CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 48, Numbers 2 & 3

APRIL-JULY 1984

CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

ISSN 0038-8610

**Issued Quarterly by the Faculty of
Concordia Theological Seminary**

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

The CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY is indexed in Religion Index One: Periodicals, and abstracted in Old Testament Abstracts and New Testament Abstracts.

The CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July and October. All changes of address (including Missouri Synod clergymen), paid subscriptions and other business matters should be sent to Concordia Theological Quarterly, Concordia Theological Seminary, 6600 N. Clinton Street, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46825.

Annual subscription rate: $5.00

The Use of the Church Fathers in the Formula of Concord

J.A.O. Preus

The use of the church fathers in the Formula of Concord reveals the attitude of the writers of the Formula to Scripture and to tradition. The citation of the church fathers by these theologians was not intended to override the great principle of Lutheranism, which was so succinctly stated in the Smalcald Articles, "The Word of God shall establish articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel" (II, 2.15). The writers of the Formula subscribed wholeheartedly to Luther's dictum. But it is also true that the writers of the Formula, as well as the writers of all the other Lutheran Confessions, that is, Luther and Melanchthon, did not look upon themselves as operating in a theological vacuum. They were part of the historic church. Luther was an Augustinian friar, with great respect for the man whose name the order adopted. He had had extensive training in scholastic and patristic theology, for which he made few apologies. Melanchthon was a humanist and was schooled in the great writings of the past. Both had respect for history and tradition, and they viewed the church as an organism in vital continuity with its past and its future. They did not believe that the Reformation was something which had burst full-blown from the mind of God or that they alone had first received the revelation of the Gospel. The writers of the Formula were trained in this same school of thought. They were all sons of the church in the historic and traditional sense. In order to get a picture of the use of the church fathers in the Formula of Concord, it will be necessary to look beyond the limits of that document, since the Formula does not cite the fathers at great length.

I. The Use of the Fathers in Luther and the Pre-Formula Lutheran Confessions

A. *Luther*

Luther had a great respect for his theological fathers, but he was rather eclectic in his choices. As a study of his exegetical writings will show, he relied heavily on the Spaniard, Paul the

bishop of Burgos. Luther regarded him highly and cited him frequently. Born Solomon ha-Levi in 1351, he became a rabbi, was converted to Christianity by the study of Aquinas, wrote additions to Lyra's work, and was finally made bishop of Burgos, one of the outstanding sees in Spain. Luther was also a great admirer of Lyra (1270–1340), a Franciscan Hebrew scholar who produced excellent commentaries on Genesis and Isaiah. Luther leaned on Lyra quite frequently in his commentary on Genesis, as the doggerel poem states, "If Lyra had not played the lyre, Luther would not have danced." Luther taught a course in the theology of Peter Lombard, who in turn cites many of the fathers. Luther was also a particularly knowledgeable student of Augustine. Thus it is not strange that Luther and his followers would be well-versed in the fathers, use them respectfully, and claim them for their theological fore-runners.

As an example of Luther's use of the fathers, note the account of the Marburg Colloquy,[2] where Luther, Zwingli and Oecolampadius get into an argument over certain quotes from Augustine and Fulgentius. Luther shows great acquaintance with Augustine and, not only knows him, but tells how he must be interpreted.

B. *The Pre-Formula Confessions*

As to the use of the fathers in the pre-Formula Lutheran confessions, it should be noted that the Augsburg Confession has fourteen citations from, or references to, the fathers; the Apology has twenty-nine; the Smalcald Articles has only five; the Small Catechism has none; the Large Catechism of Luther has five, with one of them negative (something rather unusual). The comparatively small number of actual quotations or references to the fathers in the Confessions does not indicate a lack of interest in, or respect for, the fathers on the part of the Lutheran theologians, but rather reflects the intended purpose of the Confessions. "Confessions" are the symbols or rallying points for the whole church: for the laity, for parish pastors, and for officials; they are not intended only for theologians. The use of the fathers is far more the task of scholars than of the common people. The very introduction to the Catalog of Testimonies bears witness to this fact. But the manner in which fathers are used is the same in Luther, in Melanchthon, in the early confessions, in the Formula of Concord, and in the writers of the Formula.

