).
 - 1. We were like sheep going astray (v25; Is 53:6).
 - 2. He bore our guilt and suffered our punishment (2 Cor 5:19-21).
 - B. The benefit is ours.
 - 1. By His stripes we are healed (v24).
 - 2. We are now returned to the Shepherd and Guardian of our souls (v25; Ro 8:17; Ps 100:3).
- It's easier to bear the cross when you remember that He bore it once for you.
- II. Follow His example in suffering (v21).
 - A. How Christ faced suffering.
 - 1. He did no sin (v22).
 - 2. He did not practice deceit to escape suffering (v22: Mk 14:49).
 - 3. He threatened not (Lk 23:34).
 - 4. He committed Himself and His cause to God.
 - B. How we follow His steps. We should be dead to sins, particularly to the sins of deceit and retaliation (1 Pe 3:9).
 - 1. To this life we were called (v21; 1 Pe 3:15).
 - 2. Our righteous deeds may be instrumental in winning others (Mt 5:16).

Let us bear the cross after Jesus until, by God's grace, we receive the crown.

HJE

THE THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

1 Peter 2:11-20

April 27, 1980

Verse 11: "Strangers and pilgrims": Strangers were foreign settlers in a strange land. Pilgrims are visitors in a foreign country. Christians are sojourners on earth. "Abstain": Do not follow the practices of the strange land in which you are sojourners. "Lusts": Ga 5:16-21. Christians are to wage war against the flesh. "Soul" refers to the spiritual nature. V.12: Christians were called atheists and blasphemers of the popular religion, enemies of the state. "As evil doers": Ac 17:6-7; Ac 19:37. "Day of visitation": The day of visitation is any day in which God visits man with the Gospel. "They shall behold": The word implies close scrutiny. Many an unbeliever has been won by the conduct of the Christian. V.13: "Ordinance of man" refers to human institutions. "For the Lord's sake": not from human motives, such as fear of punishment, but because it is God's will that you do. Christians were accused of going contrary to the decrees of Caesar (Ac 17:7). The existence of government as divine order is to be acknowledged. V.14: "Punishment of evildoers": cf. Romans 13:3-4. V.15: "Put to silence the ignorance": Silence the ignorant talk of foolish men who speak against the Christians as evildoers. "Put to silence" means muzzle. V.16: "As free": free in Christ. "A cloak of maliciousness": Christian freedom must show itself, not in license, but in willing obedience to constituted authority. The pretense of Christian liberty must not be made a covering of wickedness. "As the servants of God": His service is perfect freedom. We are to serve our fellow man remembering that we are God's servants. V.17: Peter illustrates the well-doing he enjoins. "The brotherhood": This word is peculiar to St. Peter. "Fear God": Revere Him. This is the motive for honoring a king like Nero. V.18: "Servants" are, literally, household servants. Many of the early Christians were in the condition of servitude. "Fear" is reverence, respect (Eph 6:5). "All fear": not only the fear of punishment but also the fear of neglecting duty. "Forward": unreasonable, overbearing, cruel; literally, crooked or perverse. V.19: "Thankworthy": Literally, this is grace, a mark of His favor in granting the ability; pleasing in His sight. "Grief": literally, griefs (Mt 5:39). "For conscience toward God": literally, for conscience of God. TCNT: "Because conscious of God's presence, of His will." "Glory": report, fame, renown. V.20: "Buffeted": if you receive a blow. Blows were common in the lives of slaves. "Acceptable": wins the approval of God. Christian suffering brings honor to Christianity and is thankworthy in the sight of God.

Introduction: Strangers and pilgrims — that is who we are. Redeemed by Christ and made God's children by faith, we are citizens of heaven. Our task is to live as strangers and pilgrims here on earth.

Live As Strangers and Pilgrims

- I. In your personal life.
 - A. Abstain from fleshly lusts (v11).
 1. Fleshly lusts war against the soul (Ga 5:16-21).
 2. Abstain from them by daily contrition and repentance.
 - B. Live honorably according to God's Law (v12).
 1. Men may indeed speak against you, as they did against the Christians in Peter's day.
 2. But our good works may be instrumental in leading them to God when the Gospel comes to them.
- II. In relationship to government.
 - A. Government is a divine ordinance (v13; Ro 13:1-7).

1. For the punishment of evildoers.
2. For the praise of them that do well.
- B. Christians are to submit to the government's laws (vv13-14).
 1. This rule does not obtain, of course, when a law of the land goes contrary to God's law (Ac 5:29).
 2. But we are not to turn our freedom in Christ into license (v16; Cf Ro 14).
 3. The effect is that with well-doing you may put to silence those who may charge you with being enemies of the state (v15).
 4. The motive for Christian obedience is "the Lord's sake" (v13), acting "as the servants of Christ" (v16).
- III. In relationship to your employer.
 - A. Be subject with all reverence (v18; Fourth Commandment).
 1. It is easy to do when masters are good and gentle.
 2. But it is not so easy when they are overbearing and cruel.
 - B. But Christians are to be obedient even to inconsiderate masters.
 1. There is no glory in being punished for your faults (v20).
 2. But it is praiseworthy if a person suffers even when he does well (vv19-20).

HJE

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

James 1:16-21

May 4, 1980

Verse 16: "Do not err": Be not deceived, make no mistake about it. To say that God can in anyway be responsible for sin is a blasphemous thought which Christians should never entertain (cf. context), because good gifts come from God. V.17: "Father of lights": Father of the heavenly lights. "Variableness": no variation, never subject to change. The sun rises and sets, but God does not change. "Shadow of turning": shadow cast by turning. God does not change, as we see changes in the heavenly bodies, sometimes light, sometimes part shadow (1 Jn 1:15). God's merciful countenance is hidden from His children. V.18: "Of His own will, etc.": Our conversion is an act of grace. He begat us with the Word of truth, the Gospel (1 Pe 1:23). "Begot": literally, brought forth. "Kind of first fruits": First fruits of the Judean harvest were consecrated to the Lord; so we Christians are set apart from the sinful world to be creatures of God (Eph 2:10; 2 Th 2:13). V.19: "Swift to hear": quick to listen. If anger wells up, the Christian should control himself. V.20: "Worketh not the righteousness of God": the righteousness which God demands and requires. Beck: "An angry man doesn't do what is right before God." Outbursts of wrath do not meet the approval of God, but His condemnation. V.21: "Filthiness": all that is vile, sordid, sensual sins. "Superfluity of naughtiness": excess of malice. *Kakia*: not vice in general, but the vicious nature which is bent on doing harm to others. "Meekness": gentleness (Mt 13:3ff). "Engrafted Word": the Word implanted in your hearts. Christians should daily use the Word and accept its message of salvation and sanctification. The seed implanted in their hearts is supposed to grow into a strong, healthy plant.

Introduction: In Old Testament times, harvest time was always a joyous time. People thanked God by offering to His praise the first-fruits of the harvest.

You Are God's First-Fruits

- I. You are first-fruits by His grace.
 - A. God blesses us with daily bread.
 1. Lavishly.

2. Constantly (v17).
- B. He has blessed us with spiritual life.
 1. He has begotten us.
 - a. By nature we were enemies (Eph 2:1-10).
 - b. He regenerated us (Eph 2:8-9).
 2. He has regenerated us through the Word.
 - a. Baptism is the visible Word (Tt 3:5; Jn 3:5).
 - b. The written and spoken Word are the power of God (Ro 1:16).
 3. Now we are children of God and heirs of heaven, first-fruits of His grace.
- II. Live as first-fruits of God's grace.
 - A. We have been regenerated to live lives which glorify God (Eph 2:10; Ro 12:1).
 - B. We are to lay aside sin.
 1. Filthiness in deed, word, or act (Jas 1:14).
 2. Malice.
 - a. A malicious person is generally "slow to hear, swift to speak, and swift to wrath" (v19).
 - b. Wrath does not work the righteousness that God demands.
 - C. Power comes from the Word (v21).
 1. Christians have the Word in their hearts by faith (v21).
 2. The Word is able to save our souls (v21).
 - a. It strengthens faith (Jn 8:31-32).
 - b. It strengthens us for godly living.
 3. Therefore we are to desire the Word to grow (1 Pe 2:2).

Conclusion: Let your life be filled with the praise of the Giver, God, for you are the first-fruits of His grace.

HJE

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

James 1:22-27

May 11, 1980

Verse 22: Christians are not merely to hear the Word, but are to act on it (Ro 2:13). James combats mere head-Christianity. Faith should be active in love (Ro 10:17). Hearing only can be a dead custom, a habit without life. Unless sanctification follows justification, people are deceiving themselves. V.23: "Beholding his natural face": literally, the face of his birth. Here is a man who looks at his own face in a mirror. V.24: A man who just glances in a mirror and forgets is like the man whose hearing of the Word has no relationship to his life (Lk 8:15). V.25: With forgetful, vain hearers, the Apostle contrasts true believers. "Perfect law of liberty": the faultless law that makes men free; the perfect law of liberty, that is, the Gospel, which teaches us that true liberty is in Christ, prompts to a life of sanctification. "Doer of the word": He obeys and acts upon the directives of the Word. "Blessed": God gives rewards of grace to encourage us. Part of the reward is realizing the power the Word of God has in one's life. V.26: "Seems to be": thinks that he is. "Religious": engaged in going through the rituals of religion. "Deceives his own heart": He is just fooling himself. If a person boasts of being religious but does not control his tongue, his religion is vain (Mt 7:21). V.27: James describes what pure, real, unsoiled, selfless religion is all about. "Before God": in God's eyes; literally, our God and Father. "Undeified": spotless. Faith is to manifest itself in two ways: (1) in taking care of those who have no protection, the fatherless and widows; (2) in keeping one's self unspotted from the world. Piety is to be directed toward others and toward ourselves (Mic 6:7-8).