II. The Use of the Fathers in Lutheran Writings Preceding the Formula of Concord

A. *Chemnitz*

Next to Luther himself, Martin Chemnitz is the man who has left the greatest mark on the theology of the Lutheran church. The writings of Chemnitz, which continued to be published well into the eighteenth century, are the best examples of the state of theology in the late confessional period of Lutheranism that are currently available. Likewise, Chemnitz' use of the fathers gives a clear picture of the position of late confessional Lutheranism on this subject. It is important to state that there is no significant difference between the usage that Luther, Melanchthon, and the pre-Formula confessions make of the fathers and the way in which Chemnitz and the Catalog of Testimonies of 1580 used them. The primary difference is that in the voluminous writings of Chemnitz there are literally thousands of citations which give a total picture of the theology of the church fathers. It should be noted that many of Chemnitz' writings were completed before he began earnest work on the Formula of Concord and the others were produced during the period of work on the Formula. In fact, he produced very little after 1580, and his last years were spent with the work of producing the Formula of Concord, getting others to support and sign it, and defending it.

Chemnitz spent the years from 1550 to 1553 at Koenigsberg where he served as librarian. He apparently spent all of his time reading Luther, commentaries on the Scripture, and the church fathers. He emerged from this literary paradise as probably the best informed and best equipped student of patristics that Lutheranism has ever known. As an example of Chemnitz' treatment of the church fathers, the treatise entitled "On the Reading of the Fathers or Doctors of the Church" may be cited. This treatise was later to be incorporated as part of the introductory material to Chemnitz' *Loci Theologici*. He begins with the earliest fathers and continues to the time of Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian controversies. The following quote is representative of the material in this treatise:

> Irenaeus is by far the oldest among those whose writings are extant and of whom there is nothing doubtful. He sat at the feet of Polycarp, the disciple of John. Moreover, he wrote many things which were preserved by Jerome. But in our day only five books remain, and these indeed are

rather badly translated, since Irenaeus in his own language speaks with great elegance.... However, these books are most worthy of our reading because they deal with the main points of the Christian faith in a most fundamental way. For in those days heretics were rejecting the Scripture and obtruding onto the churches their own absurd ravings under the name of apostolic tradition. Therefore, Irenaeus sets forth the true tradition which had been commended to the church by the apostles, namely, that the summary of the faith is comprehended in the Creed (for he often cites the Creed in almost the precise words) and he says that the tradition in all the apostolic churches is the same. To this he adds the text of the Scripture and in many ways demonstrates which of the writings of the apostles are canonical. He summarizes the matter in two points, tradition or the Creed, and the text of the Scripture; and what does not agree with these, he rejects as heretical. We must carefully observe this in opposition sitto our adversaries who are trying to get the church to accept notable errors and manifest abuses on the grounds that the only traditions are the things which they say. In the second place, the pious mind will be greatly comforted when it sees that in the description of the heretics of that time the face of the papacy is already becoming evident with all its errors and abuses, such as anointing extreme unction, and many other matters. Furthermore, a great many fine doctrinal points are contained in the writings of Irenaeus concerning nearly every article of faith, such as the two natures in Christ, the Eucharist which is not a sacrifice as our adversaries imagine, and that the fathers in the Old Testament were saved by the same faith as the saints of the New Testament. Again, however, because even at that time he was disputing against the same notion which the Manichaeans later embraced, he speaks harshly
and unfortunately concerning the free will. Again, because he was opposing those who dreamed that there is one God who is the righteous God of the Law and another God who is the merciful God of the New Testament, he sometimes speaks carelessly regarding the distinction of Law and Gospel. But in other places he makes a proper and careful statement concerning faith in Christ and justification. He does not set forth a sufficiently accurate definition of original sin because he is speaking in opposition to those

> who attributed the cause of sin to God. We can read these points in many places in Irenaeus and, when we see clearly both the cause and the occasion of what he says and why he speaks the way he does, then his words can be read without offence and with real profit. There are some rather superficial statements, as in his explanation of Elohim, Adonai, Sabaoth, which are lacking in grammatical foundation. And when he says that Christ was almost fifty years old, he has no historical basis. The ancient church noted in him one basic error, namely, his holding to Chiliasm, and there are in Book 5 a few seeds of this error in his handling of certain chapters of the Apocalypse.[6]