Introduction: We are encouraged: "Examine yourselves whether you be in the faith; prove your own selves" (2 Cor 13:5).

How Genuine Is Your Christianity?

- I. Hearing the Word but not doing is not good enough.
 - A. The hypocritical hearer hears.
 - B. But he does not do, like the man who looks in the mirror and forgets.
 1. He does not accept the Word in faith (Mt 23:37).
 2. He brings no fruits of faith. Example: the man who does not bridle his tongue (v26; Mt 7:21; Mt 13:3ff).
 - C. He deceives himself (v26).
 1. He imagines that he is pious, like the Pharisees (cf. Mt 23).
 2. But he excludes himself from the kingdom (Mt 7:21-23; Mt 25:41; 1 Jn 3:17).
- II. A genuine Christian hears and does.
 - A. He looks into the perfect Law of liberty (the Gospel) and continues in it.
 1. He accepts in faith the freedom from sin and death which the Gospel talks about (Ga 5:1; Is 61:1).
 2. He continues in the Word (Jn 8:31-32; Ps 1).
 - B. He manifests his faith in his life. Luther: God's free man is also a servant and subject to all men.
 1. He visits the fatherless and widows (Mt 25:34-40; Mic 6:8; 1 Jn 3:18).
 2. He keeps himself unspotted from the world (1 Jn 2:15-17).

HJE

THE ASCENSION OF OUR LORD

Acts 1:1-11

May 15, 1980

"To do and teach" (v 1): The present infinitives suggest linear action, still going on. The *te-kai* binds together the life and teachings of Jesus, emphasizing that Jesus is still carrying on from heaven the work of his disciples which he started on earth before His ascension. "Presented Himself alive" (v 3) at intervals during the forty days: His appearances were proofs (*tekmeriois*), sure signs of his resurrection. "Baptized with the Holy Spirit" (v 5) is a reference to Pentecost. "Asked" (v 6): an imperfect — repeatedly asked. After Christ's resurrection the disciples' expectation of a political kingdom revived with new force. How they needed the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit! Not the power they were concerned about (political), but spiritual power for spreading the Gospel (v 8) would come upon them from the Holy Spirit (referring back to v 5), who would enable them to be His witnesses throughout the known world. He was taken up as they were looking directly at him (v 10), were looking steadfastly (imperfect). The two men were really angels, their white robes signifying perfect holiness and heavenly glory. Christ will come in the clouds (Re 1:7, Mt 26:64, Lk 21:27). "In the same way": literally, "so in like manner" (v 11). The fact of His second coming and the manner of it are described by this emphatic repetition.

The central thought of the text is that Christ's ascension moves us to believe in him and to witness to him. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers would see more clearly how Christ's ascension relates to their Christian faith and life. The problem is that we often see no connection between Christ's ascension and our faith and life. The means to the goal is that the ascended Christ sends us His Spirit to strengthen our faith and empower our witness.

Introduction: When a fire has trapped people in a burning house, or someone is seriously injured, drowning, or choking, apathy can result in fatality. When a

contract has to be signed, an examination taken, a paper written, a house built, apathy is out and concerned action is in. Then it is appropriate to say to ourselves or to others, "Don't just stand there; do something!" In a way, that is what the angels were saying to the disciples as they stood gazing into heaven. "Why do you stand looking into heaven?" as if to say, "Don't just think about his leaving you, but about what you must do. His ascension lays an obligation on you." It lays an obligation on us too, for we are His disciples. The two angels are saying to us:

Don't Just Stand There: Do Something!

I. Look for Jesus to come from heaven.

- A. Doing something is not restricted to activity with the hands and feet. We are doing something when we look in faith to Jesus Christ as the Lord who will come again visibly from heaven (v 11b).
 1. We believe He will come again because He is powerful and glorious enough to do so (Php 2:9). God exalted Jesus, for He finished the work of redeeming us.
 2. We believe Jesus will come again because God has given Him the task of final judgment (Jn 5:22).
 3. We believe that no matter what happens in this world, Christ is the Lord to whom everyone will give account.
- B. We look in faith to Christ to bring His kingdom in triumph.
 1. It is not an earthly political kingdom, as the disciples thought (v 6).
 2. It is "the kingdom of God" (v 3c) in glory — the fullness of our salvation.
 3. We leave the exact time of the kingdom's coming to the Father (v 7) and look expectantly for everlasting life.

Transition: Faith-doing results in life-doing.

II. Witness to Jesus everywhere on earth.

- A. We are doing something when we witness to Jesus with our hands and feet and mouth.
 1. We speak about Christ's death and resurrection (v 3) and what Christ means to us.
 2. With our words and actions we express our care and concern for people around us.
 3. We support our church's mission program so that Jesus may be known to "the end of the earth" (v 8).
- B. Our witnessing is empowered by the Holy Spirit.
 1. "Before many days" (on Pentecost, ten days after Christ's ascension) the disciples were baptized with the Holy Spirit, and were thereby enlightened and emboldened to proclaim the Gospel (v 5).
 2. The Holy Spirit comes to us in Word and Sacrament, and we receive power (v 8) to be witnesses of Jesus Christ. Christ's ascension guaranteed the Spirit to the disciples and to us for witnessing.

Conclusion: He is gone, in one sense, but let us not stand looking into heaven. Christ will come again. He is with us now through his Spirit to strengthen our faith and embolden our witness. There is no need just to stand there. Away with apathy! Let us believe more firmly and witness more zealously until He comes again.

THE SUNDAY AFTER THE ASCENSION

1 Peter 4:7-11

May 18, 1980

The "charity" spoken of in v8 is none other than "agape" love. We may not have the same need for physical hospitality as some did in the early church, but we do have need for emotional support. In our society many children are virtually abandoned, husbands and wives barely talk to each other, workers are impersonalized and computerized. The liturgical context of this day's service is important — a "hiatus" between Christ's Ascension and Pentecost. Similarly, Christians are in a waiting period between their Lord's first and second coming. That waiting should not be mere thumb-twiddling.

Introduction: We who know God's forgiving and powerful love in Christ are called the "church." As we worship and work together, we constitute a Christian community. Our test shows us how we can be

A Caring Christian Community

- I. A caring Christian community is strengthened by its Lord.
 - A. He leads us to anticipate our final salvation with Him in heaven (v7).
 - B. He strengthens us through our worship.
 1. In worship, we meet our Lord.
 - a. We bring to Him our sins, doubts, anxieties.
 - b. We receive from Him His love, pardon, presence, power.
 2. Our Christian community, the church, rightly emphasizes a Word-and-Sacrament ministry so that we can glorify God (v11) by caring about one another.
- II. A caring Christian community is dominated by love.
 - A. Love shows itself in unselfish concern for the needs of others, perhaps at great cost to us.
 1. Loving those closest to us, other members of the Christian community (1 Cor 12:12).
 2. Loving continuously, even though this goes against the world's way (Jn 13:35; 1 Th 3:12).
 - B. Love covers sin.
 1. By refusing to major in the minor faults of others.
 2. By forgiving as we have been forgiven (Mt 18:22).
- III. A caring Christian community is earmarked by service.
 - A. The ability to serve is God-given.
 1. He gives that ability to every Christian.
 2. Christian service is directed to others, especially other Christians (v10).
 - B. There are many kinds and opportunities for service.
 1. In our daily speech we can share His love with others.
 2. In our daily activities we can reach out as caring Christians.
 - a. Showing Christian hospitality.
 - b. Helping to integrate new members into the congregation.
 - c. Listening to someone else's (maybe your children's) problems and joys.

Conclusion: God does not expect us Christians to solve magically the world's problems. Yet He will help us to make life more pleasant for others and for ourselves through our service in a caring Christian community.

Lloyd Strelow
Covina, California

PENTECOST SUNDAY**Acts 2:1-13****May 25, 1980**

Like other well-known texts for feast days, this one runs the risk of shallow treatment by the preacher or hearer who feel they have heard it all before. Peter's Pentecostal sermon is not part of the text, but follows, and should be used as proof of the Spirit's message. The goal of the sermon is that the hearers, enriched by faith, would use the Spirit's power to witness boldly to God's love in Christ. The problem in that, while admiring the Spirit's Pentecostal out-pouring, we either ignore His power today or expect it apart from the Word.

Introduction: We fear the power of the atom, the tornado, and the crooked politician. Yet not all power is destructive. The power in the ballot box, in the batter's box, or in the safe-deposit box may be good. To be of service it must be released. The Feast of Pentecost spotlights for us the good power of the Holy Spirit. Many Christians have not yet understood how much they need His power in their lives.

Who Needs Spirit-Power?

- I. The Holy Spirit gives power to witness.
 - A. This power was promised by Jesus (Ac 1:8).
 - B. It was demonstrated by signs: the sound of wind, the tongues of fire.
 - C. It was evident as the apostles boldly spoke (Ac 2:14). (Compare their behavior on Pentecost to their previous behavior. Jn 20:19.)
 - D. Christian witnessing today needs the power of the Holy Spirit.
 1. Our congregational and personal evangelism will be impotent without the Spirit.
 2. In the Spirit's power we can share Christ with unbelieving relatives or neighbors.
- II. The Holy Spirit gives power through the Word.
 - A. The disciples *spoke* in different languages as directed by the Holy Spirit (Ac 2:4).
 - B. They spoke the Word clearly.
 1. You caused Christ to be crucified (Ac 2:23, 36).
 2. God raised Jesus to life! (Ac 2:32). Speak God's wonderful things (Ac 2:11).
 3. As witnesses, we are called to speak clearly the word concerning Christ.
 - C. The Spirit still works by means of the Word.
 1. Beware of those who claim direct visions from God.
 2. To see the Spirit's power at work, use His Good News to answer your neighbor's spiritual hunger. Nice pastors, beautiful choirs, or picturesque churches can never do it.
- III. The Holy Spirit gives power for faith.
 - A. The Holy Spirit changes people.
 1. Some will continue blocking the Spirit's efforts to change them (sneering and stubborn unbelief, Ac 2:13; Mt 12:31).
 2. Yet changed hearts and lives are always the goal of the Holy Spirit.
 - B. Changed lives give evidence of the Spirit's power.
 1. On Pentecost, three thousand people were led by the Spirit to repentance and faith.
 2. Since Pentecost the Holy Spirit has continued to change one person after another from sinner to saint.

3. The Spirit's power is available to you in the Word and the Sacraments.

a. To strengthen your personal faith in Christ.

b. To help you witness to Christ.

Conclusion: Who needs Spirit-power? We might just as well ask: Who needs water? Every person, you and I, need Spirit-power. Without it no one can become or remain a Christian.

LS

Book Reviews

I. Biblical Studies

TOWARD AN OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. By Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 303 pages. Cloth. \$10.95.

Normally Old Testament scholars attempt to set forth their views as to what should constitute Old Testament Theology toward the close of their academic careers, because of the magnitude and scope of this discipline. This would have meant that Walter C. Kaiser, Professor of Semitic languages and Chairman of the Division of Old Testament at Trinity Evangelical School, Deerfield, Illinois, should have waited for many years to come. The reason he did not follow this rule is stated by him in the preface as follows: "However, the more I read the theologies of our day, the more restless I became. I felt some important options were being neglected in the contemporary dialogue. This was especially true in the unsettled area of methodology and definition" (p. viii).

That Old Testament Theology in a bad way has been recognized by a number of Old Testament specialists. Gerhard Hasel had made that clear in his *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in Current Debate*. Rev. ed., Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1975. Kaiser endeavors to resolve the major crisis in Biblical theology, which has refused to recognize the authority of the canonical Scriptures. Kaiser's book probably constitutes the most thorough attempt by conservative Biblical scholarship to confront the erroneous views propagated by historical-critical scholarship.

Kaiser devotes nearly one fourth of his book to the question of methodology used in Biblical theology. He offers what he believes is a valid solution for the definition and methodology of Old Testament theology. Thus he contends that a proper understanding of Biblical theology "shows us the inner center or plan to which each biblical writer consciously and deliberately contributed; however, this inner biblical unity, which biblical theologians have been loathe to adopt for fear of gratuitously imposing a grid of their own devising over the text, is a center that is inductively supplied and confirmed by the text of Scripture itself."

The promise of God made to Abraham, which he looks upon mainly as promise, is the center of Old Testament theology for Kaiser. In following this organizing concept through the Old Testament he rejects the barren-history of Hebrew religion school on the one hand and the use of a doctrinal plan of organization, normally followed in systematic theology on the other hand. Kaiser follows von Rad's diachronic approach rather than Eichrodt's typical approach who organized his three-volume Old Testament Theology around the covenant concept. In showing how the Messianic promises given to Abraham are carried out, Kaiser operated with the following historical periods: Prepatriarchal, the patriarchal, the Mosaic, the premonarchial, the Davidic, the sapiential eras, the ninth century, the eighth century, the seventh century, exilic times and post exilic times. A special section examines the connections between the Old and New Testament theology. *Toward an Old Testament Theology* includes an annotated bibliography and topical, Scripture, and names indices.

The author holds to Biblical inerrancy and on isagogical questions is very conservative. Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs are considered written by Solomon, Daniel by the prophet of that name in the sixth century B.C., and Joel and Obadiah placed in the ninth century B.C. However, his hermeneutics leave

something to be desired. Kaiser rejects the historical Protestant principal of the "Analogy of Faith." He does not allow the New Testament to give the definitively defined interpretation of certain Old Testament passages. Consequently, his chapter which treats of the relationship of the Old Testament to the New is unsatisfactory for those who accept the New Testament interpretations of Old Testament passages. He does not permit the Biblical writers to "speak better than they knew." The famous Is. 7:14 first is applied to Hezekiah and then to Christ (cf. p. 210). Thus he explains the Isaiah prophecy by the multiple fulfillment theory of prophecy. The author is also a millennialist asserting that Christ will rule as king ultimately upon earth.

Although, unlike J. Barton Payne, he does not make the covenant the organizing principle, he does not find it possible to escape this concept saying: "The content of God's numerous covenants" (p. 34) or: "Again, all this divine activity could be summed under one concept: it was a remembering of His covenants."

The book is a worthwhile contribution to a sound Biblical theology of the Old Testament and will be appreciated by conservative readers.

Raymond F. Surburg

DANIEL. By Joyce G. Baldwin. Inter-Varsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1978. 210 pages. Cloth. \$7.95.

This is the twelfth commentary of the *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries*, D. J. Wiseman, general editor. Joyce C. Baldwin, author of *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* and the *Tyndale Commentaries*, is dean of women, Trinity College, Bristol. Thus far she represents the only woman to be chosen to write commentaries for the Tyndale series of commentaries.

Like previous volumes, the aim of the Daniel volume has been to provide a handy up-to-date commentary with emphasis on exegesis. While undue technicalities are avoided, major critical questions are discussed in the Introduction, and where necessary, in additional notes.

Of the 210 pages constituting this work, 75 are devoted to a survey of the scholarly literature, to a discussion of historical, literary and linguistic background as well as to a consideration to the troublesome questions dealing with date of the writing of Daniel and its authorship.

Those who have worked with Daniel know that it is one of the most difficult books of the Old Testament to interpret. A number of its key passages have received diverse interpretations by able and skilled exegetes. Despite the difficulties it presents, Daniel is a Biblical book that contains an important philosophy of history.

Joyce Baldwin believes the Christian in the world needs the message of Daniel. Thus she wrote:

The whole church needs . . . reassurance . . . not least in view of Marxist claims to hold the key to history and to be able by human strategy to introduce a utopian world government.

Again she opined:

Secularism denies the supernatural. All the more reason, then, why the church needs to be counting on the certainties proclaimed by Daniel, namely that God is constantly overruling and judging in the affairs of men, putting down the mighty from their seats, overthrowing unjust regimes and effectively bringing in His kingdom, which is to embrace all nations" (p. 17).

While commentaries like Young, Leupold, L. Fuerbringer and others have

found the Messiah foretold in chapter 2:44-46, 7:13, 14 and 9:25-27, Baldwin has interpreted these significant passages in a different manner, a fact that will disturb many readers of this scholarly and informative exposition of one of the Old Testament books used by the apostle John when under the Spirit's guidance he wrote the book of Revelation. Daniel is an Old Testament book that Lutherans should especially study because of its abuse by dispensationalists and millennialists and so-called prophetic writers and electronic evangelists.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE NEW HERMENEUTIC. By Cornelius Van Til. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1974. Distributed also by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 230 pages. \$5.95. Cloth.

This is a valuable contribution to the discussion in the current field of Biblical hermeneutics. The author of this incisive volume is Professor Emeritus of Westminster Theological Seminary, where for many years he was one of its leading lights. Lutheran opponents of the new hermeneutic, which has been responsible for the emasculation of Biblical and doctrinal theologies, will find this volume instructive, because here we have the evaluation of a man in the Reformed tradition who shows that it is utterly impossible for any theologian who wants to be faithful to a reliable Scripture to espouse the so-called "new hermeneutic."

Germany, which has spawned the various forms of the historical-critical method, that have bedeviled Christianity, also takes credit for the architects of the new hermeneutic. Therefore, in chapter I Van Til presents the views of its main proponents, namely, Ernst Fuchs, Bultmann, Heidegger and Gerhard Ebeling together with an excellent analysis of their hermeneutical theories.

Van Til claims that "the New Hermeneutic of such men as Ernst Fuchs and Gerhard Ebeling has had an effect on modern theology similar in recent decades to what Barth did in the early twenties. The propounders of the "new hermeneutic seek to be both modern and more Reformational than Barth was in his day. Theologians of the various schools are taking their positions in relation to this New Hermeneutic as their forbearers did in relation to Barth" (Preface).

In Chapter II Van Til has given the reaction of a number of modern theologians. The theologians specifically discussed are John Dillenberger, Fritz Buri and Schubert M. Ogden. The new hermeneutic reinterprets basic doctrines so that they are supposed to appeal to modern man but in so doing empty the Biblical doctrines of their true meaning. They demythologize the Christ of the Chalcedonian Creed.