In other writings Chemnitz carries his list of "fathers" down to Luther and Melanchthon. He is highly critical and issues warnings against certain men, even some of the greatest. Chemnitz states that Augustine is correct almost all the time, but he did not speak correctly on justification. Chemnitz notes that John of Damascus lived during the decline of the church and the Moslem conquest, and so most of what he has written is worthless; but his Christology is valuable, and therefore Chemnitz quotes him. John Cassian is roundly condemned for his Pelagianism and is approvingly cited for his Christology. Jerome is praised by Chemnitz as an exegete and berated as a tactless and legalistic supporter of Mariolatry and monasticism. Chemnitz'*De Duabus Naturis in Christo*[7] has certain chapters devoted almost entirely to citations from the fathers. Chapter 25, entitled "Testimonies of the Ancient Orthodox Church," has 313 patristic or conciliar quotations dealing with the personal union, ranging from Justin down to Luther. In all, thirty-three fathers and one council are cited. Again in chapter nine Chemnitz has 240 citations. Likewise in his *De Coena Domini*, chapter ten has over 130 references and chapter twelve over 90, these dealing with the teachings of the fathers concerning the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Chemnitz' trenchant critique of the Council of Trent, the *Examen*, is a fine example of Chemnitz' usage of the fathers. Just a look at the indices of the volumes already published will show what a formidable opponent Chemnitz was to those lordly Iberian Jesuits with his use of weapons from their own arsenal, that is, the church fathers.

B. *The Magdeburg Centuries*

Another factor which perhaps did not influence Melanchthon or Chemnitz greatly, but which shows that the study of patristics was not unknown in Lutheran circles, was the beginning of the publication in 1559 of the now famous *Magdeburg Centuries.* This work was conceived by Matthias Flacius in 1553, begun in 1559, and ended in 1574. It went only as far as the thirteenth century, although it had been projected to go to the sixteenth. Some of it has never been printed, although the manuscripts exist. It was to be a church history, century by century, based on original sources showing the course of the true doctrine and the deviations from it in each century. The Romanists called it an *opus pestilentissimum.*

III. The Use of the Fathers in the Formula of Concord

A. *The Epitome and the Solid Declaration*

In the Formula of Concord itself, the last and longest of the Lutheran confessions, the citation of the fathers is infrequent, as noted before. The Epitome, which was obviously written, like the two catechisms of Luther, for the laity and the parish clergy, has only six citations or references to the fathers. In the Solid Declaration, on the other hand, there are twenty-four, including references to the creeds.

B. *The Catalog of Testimonies*

The most significant use of the fathers in the Book of Concord appears in the Catalog of Testimonies,[11] which was prepared by Andreae and Chemnitz and added as an appendix to the Book of Concord. This document, which is concerned only with Christology, contains eight citations from the canons of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. There are at least 133 references to, or citations from, church councils or fathers. The reason that the Catalog does not appear to be the sole work of Chemnitz is that the Catalog's citations do not tally with the citations in his *De Duabus Naturis.* It is interesting that Andreae, who was also a prolific writer, also wrote a work entitled *De Duabus Naturis in Christo.*

C. *The Real "Father" in the Formula of Concord*

Using Chemnitz' example in his De Duabus Naturis as an indication that Luther was ranked with the "fathers," it can be asserted without hesitation that the "father" most quoted in the Formula is Luther himself. This document, which had as its purpose the uniting of the divided household of Lutheranism, operates on the principle that all Lutherans accept the three universal creeds, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, and the two catechisms of Luther (FC SD Rule and Norm). The Formula of Concord of 1577 was certainly conceived of as being an integral part of a larger *corpus doctrinae* which was adopted in 1580 as the Book of Concord. The authors of the Formula were not being innovative in proceeding in this way because in the decade or so which led up to this Formula many territorial churches had already adopted *corpora doctrinae*, which included the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, and the two Catechisms.

Without raising everything that Luther said to the level of a confession, it is worthy to note that every single article in the Solid Declaration, except Article XII which is in a special category, has at least one quote or reference to Luther. Some of the articles have many quotes from him. It is also interesting to note that wherever possible they cite his catechisms or the Smalcald Articles. They also cite the Augsburg Confession and the Apology. When they do not cite Luther's confessional writings, they cite his better known and most acceptable ones. There are references to his preface to Romans, his many writings on the Lord's Supper, *De Servo Arbitrio*, *On Councils and the Church*, his commentary on Galatians, and various sermons. They do not cite his more vituperative works. There is no question that Luther is the real "father" and hero of the Formula of Concord, the flag around which his quarrelling sons were invited to rally. It is interesting to note that, in speaking of the Formula as a confession with the great words "we believe, teach and confess," the writers, who represented both the Gnesio-Lutheran wing and the Philippist wing, are raising many of the writings of Luther himself to confessional rank. In no case, except for the "Unaltered Augsburg Confession" and the Apology, are Melanchthon's writings treated in this way, nor are those of any other Lutheran, including those of the authors. A rather careful study of the way in which the Solid Declaration is constructed shows that each article begins with a statement of the *status controversiae* which is followed by a clear and concise statement of the correct doctrine buttressed by

Scripture, and then there are citations from Luther and occasionally from the other fathers or councils to support what has been said.