In chapter III, the longest in the book, pages 53-206, Van Til discusses reactions of some orthodox theologians to this new method of Biblical interpretation. Three Reformed theologians are selected for their reactions to the New Hermeneutic. The first is A.D.R. Polman of Kampen who is especially helpful, because, as the author points out, Polman sets the new hermeneutic in the context of its historical origins. Then the reaction of Fr. Kuitert of the Free University of Amsterdam is given and he attempts to reconstruct Reformed theology so that it will be able to meet the New Hermeneutic on its own ground and yet at the same time not surrender the basic doctrines of the historic Christian faith. The third theologian presented by Van Til is Dr. S. U. Zildema, also of the Free University of Amsterdam. The latter evaluates Fuchs, Bultmann and Ebeling within the perimeters of a strictly Biblical and historically oriented Reformed faith.

Van Til has shown that the new hermeneutic of modern theologians has as its background the older modernism of such men as Schleiermacher, Ritschl,

Hermann, Harnack and the new modernism of such men as Barth and Bultmann.

The last chapter of the book deals with the New Hermeneutic of Holland. The men whose views are analyzed and evaluated are: Herman Wiersing, G. P. Hartvelt, Z. Z. Koole, F. J. Baarda and C. Augustijn. The background of these scholars is the theology of Calvin, of Kuyper, of Bavinck, of the Reformed Confessions, such as the Heidelberg Catechism, the Netherlands Confession and the Five Articles of Dordt. Van Til laments that the fact that these Dutch scholars, like Kuitert, are unable to recognize the truth that the New Hermeneutic in no way can be accommodated to historic Calvinistic theology.

Van Til expresses his disappointment with the scholars of Holland who have written on the New Hermeneutic. Since Van Til claims these Dutch theologians had at their disposal the Reformed theology of such men as Kuyper, Bavinck, the exegetical and hermeneutical works of such scholars as Grosheide and Geydanus they had the wherewithal to set a truly Christ-and-Scripture-centered hermeneutic over against the man-centered hermeneutic of such men as Fuchs and Ebeling. "Instead of doing this they have developed a hermeneutic that is both God-centered *and* man-centered. The new hermeneutic of Holland comprises a synthesis of Christ and of Kant in the way that the hermeneutic of Roman Catholicism comprises a synthesis of Christ and Aristotle" (p. 214).

The new hermeneutic, advocated and developed by European and American Lutherans, is completely antithetical to a sound Biblical hermeneutics and its propagation can only result in emasculation of the Christian faith.

Raymond F. Surburg

CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By James A. Borland. Moody Press, Chicago, 1978. 195 pages. Paper. \$4.95.

This book is an important contribution to the area of Old Testament Christology. The associate professor of religion at Liberty Baptist College in Lynchburg, Virginia has furnished those who follow the historical-grammatical-theological method with a comprehensive study of Old Testament appearances of Christ in Human Form. Questions answered by Borland are: Did Christ appear to men in the Old Testament prior to His incarnation? If so, why and in what form did it take place?

The author shows that the Old Testament contains numerous statements to the effect that God appeared bodily and talked personally with Old Testament saints. In a scholarly and thorough fashion Borland studies the Person who appeared in the Old Testament as well as the purposes of such appearances.

Borland defends and proves that there were "Christophanies" in the Old Testament. By Christophany he means "those unsought, intermittent, and temporary, visible and audible manifestation of God the Son in human form, by which God communicated something to certain conscious human beings on earth prior to the birth of Jesus Christ (p. 31)." Special attention is devoted to the "Angel of Yahweh," whom the author identifies with temporary pre-Bethlehem appearances of Jesus, who in the incarnation assumed human form permanently. In this volume the reader will be shown the importance of the Christophanies of the Old Testament for the topics of bibliology, revelation and Christology. It is especially in the early books of the Old Testament that the Christophanies play an important role as a prevalent form of revelation.

This book is the most important study on the subject of Christophanies since the appearance of Hengstenberg's *Christology of the Old Testament*, 1829-35, who was more interested in Old Testament Messianic Prophecy and only

devoted a brief chapter to the Angel of the Lord. Thus Borland's work makes an important contribution to a neglected subject on the part of those scholars who believe Christ is the heart of the Old Testament revelation.

Raymond F. Surburg

EVOLUTION? By Theodor Reuter. Selbstverlag, 7537 Eemchingen-Wi. Germany, 1975. 96 Seiten. Broschiert. DM 4, 85.

This German booklet is an attempt to counteract the teachings of evolution as taught in Germany. Dr. A. V. Guttenburg, one time professor of biology of the University of Graetz, wrote the foreword for this book dealing with a theory that has exercised such a great influence on scholarly circles and on the general public. On the basis of extensive study for many years, pastor and theologian Reuter has set forth in 24 chapters, some just a few pages in length, the claims and the weaknesses of the evolutionary theory.

Reuter's bibliography refers to both German and English books, most of the latter were written by American scientists and theologians. In setting forth the theory, its false assumptions and conclusions the author refers to the writings of about 250 scientists, theologians from fourteen different countries and representing more than thirty scientific disciplines.

Those who are well acquainted with the anti-evolution literature will not find any new arguments against the untenability and baneful influences of this theory which when correctly understood robs God of His glory and presents a degrading concept of man. This reviewer wishes that the author had been better acquainted with the American and British anti-evolution literature, because some significant contributions could have been mentioned and used, for example, such as Klotz, *Genes, Genesis and Evolution*. (2nd edition, 1970).

However, may this book open the eyes of many in Germany to the weaknesses and the dangerous implications of evolution, whether in its atheistic or theistic forms.

Raymoud F. Surburg

ESSAYS IN JEWISH THOUGHT. By Nahum N. Glatzer. University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1978. 295 pages. Cloth. \$19.95.

This is volume VIII of the Judaic Series, published by the University of Alabama Press, Leon J. Weinberger, general editor. This book is comprised of twenty-two essays by Dr. N. N. Glatzer, now Professor Emeritus of Jewish History at Brandeis University (Chairman of the Department of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies, 1957-1969) and Professor of Religion at Boston University. The author was encouraged to publish these scholarly contributions to Jewish thought by some of his former students, most of whom now occupy professorships in Judaic studies throughout the United States.

Professor Glatzer offers an interesting variety of topics. Among subjects covered are some aspects of rabbinic literature (notably the changing attitude toward Rome, the problem of biblical prophecy, the concept of peace, the concept of sacrifice, the personality of Hillel; and attempt to understand the Book of Job and its place in midrashic interpretation; the Zion motif in medieval literature; the life and thought of Leopold Zunz and the beginning of modern Jewish studies; the Judaic strain in Franz Kafka's reflection on the human condition; some of the concerns of Martin Buber and Frand Rosenzweig; an account of the Frankfurt Lehrhaus. Although Glatzer has authored German articles they were not included, but one in modern Hebrew was, one which dealt with the last year of Rosenzweig's life.

The first nine essays would be of value to those interested in how Judaism understood and interpreted certain Biblical topics or in information concerning individuals whose names have become famous in philosophical circles, such as Franz Rosenzweig and Martin Buber. Three of the studies deal with the interpretation of Job. Those interested in the history of Biblical interpretation will find some of the essays useful in seeing how non-Christian scholars deal with Biblical themes and will notice significant differences in the apprehension of Biblical truth.

Raymond F. Surburg

EVANGELICALS AND JEWS IN CONVERSATION. On Scripture, Theology, and History. Edited by Marc H. Tannebaum, Marvin R. Wilson and A. James Rudin. Baker Book House, 1978. 326 pages. Cloth. \$7.95.

This volume contains eighteen essays by nine Jewish scholars and nine "evangelical" scholars, the latter a group who disclaim any sympathy with "the fundamentalists." The views enunciated in this volume were first shared on December 8-10, 1975, in New York City at a national conference of evangelical and Jewish scholars and religious leaders. The gathering was co-sponsored by the Interreligious Leaders Affairs Department of the American Jewish Committee and the Institute for Holy Land Studies (an evangelical school of higher education based in Jerusalem).

The book is divided into seven parts. Part 1: Evangelical Christians and Jews share Perspectives. Part 2: The Messiah. Part 3: The Meaning of Israel. Part 4: The Interpretation of Scripture. Part 5: Responses to Moral Crises and Social Ferment. Part 6: Religious Pluralism. Part 7: The Future. For each of these topics there were two essayists, one a Christian and the other a Jew, except for numbers 4 and 5 where there were four essayists, two Christians and two Jews.

The evangelical Christian scholars who participated were: Marvin R. Wilson, William Sanford La Sor, Edwin Yamauchi, Roger Nicole, Paul E. Tombs, Vernon C. Grounds, G. Douglas Young, Leighton Ford. The representatives of the synagogue were: Michael Wyschogord, Ellis Rivkin, Seymour Asher Finkel, Bernard Martin, Marc H. Tannebaum, Emanuel Rackman, Albert Vorspon and A. James Rudin.

A reading of this symposium will be valuable to see how prominent Jewish and Christian scholars view their basic theological and world views and how they regard each other. The Christian essayists nearly to a man apologized to their Jewish participants for all the wrongs that had been done to the descendants of Abraham in the course of the Christian centuries. The Jewish writers contend that as God's chosen people the land of Palestine was bestowed on Abraham and his descendants in perpetuity. According to chapter 18, "Prospectus for the Future" the group of eighteen adopted a consensus on a number of points. 1. Regarding Israel: "Evangelical Christians and Jews must resist all attempts at the United Nations and elsewhere to judge Israel by unfair and dishonest 'double standard.' The grotesque United Nations resolution of 1975 that linked Zionism with racism is but the latest and worst example of the 'outrageous double standard' at work. Since evangelical Christians and Jews are rooted by faith to both the Hebrew Bible and the land of the Bible, both communities must continue to express positive support for and solidarity with the people and the state of Israel to insure her survival" (p. 311). 2. Regarding anti-Semitism: "The much more systematic and serious work by both evangelical and Jewish scholars is needed to eliminate all forms and anti-Semitism in Christian teaching, preaching and liturgy . . . Intensive work needs to be undertaken by

Christian scholars to eradicate all traces of the infamous and murderous 'Christ killer (deicide)' charge that has historically been used against Jewish people. Evangelical seminaries especially need to interpret the Easter story, the Gospel of John, and the Jewish roots of Christianity in positive and theologically authentic terms to their students" (p. 312). 3. Regarding human rights and social justice: "Both religious groups have an obligation to support the cause of human rights around the world, especially in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe where Jewish and Christian believers are currently being persecuted. Evangelical Christians were urged by Leighton Ford to 'reject the neurotic approach which would select out Jews alone as some uniquely needy objects of proselytism.' Christians need to disassociate themselves from all form of evangelistic methods 'that involve force or manipulation or deception.' The conference all agreed that Jews and Christians could work together on such social issues as: gun control, world hunger, energy, pollution, racism, ethics in government and business, quality education, fair housing, and full employment" (pp. 312-313).

Many of the evangelicals who contributed to this volume believe in a coming millennium, which will become a reality when Christ returns to Jerusalem and establishes his earthly reign, thwarted 1900 years ago by the Jews who refused to accept Him as King. At the second return Paul supposedly teaches "then all Israel will be saved." The amillennialistic school totally rejects the whole concept of a total earthly kingly reign of Christ. Because of their support for Christian Zionism, millennialists are willing to side with the Jewish Zionists, many of whom are secularists, in their defense of the Jewish claims for Palestine over against the Arabs. Anti-Semitism is a two-way street. Arabs are Semites and this opposition to their claims might just as reasonably be termed anti-Semitism on the part of these Christian theologians who do not speak about the rights of one and a half million displaced Arabs, thousands of whom live now under the most deplorable conditions, since they have been expelled by the Jews. Conservative scholars who are not dispensationalists and millennialists seriously question the interpretation of Romans 11:26: "And thus all Israel shall be saved," for the Israel spoken of by Paul is the spiritual Israel which includes all true sons (including Jewish and Christian believers) of Abraham, who are persons who are justified by faith in Christ Jesus. Christ clearly taught that only those who accept Him can truly know the Father. Jesus taught: "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life, no one ever cometh unto the Father but by me" (John 14:6). Apart from Christ there is no salvation for any person, be he a Jew or a Gentile, male or female, young or old. Cf. Acts 4:12, John 6:66.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE ANALYTICAL GREEK LEXICON, 1978 EDITION. By Harold K. Moulton. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1978. 448 pages. Cloth. \$12.95.

This lexicon, now a part of COMPANION TEXTS FOR NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES of some twenty books now available from Zondervan, is a reissue of the lexicon originally published in 1852. Many students of the Greek New Testament in the past found it a valuable tool for unlocking the meaning of the Scriptures of the New Covenant. This Lexicon gives meanings classified according to their derivation, but its distinctive feature is that every word of the Greek New Testament, exactly as it stands is given in alphabetical order, together with a complete grammatical analysis of each entry as well as an indication of its root.

Variant critical readings together with the authorities supporting them are included at their proper places. There is a grammatical introduction and also verb and nouns charts which precede the lexicon proper. Users of the earlier edition found a number of misprints which have been corrected in this new edition.

The revision was supervised by Harold K. Moulton, a one-time missionary in India and translation secretary for the British and Foreign Bible Society. He is the grandson of W. F. Moulton and son of J. H. Moulton, two distinguished Greek scholars. An authority of New Testament Greek, he corrected mistakes, but also took into account recent scholarship. Moulton has also added a supplement, listing words omitted in the original edition.

This Analytical Lexicon is a companion volume to B. Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, originally published by S. Bagster and Sons Limited and in New York: James Pott & Co. The same format also underlies this analytical lexicon for the two languages of the Old Testament. Both lexicons could be of service for students studying the Biblical languages on their own or in the case where they have neglected their Biblical languages for purposes of help and review. Davidson is also available from Zondervan.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE COMMENTARY, Volume XI. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978. xvi and 464 pages. Cloth. \$14.95.

The present volume is the second to appear in print of the twelve planned volumes of this new commentary. In it are contained commentaries on nine Pauline letters, which are now listed, with the name of the commentator in each case being given in brackets: Ephesians (A. Skevington Wood), Philippians (Homer A. Kent, Jr.), Colossians (Curtis Vaughan), 1 and 2 Thessalonians (Robert L. Thomas), 1 and 2 Timothy (Ralph Earle), Titus (D. Edmond Hiebert), Philemon (Arthur A. Rupprecht).

The Preface of the General Editor informs us that the commentary, as its title implies, is "written primarily by expositors for expositors . . . preachers, teachers, and students of the Bible," that "its stance is that of a scholarly evangelicalism committed to the divine inspiration, complete trustworthiness, and full authority of the Bible," and that "its seventy-eight contributors come from the United States, Canada, England, Scotland, Australia, New Zealand, and Switzerland and from various religious groups" (nine are listed).

A study of the various commentaries supports the claims made by the General Editor. It is scholarly and evangelical. The various exegetes take definite positions, or as definite as possible, on the various difficult exegetical problems encountered, but they always mention other views and the reasons for them as well as the reasons for rejecting them. It is a pleasure to read commentaries where the text is the thing and where speculations as to supposed antecedents or sources of this or that phrase or idea are regularly regarded as irrelevant. Homer Kent is quite willing to see Phil. 2:5-11 as being a quoted Christian hymn, but says quite rightly as well that "Paul himself could write highly poetic passages . . . and the content is harmonious with Pauline thought, without any need for resorting to pagan concepts" (p. 99). The writer of the commentary on Colossians takes much the same position in respect of Col. 1:15-20: "My position is that the passage is genuinely Pauline and, whether hymnic or not, presents a true and exalted view of Christ" (p. 184).

As is to be expected in a commentary like this, conservative positions are taken in matters of introduction. Paul is regarded as the writer of all the letters of

this volume, which fixes the time of writing pretty closely, too. All the writers opt for Rome as the place where the Captivity Lettres were written. The case for Ephesus does not get much of a hearing. Philippians is certainly far better understood as coming from Ephesus than from Rome, and Manson's study, in which he denies that it is a letter written in captivity, might have been given attention. The commentators on the Pastoral Epistles are more than a little inclined, as I am, to the view that Paul gave his amanuensis a pretty free hand in composing these letters (p. 343). We can only hope that conservative positions in matters of introduction gradually win back the general acceptance they deserve. External evidence is all the one way.

The Lutheran reader or one with a high view of the Sacraments will probably not have to be specially alerted to passages like Col. 2:12 and Titus 3:5b-6. It is denied that baptism works regeneration in connection with the latter passage (p. 445), and also in connection with the former passage (p. 200). The writer of the material on p. 200 is pretty blunt about his position:

Baptism, then, is not a magic rite, but an act of obedience in which we confess our faith and symbolize the essence of our spiritual experience. Faith is the instrumental cause of that experience and, apart from real faith, baptism in an empty, meaningless ceremony.

A similar view of the Sacraments will probably appear throughout the commentary, and with it an emphasis on faith which can only detract from the all-sufficiency of the atoning work of Christ, as in the following sentence in connection with Titus 2:11: "Salvation is available to all, but its saving effect is dependent on the personal response of faith" (p. 440).

Finally, I raise the question as to the value of transliterations of the underlying Greek text. The principle in the commentary is that transliterations of Greek words are supplied in the text proper, while the actual Greek, with transliterations in brackets, is found in the specialized notes found at the end of each sub-section. Those who know Greek don't need the transliterations, and the value of transliterations to those who don't know seems minimal to me; if not worse, in that it conceals from those who pick up a few Greek words that way that skimpy knowledge is worse than useless. A little learning is a dangerous thing. Be that as it may. One thing is sure: the number of actual errors in the process becomes quite formidable. I counted something like fifty, and that is without the endeavour to subject the whole to a microscopic examination from just this point of view. By far the greater number of errors result from two causes: failure to transliterate the Greek ypsilon accurately, for "u" frequently appears for "y" and the failure to supply certain vowels in the transliteration with the short line to indicate a long vowel. Apart from these two errors the following mistakes may be pointed out: *doksa* appears occasionally for *doxa* in spite of the table of Greek transliterations on p. xvi; *hēlikia* is the noun, not *hēlikios* (Eph. 4:13, p. 59); "belt" is *zōnē*, not *zōna* (p. 87); *en panti kairōn* appears for *en panti kairō* (p. 89); on p. 112, *en kyriō* appears without the subscript; *ti* is given a grave accent wrongly in the combination *ti gar* on p. 113; and on p. 298 *anagnōsthēnai* appears as *anagnōsthmnai*.