IV. The Relationship of Scripture and the Fathers in the Formula

What is the relationship between Scripture and the fathers as authorities in the enunciation of doctrine in the Formula and in the writings of those who produced it? Despite the fact that Luther, Melanchthon, Chemnitz, and the other authors of the Formula make much greater use of the fathers than we do in our age, the fact remains that they are our best teachers in emphasizing that "The Word of God alone shall establish articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel" (SA II, 2.15). If one were to accuse these men of traditionalism or crypto-romanism on the subject of authority in matters of doctrine, they would be appalled. Endless quotations can be adduced to demonstrate this fact, but the introduction to the Epitome of the Formula of Concord is a good place to begin (Rule and Norm, 2-3):

> "Other writings, however, of ancient or modern teachers, whatever name they bear, must not be regarded as equal to the Holy Scriptures, but all of them together be subjected to them, and should not be received otherwise or further than as witnesses, (which are to show) in what manner after the time of the apostles, and at what places, this (pure) doctrine of the prophets and apostles was preserved. And because directly after the times of the apostles, and even while they were still living, false teachers and heretics arose, and symbols, i.e., brief, succinct (categorical) confessions, were composed against them in the early Church, which were regarded as the unanimous, universal Christian faith and confession of the orthodox and true Church, namely, the Apostles Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed, we pledge ourselves to them, and hereby reject all heresies and dogmas which, contrary to them, have been introduced into the Church of God.

The Solid Declaration speaks in the same way (Rule and Norm, 2-3):

> ...just as the ancient Church always had for this use its fixed symbols moreover, since this (comprehensive form of doctrine) should not be based on private writings, but on such books as have been composed, approved, and receiv-

> ed in the name of the churches which pledge themselves to one doctrine and religion, we have declared to one another with heart and mouth that we will not make or receive a separate or new confession of our faith, but confess the public common writings which always and everywhere were held and used as such symbols or common confessions in all the churches of the Augsburg Confession before the dissensions arose among those who accept the Augsburg Confession, and as long as in all articles there was on all sides a unanimous adherence to (and maintenance and use of) the pure doctrine of the divine Word, as the sainted Dr. Luther explained it.
>
> First (then, we receive and embrace with our whole heart) the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the pure, clear fountain of Israel, which is the only true standard by which all teachers and doctrines are to be judged.

It is also significant that the Catalog of Testimonies is not merely a collection of testimonies from the fathers, but in each article the opening statements consist of testimonies from Scripture dealing with the particular point at issue. This is a practice which Chemnitz commonly follows in his writings: First a chapter of testimonies from Scripture, then a chapter of testimonies from great men of God. Chemnitz' *Examen* has some extremely interesting quotations from the fathers which show their dependence upon Scripture and their insistence that Scripture is to be the highest authority in the church. One such statement of Augustine provides a good example:

> I do not accept this opinion of Cyprian, that heretics are to be rebaptized, although I am incomparably inferior to Cyprian; as also I do not accept the opinion of the apostle Peter where he forced the gentiles to judaize, nor do I act upon it, although I am incomparably inferior to Peter.[13]

He put the authority of Scripture above even the greatest men. How Chemnitz must have enjoyed throwing this quotation in the teeth of the Jesuits!

V. Reasons for Citing the Fathers

The question may be asked as to why our Lutheran fathers, with their strong emphasis on *Sola Scriptura*, felt any need or desire to cite the ancient fathers of the church, many of whom were in error on many points and whose writings added greatly

to the burden of studying a doctrinal point. The Anabaptists and other sects condemned in Article XII of the Formula were already ranting about the lack of complete house-cleaning by Luther and his followers, but the Lutherans of the period of the Formula of Concord held firm.

About eight different reasons may be adduced for the use of the fathers in this and succeeding periods of Lutheran church history, even down to the present day in the works of Francis Pieper and other moderns.

> 1. The Catalog of Testimonies begins with this statement: In the article of the Person of Christ, some have without reason asserted that in the Book of Concord there is a deviation from *phrasibus* and *modis loquendi*, that is, the phrases and modes of speech of the ancient pure church and the fathers, and that, on the contrary, new, strange, self-devised, unusual and unheard-of expressions are introduced....

This point appears several times in the writings of Chemnitz. There is a strong desire to remain within the tradition of the ancient pure church not only in teaching but even in terminology.

2. There was a desire to show the unbroken tradition of teaching. This was certainly the philosophy behind the *Magdeburg Centuries*. This was one of the chief defenses against the Romanists. Chemnitz in his *Examen*:

> We confess also that we disagree with those who invent opinions which have no testimony from any period in the church, as Servetus, Campanus, the Anabaptists, and others have done in our time. We also hold that no dogma that is new in the churches and in conflict with all of antiquity should be accepted.