I hope *this* aspect of the volume reviewed, an unfortunate one, does not give the reader the impression that the work generally has been carelessly done. This is not the case. I have seen enough mistakes resulting from the transliteration process in the theological journal I edit (our publisher has no Greek characters), to know only too well how easily just the errors referred to can creep into the text. Any reader who is looking for the sort of commentary this one sets out to be will not be disappointed in it.

Henry P. Hamann

EXPOSITORY COMMENTARY ON HEBREWS. By J. C. Macaulay. Moody Press, Chicago, copyright 1948; reprint 1978. 270 pages. \$6.95.

The author of this devotional study of Hebrews is the dean of the New York School of the Bible. It is not a commentary but many items in the book will be of interest to the exegete. The author states in the Preface: "The purpose throughout is devotional and practical . . . these studies have been given as Sunday morning messages at a congregation able to digest strong meat as well as milk." The Table of Contents lists forty topics, covering the entire Epistle, and the forty devotions average six to seven pages. The jacket rightly says: "Macaulay's extensive knowledge of the Scriptures and ready ability to communicate clearly the truths found there make this volume an outstanding meditation on Hewbrews." The pastor can use this volume for preaching or teaching a Bible class. And the layman can use it with profit. However, Macaulay is obviously Calvinistic. This will be documented later in this review.

Macaulay's attitude toward the Scriptures is a healthy one: "Many who are fully convinced of the divine revelation in Christ are not so sure that what we have in the Old Testament is unmixed revelation, and they regard the inspiration of our Old Testament as of an entirely different and decidedly lower sort than that of the New Testament. That is not the view of the Scriptures themselves" (p. 14). There are many beautiful, evangelical passages in the book. For example: "Only the once for all sacrifice of the Holy Lamb could serve to erase our sins from the memory of God, and only when we know that this is done can our smitten conscience be at rest" (p. 127). And this: "Let us indeed pray one for another, but let our confidence rest in this glorious fact, that He who, in the sacrifice of Himself, put away our sins, now appears in the presence of God for us, securing the benefits of His redemptive sacrifice to all who believe, and assuring the abundance of grace to bring us to glory. He appears for us!" (p. 141). There are many applicable illustrations. For example, this on page 175: "You know how the little Sunday School girl told the story: that God and Enoch went for a walk every day, and one day they walked so far from Enoch's house that it got dark before they knew it, and God said to Enoch, Don't bother going home tonight; it's nearer to My house, so just come home with Me. I reckon that is pretty close to the truth."

Apart from Macaulay's Calvinism we have several things which need criticism. Implicit in his exposition of chapter 2, the Messianic character of Psalm 8 is denied. That is nothing new. Even Lenski has done that. The Missouri Synod, following the teaching of Luther and Stoeckhardt, insists that Psalm 8 is Messianic. On page 91 we are told that Melchizedek in Genesis 14 is a theophany. "... here, as upon other occasions, there was granted to a man the appearing and ministry of none other than the Son of God, the One who is King of righteousness, and therefore King of peace." This surely violates Psalm 110:4, where Melchizedek is mentioned again. We are told, in prophecy, that Jesus, the Highpriest, is LIKE Melchizedek. He is not identified with him.

As mentioned above, Macaulay is Calvinistic. In his exposition of Hebrews 6:4-9, he states: "The sovereignty of God and the freedom of the human will are so contrary that extreme positions have been taken on one side and the other." Concerning Christ, we read on page 88: "Not into an earthly sanctuary, but into heaven itself He went; not with the blood of bulls and goats, but with His own blood." That implies that Christ's human nature is limited to heaven. With reference to 10:26-39 there is this: "Can a true Christian so apostatize, so turn away from the Lord, and be lost? It is our sensitiveness regarding, and our jealousy for, the blessed teaching of the security of the believer that brings the question to our minds. Actually it does not arise in the text." But it DOES arise

in the text. That is what the text is saying precisely. His denial of the Lord's Supper as a means of grace is apparent on page 119: "As I understand the Scriptures, the benefits of our Lord's sacrifice are mediated to us by the operation of the Holy Spirit, not by sacramental rites." And on the following page he calls the Lord's Supper "the memorial of His offering," nothing more. Hebrews 10:22 is not a *sedes doctrinae* on baptism but is surely a reference to it. Be that as it may, Macaulay's attitude toward baptism becomes clear on page 149: "We can take the washing of the body no more literally than the sprinkling of the heart." Also: "A reference to baptism in such a connection of thought would imply an importance assigned to sacraments which I should accept only on very clear evidence." The sacraments ARE important. How else does God come to us other than through Word and Sacraments?

Macaulay makes some pointed remarks about the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Concerning the mass: "What a monstrosity is the perpetual sacrifice of the Roman mass! It is the boast of the Roman hierarchy that Christ is offered four times per second on their altars!" (p. 118). On page 126 he scorns the *vox ex cathedra* teaching. On page 132 he states: "This reminds one, indeed, of the holy water used so copiously in Romish churches where it is forgotten that outward ablutions were abolished with the sacrifice of Christ."

If one is aware of the Calvinism, much can be learned from this book, especially the sections which deal with the high priestly office of Jesus Christ. The book is very readable and the author must have worked hard on these expositions.

Harold H. Buls

LEIDEN ALS GNADE: EINE TRADITIONSGESCHICHTLICHE UNTERSUCHUNG ZUR LEIDENSTHEOLOGIE DES ERSTEN PETRUSBRIEFES. By Helmut Millauer. Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 23, Band 56. Herbert Lang, Bern, 1976. iv + 225 pages. Paper. No Price Listed.

Leiden als Gnade was the author's dissertation which he submitted to the Protestant Faculty of the University of Munich in 1975. As dissertations are meant to do, this work demonstrates a thorough acquaintance with the primary and secondary sources pertinent to the problem it addresses. It is lucidly written but (as is often the wont of dissertations) somewhat formal in its presentation.

The apparent differences in the life situation of the addressees reflected in 1 Pet. 1:6ff. and 1 Pet. 4:12ff. have sometimes led to the conclusion that 1 Peter is not a literary unity. Basing himself on the work of Selwyn, Lohse and Nauck, the author however posits the unity of the letter and attributes the differences in the sections mentioned above (which speak of suffering) to the differing Old Testament, late-Jewish, and early Christian traditions from which Peter borrowed. It is the intent of this work to determine those traditions which played a role in formulating 1 Peter's statements concerning Christian suffering.

In the first chapter, "Das Leiden als Kennzeichen christlicher Existenz" ("Suffering as a Mark of Christian Existence"), Millauer determines that the basic perspective of 1 Peter is that the life of obedience to God (which may lead to suffering) belongs essentially to God's election of His people. That is, 1 Peter's theology of suffering is embedded in a theology of election. Millauer asserts that this is a common idea found throughout the Old Testament (Deut., Psalms, the Prophets, Wisdom Literature, Daniel; pp. 45-65); Jewish Apocalyptic (pp. 54-56); Qumran (pp. 56-58); and the New Testament (Paul, Synoptics; pp. 38-44).

Given this fundamental perspective, Millauer proceeds in three further chapters to elucidate the backgrounds from which 1 Peter derived its theology of

suffering. In Chapter 2, "Leiden als Gnade" ("Suffering as Grace"), Millauer discusses the traditions which may have provided the basis of 1 Peter's view of Christian suffering as "discipleship" (1 Pet. 2:21); as "communion with Christ" (1 Pet. 4:13); and as a "gracious call" (1 Pet. 2:19f.). Christian suffering as "discipleship" finds its sole analog in the synoptic concept of discipleship according to which one is called to participate in the sufferings of Christ. 1 Peter's view of suffering as "communion with Christ" is to be understood, like "discipleship", as expressing the tight association the sufferer has with his Lord. As a participation in the "way" of Christ, the suffering of Christians for the Name is a demonstration of God's love ("Liebeserweis Gottes", p. 103) and as such a demonstration of God's grace and call ("Gott hat sie in seiner Gnade schon jetzt in die Gemeinschaft mit ihm berufen", p. 103).

In the chapter, "Leiden als Gericht" ("Suffering as Judgment"), Millauer discusses 1 Pet. 4:17, the background of which is the Old Testament. The rest of the chapter is devoted to the search for the background of 1 Pet. 4:1: "whoever has suffered in flesh has ceased from sin." This indeed is a difficult and much disputed passage in 1 Peter, and Millauer finds only one analogous passage to it in the whole Jewish literature, Qumran's *Manual of Discipline* 10:9-11:15. Here in the Qumran literature as well as in 1 Pet. 4:1 the author finds the thought that in leading His people into suffering God frees them from sin in that He "kills" the flesh, the *locus* of sin. In that God does this, He acts graciously.

In the final chapter, "Die Freude über das Leiden" ("Joy on account of Suffering"), the author discusses the concept of suffering as *peirosmos* ('temptation') in 1 Pet. 1:6f., a concept which occurs often in the Old Testament and Jewish literature. This idea, argues the author, belongs to the election motif which speaks of the chosen ones of God suffering temporary evils before entering into eternal peace and bliss. Finally the author discusses the idea of joy in the midst of suffering and distinguishes three ideas concerning the relationship between joy and suffering: joy after suffering, joy in spite of suffering, joy on account of suffering. The first two ideas occur often in Jewish literature and also in the New Testament. However, the last idea in which suffering receives a positive evaluation is a uniquely Christian understanding of suffering (p. 182): the Christian in taking the cross of Christ participates already in the glory which was hidden in the cross of Christ. In 1 Peter this idea is especially expressed in 4:13-14. The book concludes with an excursus on the date of 1 Peter, which Millauer puts at 75-80.

This is an interesting and worthwhile study; it is well presented and generally convincing in its argumentation. However, as popular as "Traditionsgechichte" is these days, it too often takes the place of an actual exegesis of the text. One ought certainly appreciate the benefits of such study; but as necessary as it may be, such study is prolegomena to exegesis, not exegesis itself. That a New Testament writing has taken over a traditional viewpoint is not yet to say that viewpoint has remained unchanged. Indeed, in the New Testament the traditions have been transformed in the light of the Christ event; they have received their fullness. To ascertain this fullness of meaning is the goal of New Testament exegesis. An example of this may suffice. The author is correct in asserting that joy because of suffering is a uniquely Christian attitude. But, because no tradition of this attitude can be found, this aspect of 1 Peter's message is given cursory treatment (pp. 183-85). Important accents in 1 Peter's theology of suffering therefore go unnoticed: the presupposition of Christ's resurrection (1 Pet. 1:3), the dwelling of God's Shekinah and Spirit upon the suffering Christian (1 Pet. 4:14). These accents give a decidedly eschatological thrust to what 1 Peter says about Christian suffering. All this however, the author leaves in silence, although he is not unaware of them ("So gehört das Leiden zum neuen Wandel

und ist Kennzeichen der eschatologischen Existenz", p. 102). This is not by way of critique of this book — it was not the purpose of the author to offer an exegesis of 1 Peter but to lay bare the stream(s) of tradition in which 1 Peter participated. Rather, this is to illustrate the nature of such study as prologomena to exegesis. When this is kept in mind, a study such as the present one can be of great assistance.

William C. Weinrich

II. Theological — Historical Studies

THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS: A HARMONY AND RESOURCE BOOK. Edited by Neelak S. Tjernagel. Evangelical Lutheran Synod, 734 Marsh St., Mankato, Minnesota 56001, 1979. 220 pages. Paper, \$11.75. Cloth, \$14.75.

Lutheran synods in the United States are rising to the occasion in the celebration of the 400th anniversary of the Book of Concord in 1980. The Missouri Synod's Concordia Publishing House is providing popular histories and theologies of the Lutheran Confessions. Noteworthy is the literary production of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, i.e., "the little Norwegian Synod", one time a sister church of the Missouri Synod within the Synodical Conference. Dr. Bjarne Teigen has produced four studies on the confessions to date. Another clergyman of that synod and long time friend of the Missouri Synod, Dr. Tjernagel has collated various sections of the Lutheran Confessions under 179 sections. It is not unlike Graebner's *Doctrinal Theology* in regard to the Holy Scriptures or Plass' *What Luther Says*.

The major section consisting of 172 pages is divided into four sections: Man and Sin, The Christian Creed, The Means of Grace, and Prayer. Each of these sections is broken down into further subtopics, each with its own title. There are a total of 179 subtopics or paragraphs. Here is an example of the organization. The third section, "The Means of Grace" has four subtopics. The third subtopic, "C. The Sacraments" has four further subdivisions. Under each of these subdivisions there are additional paragraphs. For example under "(C) The Lord's Supper" there are twelve listings from "The Sacrament of the Altar" to "Nothing Has the Nature of a Sacrament Apart from the One Instituted by Christ."

The first and obvious benefit of Dr. Tjernagel's careful work is that he has made it possible for pastor, student, and layman to know what the Lutheran Confessions say on a point by flipping to the table of contents and finding the corresponding paragraph which is listed by page. It is by all assessments an eminently practical book. Secondly, he has provided the Lutheran colleges and seminaries with a doctrinal textbook for the Lutheran Confessions. This is not to deny that the confessions must be understood within their historical context, but if the confessions are going to be catholic and ecumenical they must be available for the church without rehearsing each time the history of each confession. How many people who know the Nicene Creed know its history or really have to know its history? After the harmony section follows citations to other writings which touch upon the subjects handled. Both Luther and more contemporary authors are listed. A comprehensive topical bibliography will introduce the reader to specialized literature. Also included are glossary of persons and terms, an outline of the theology of the confessions, and an outline analysis of the confessions. The amount of time put into this work is phenomenal. Dr. Tjernagel has produced a classic for the study of the Lutheran Confessions. This reviewer can safely predict that it will be used and valued by several generations in the Lutheran Church. A financial grant from the Aid Association for Lutherans made this work possible. The AAL can share some of the plaudits for its investment.

David P. Scaer

FUNDAMENTALISM. By James Barr. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1978. 379 pages. Cloth. \$7.95.

From time to time the movement known as fundamentalism has come under attack by those committed to the historical critical method. In the past many Biblical scholars simply ignored this twentieth-century theological movement. *Fundamentalism*, by professor Barr of Oxford University must be considered one of the most vicious attacks on historic Christian teachings to appear in a long time. Barr is Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford University. The Oxford don claims that fundamentalism is characterized by three traits: a strong emphasis on the inerrancy of the Bible, an intense hostility to modern theology and the modern critical method in the interpretation of the Scriptures. The term "fundamentalism" is applied to individuals who believe in the inerrancy of Holy Writ, who reject modern theological thought because of its departures from and contradictions to the Word of God and who reject the presuppositions which control historical-critical method and thus result in the rejection of the Biblical explanations of revelation, inspiration, the supernatural, the occurrence of miracles and predictive prophecy. Some therefore wish to have themselves referred to as "evangelicals," or "neo-evangelicals." The three traits which according to Barr characterize fundamentalism also are characteristics of many in the mainline Protestant churches which have remained faithful to the historic theological beliefs of their denominations. Thus there are Lutherans, Episcopalians, Baptists, Christian Reformed, orthodox Presbyterians, Nazarenes, Mennonites who hold to the inerrancy of the Bible, reject the anti-Scriptural positions of modern theology and eschew the historical-critical method. The latter three traits are not only those of movements sometimes considered to the left of traditional fundamentalism, represented by the views advocated by Bob Jones and Carl McIntyre, usually referred to as hardcore fundamentalists. The American reader of this British book could therefore substitute "conservative evangelical" wherever Barr uses "fundamentalist."

Barr claims that British and American fundamentalism are logically incoherent and contradict Biblical faith, and that authentic Christianity will not resist the findings and conclusions of modern theology and will welcome and promote Biblical criticism.

Barr has attacked everything which is distinctive of the historical Christian faith. According to the Oriel professor, Christian theology should not begin "from the idea of an antecedent 'revelation,' the communication of which is the essential function of Scripture." Thus he claims that revelation should not be "the first and initiatory article in statements of Christian belief: in other words, authority is not the first thing to be stated nor the thing from which all else has to be derived" (p. 288). This stance therefore rejects the priority of God in His revelation and God's authority as reflected in Holy Writ. With this position there goes as a correlation the doctrinal reliability of the Bible and also the validity and truthfulness of Jesus' teaching. He claims that "Christological orthodoxy has to go too" (p. 172). Barr claims that Jesus' teaching has no permanent value. Thus he says, Jesus did not teach "eternally correct information," rather his teachings were "time-bound and situation-bound" (p. 171). The Oxford savant deplors the support that Jesus gave to Mosaic authorship or Daniel's and Isaiah's authorship of certain Old Testament books, books concerning which negative higher criticism has positions diametrically opposed to those of Jesus. Since the teachings of Jesus are time-bound and culture-determined, then none of Jesus' teachings are worth taking seriously!

Constantly throughout his *Fundamentalism* Barr worships before the golden

calf of the historical-critical method, which for him is to determine what Bible readers really can believe about the Holy Scripture. That the history of the historical-method is littered with many discarded theories and that there is no unanimity among critics relative to many issues does not disturb Barr. The type of religion advocated in this volume is a religion of uncertainty and puts God's revelation in the category of human knowledge which changes from decade to decade and the only certain result of Barr's religious cogitations is that "theology" is always in a state of flux.

Today the worst enemies of Christianity are not found among the communists but among those who claim that they belong to the church and purport to be its religious leaders. "They are blind leaders of the blind." This volume represents heresy to the nth degree.

Raymond F. Surburg

THE ROOTS OF FUNDAMENTALISM: BRITISH AND AMERICAN MILLENARIANISM, 1800-1930. By Ernest R. Sandeen. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1978. Paper. 328 Pages. \$5.95.

A major problem in American religious history is that of determining the origins of Fundamentalism. Classic studies of this issue include Stewart G. Cole, *The History of Fundamentalism* and Norman F. Furniss, *The Fundamentalist Controversy*, as well as the pertinent references in H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*. These scholars concluded that Fundamentalism was "the name of a party in a controversy" that attracted national attention in the 1920's. Fundamentalism was identified as a regional (Southern), cultural (rural), historical (1920's) phenomenon. That was the mainline interpretation of Fundamentalism before 1970.

In 1970, however, our understanding of Fundamentalism was enriched (and complicated) by a well-researched, tightly-written, carefully argued volume by Ernest R. Sandeen, now James Wallace Professor of History at Macalester College, entitled **THE ROOTS OF FUNDAMENTALISM: BRITISH AND AMERICAN MILLENARIANISM, 1800-1930**. Initially published by the University of Chicago Press (and selling for \$12.00), **THE ROOTS OF FUNDAMENTALISM** has been re-issued by Baker Book House in an inexpensive (\$5.95), attractive, and durable paperback format. It is a testimonial to the enduring value of this volume that it has been reprinted after a decade to minister to the needs of a new generation of American church historians.

Sandeen has contended that "the Fundamentalist movement possessed a self-conscious identity and structure," that sociological explanations of its origins are inadequate (the Fundamentalist "base of support was indistinguishable from that of the Modernists"), for it grew as much in urban, Northeastern areas as in the rural South, and that it must be understood as a spiritual movement — with both psychological and theological foundations. For Sandeen the roots of Fundamentalism date from the dawn of the nineteenth century and are to be found (1) in millenarian thinking, in both Great Britain and the United States, evident in such men and movements as Edward Irving, the Plymouth Brethren, John Nelson Darby, Dispensationalism, Cyrus I. Scofield, and the *Chain Reference Bible* and (2) in the Princeton Theology, especially as exemplified by Archibald and Charles Hodge. This certainly has been a helpful and provocative thesis.

As Sandeen's volume appears in the popular Twin Brook Series of Baker Book House at the end of the 1970's, I believe an evaluation made at the start of this decade by Robert W. Shinn ("Fundamentalism Revisited: A Review Essay," *Foundations*, October-December, 1971) remains valid:

Sandeen has proved the very relevant role of millenarianism in the mixture of doctrinal emphases that constituted the theological stance of conservative Protestantism but it may well be that fundamentalism will never be adequately understood until the complete life stream of conservatism is studied, perhaps, with reference to an "evangelical mind," stemming from Puritan, pietistic, and revivalistic sources. Millenarianism and literalism do explain a great deal but they are still only parts of the total dynamic pattern from the past.

That task remains.

C. George Fry

HISTORY IN THE MAKING. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE PAST. By Roy Swannstrom. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1978. 137 pages. Paper. \$3.95.

History is an arduous *task*. To be sure, 'history' can mean simply — the past. However, taken as a branch of human knowledge, 'history' is a scientific endeavor to know, to understand, and to evaluate the past. History, therefore, is not just knowing facts; it is knowing pertinent and significant facts and relating them in such a way that the past is perceived correctly as a coherent whole. Such a task is not easy, but involves an intimate acquaintance with a breadth of detail and a sensible sensitivity to difficult methodological problems concerning selection and evaluation.

Arduous though history may be, some appreciation of history is requisite for any cultured person and necessary for any understanding of ourselves and our situation. Yet, history is often not perceived to be a relevant enterprise worthy of the "practical" person (also in Seminary training Historical Theology remains more often than not a "required" course of study rather than an "elected" one). Any attempt therefore to present an easily comprehended introduction to the study of history, any attempt to present history to the student as meaningful and relevant is to be received gratefully. Such is the purpose of *History in the Making*. However, this book is not directed toward the general reader: "This brief introduction to history is addressed specifically to the Christian student enrolled in a college history course" (p. 8). In view of the fact that the book explicitly eschews any attempt of presenting a Christian "philosophy of history", it is reasonable to inquire why and in what way the *study* of history (to which this is an introduction) is to be "specifically" addressed to Christians. This is all the more the case in light of the author's assertion that "there is a distinctively Christian approach to the study of history" (p. 81).

In view of the primary purpose, the pith of the book is the chapters "Christian Faith and Understanding the Past" (pp. 75-90) and "Snags and Snares" (pp. 91-103). The former chapter looks at some "distinguishing characteristics of the Christian faith which should help (the Christian in (his/her) study of the past" (p. 75). These are: "the Bible's profound and unvarnished portrait of human character" ("The Scriptures teach us that human beings are capable of the noblest virtue, but also of the vilest crimes", p. 77); Christian insistence on absolute truthfulness (p. 78); a discriminating mind (enlightened by the Spirit) capable of making proper value judgments (pp. 79-80); the Christian experience itself which aids in understanding spiritual elements in history (pp. 85-89).

Among the "Snags and Snares" which may entrap the Christian historian are: inordinate concern for the individual with a corresponding loss of vision (pp. 91-93); distortion of the facts because of emotional attachment or excessive trust (pp. 93-95); manipulation of facts to give a favorable impression to a particular point of view (pp. 95-97); excessive credulity (pp. 97-98); exaggeration of religious factors in history (pp. 100-3).

The above argumentation is simply put and briefly put by the author; there is no fault in that; introductions ought to be simple and brief, uncluttered by excessive detail. However, introductions (especially introductions!) ought also to be clear, the argumentation and concepts patent. Clarity of thought is the large lacuna in this attempt at introduction. One does not have to be a Christian to be quite wise about the nature of men; insistence on truthfulness is hardly a Christian monopoly; distortion and manipulation of fact, exaggeration of particular factors and credulity are snares not only for Christian historians but for all historians. To be sure, being a Christian may aid in understanding spiritual elements in history, but only in a very limited way (for example, a Mennonite may very well better understand the motives behind the Mennoite experience than a non-Mennonite). However, what the author says of Christians may be said of all groups, religious and nonreligious alike. A Moslem may better understand Islam; a Russian may better understand the history of Russia; a philosopher may better understand the history of ideas. Seeing things from the inside is not uniquely Christian.

It is the inability of the author to provide truly "distinguishing characteristics" of the Christian faith which give advantage to the Christian student of history while all the time asserting that the Christian does have an advantage that makes this book a confusion — for an introduction a fatal flaw. The confusion is obvious in the following:

Finally, the Bible teaches and the experience of Christians through the centuries confirms that the Holy Spirit in response to faith illuminates the mind of the believer, bringing insights that reason alone could not discern. Some might call this simple intuition; we know it is the work of God. In answer to prayer the Holy Spirit can illuminate for us the significant lessons behind the facts we learn. But this can never substitute for diligent study nor compensate for failure to do adequate research (p. 90).

Given the purpose of the book as introducing the Christian student to the *study* of the past, what possible role can the Spirit's illumination play when it admittedly cannot be a substitute for solid study? This book is essentially a summary of prolegomena to historical study with a veneer of Christian religiosity.

William C. Weinrich

TRUE CHRISTIANITY. By Johann Arndt. Translation and Introduction by Peter Erb. Preface by Heiko A. Oberman. Paulist Press, New York, 1979. Paper. 301 Pages. \$6.95.

Johann Arndt (1555-1621), the son of a Lutheran pastor, himself a distinguished clergyman of the Lutheran Church, who ministered in Badeborn, Quedlinburg, Braunschweig, Eisleben, becoming General Superintendent of Celle, is remembered more for his writings than his other labors. Chief among these is *True Christianity* (*Vier Buecher vom wahren Christentum*), published in the spring, 1606, which eventually established Arndt's reputation as "a second Luther," "the Father of German Pietism," and the "prophet of interior Protestantism." Few books have had more influence on Lutheran spirituality in either the Old World or the New than *True Christianity*. It was said, with very little exaggeration, that the German Lutheran settlers of Colonial America carried four books in their crowded immigrant trunks — the Luther Bible, Luther's *Small Catechism*, the Almanac, and Arndt's *True Christianity*. For that reason a new translation of this valuable volume is most welcome.

It is a Canadian scholar, Dr. Peter Erb, Assistant Professor of English and Religion and Culture at Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, who has

completed this very readable translation and who has prefaced it with a succinct introduction to the life and times of Johann Arndt. Himself a specialist in both Medieval Catholic and Free Church Piety, Dr. Erb is ably qualified to relate the spirituality of Arndt to both its forerunners in German Mysticism (as Johann Tauler) and its contemporary counter-parts in non-Lutheran Christianity (Jansanist, Precisionist, Puritan, Anabaptist). Especially pertinent is the manner in which Dr. Erb, a Mennonite minister, and Dr. Heiko Oberman, the eminent German Lutheran Church Historian, Director of the Institute for Medieval and Reformation History at Tuebingen, who has contributed a very useful "Preface" to this text, seek to relate Arndt to the Age of Lutheran Orthodoxy. Arndt's insistence that "my books are all to be understood according to the symbolic books of the Church, the Augsburg Confession, and according to no others" (p. 233) is illustrated with significant incidents from his ministry — for instance, "firmly Lutheran, he refused to abandon the rite of exorcism before baptism, despite the order of his Calvinistically inclined Duke" (p. 5). His equally firm insistence on the Real Presence in the Eucharist has given to Arndt's peity a strong sacramental emphasis that was absent — or at least diminished — in later Pietism. Both Erb and Oberman are to be commended for indicating Arndt's ties to the mainstream of Lutheran theology in this Age of Orthodoxy. While Arndt protested against the over-intellectualization of the Faith, he was, as they ably indicate, also seriously concerned with the slow secularization of European Society and the fatal threat which that posed to "True Religion."

This volume is one of sixty scheduled to appear in a series entitled "The Classics of Western Spirituality" to be published by Paulist Press. In spite of a few errors of spelling (as Robert Preuss, p. 3), the attractive format, helpful indices, critical introduction, and lively translation of this text causes one to look for further works in this series with great expectation.

C. George Fry

Correction to the July 1979 issue of the
CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY
(Volume 43, Number 3)

Page 243 should have indicated that the author of "The *New International Version* — Nothing New" was Michael R. Totten, Cleveland Heights, Ohio.