Chemnitz was not the first, but he was certainly a strong advocate of the historical approach to the study of theology.

3. There was the desire to identify with the ancient purer church and its interpretation of Scripture. The point is often made that the closer one can get to the time of the apostles, the closer one gets to the correct teaching. Chemnitz is very upset with Andrada:

> Andrada wrongs us in that he clamors that we count the authority of the fathers as nothing, that we overthrow the approbation, faith, and majesty of the church. For we can affirm with good conscience that we have, after reading the Holy Scripture, applied ourselves and yet daily apply ourselves to the extent that the grace of the Lord permits to

> inquiry into and investigation of the consensus of the true and purer antiquity. For we assign to the writings of the fathers their proper and, indeed, honorable place which is due them, because they have clearly expounded many passages of Scripture, have defended the ancient dogmas of the church against new corruptions of heretics, and have done so on the basis of Scripture, have correctly explained many points of doctrine, have recorded many things concerning the history of the primitive church, and have usefully called attention to many things.

Chemnitz adds that he longs to see them in the life to come.

4. The Lutheran theologians of the Reformation and confessional period wanted to establish authority for their own teaching. This is certainly Luther's practice in his numerous citations. This is also quite evident in the use that the Augsburg Confession and the Apology make of the fathers.

5. The fathers were used by the Lutherans to refute errors, both in the Roman camp, as Chemnitz does so brilliantly in his *Examen*, and also in the Reformed camp, as both the Formula and the writings of the Lutherans of the confessional period demonstrate.

6. The Lutheran confessors used the fathers to distinguish between the Scripture and the writings of men, even the highly honored fathers themselves. This is very evident in a work such as the treatise "On the Reading of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church" in the introduction to Chemnitz' *Loci Theologici*. He is swift to point out that, great as some of the fathers were, all made mistakes. The Scripture did not. The Scripture was and is for us the ultimate authority.

7. The fathers were cited to help in establishing a normative interpretation for certain key doctrines and passages. This use is evident both in Chemnitz' *De Duabus Naturis*, as well as in the articles on free will and the Lord's Supper in the Formula where there are substantive quotations from Augustine and Chrysostom. For example, Chrysostom says in his "Sermon Concerning the Passion" (cf. FC SD VII, 76):

> Christ Himself prepares this table and blesses it; for no man makes the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but by God's power and grace, by the word, where He speaks: "This is My body," the elements presented are consecrated in the Supper. And just as the declaration, Gen. 1:28: "Be

> fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth," was spoken only once, but is ever efficacious in nature, so that it is fruitful and multiplies, so also this declaration ("This is My body; this is My blood") was spoken once, but even to this day and to His advent it is efficacious, and works so that in the Supper of the church His true body and blood are present.[17]

8. Finally, it does not seem beyond the realm of possibility that the Lutherans were a little impressed with their own learning and wanted to display it to the supercilious and sophisticated Romanists, as well as to the ignorant and uneducated fanatics. "Are they Hebrews? So am I" (2 Cor. 11:22). Chemnitz was a very learned man, as was Andreae. So were Luther and Melanchthon. They and other Lutheran theologians took a back seat to no men of their age. It can be conjectured that the reason Chemnitz did not stay at Wittenberg, where he was called in 1553 as a professor, perhaps to succeed Melanchthon, was not his modesty or his lack of self-confidence or his inability to teach (for he was very popular), but the fact that he saw coming down the road a head-on clash with his mentor, and this neither he nor his beloved Lutheran church needed. It is significant that the fathers of the Formula waited till both Melanchthon and Osiander were dead before they got busy.

VI. Lessons for Our Times

A. *The Position and Principle of the Formula of Concord*

In conclusion, certain lessons from this study may be drawn for our church life today. Robert Preus is correct in summing up the position of the Formula of Concord in his recent book, *Getting into the Theology of Concord*, where he states:

> Now that we have talked about the authority of our Confessions and creeds as norms for teaching in the church and also about the authority of Scripture, the reader may be a bit confused. Are there, then, levels of authority? Yes. Precisely. Specifically there is a threefold tier of authority in the church, according to our Confessions.
>
> 1. "The prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments" are "the pure and clear fountain of Israel, which is the only norm according to which all teachers and teachings are to be judged and evaluated" (FC SD, Rule and Norm, 3). That statement means two things: (a) Scripture is the one divine source from which, as

from a spring or fountain, we draw all our theology; and (b) Scripture is the *only* norm to judge teachers and teachings in the church.

2. The Confessions, on the other hand, are the "basis, rule, and norm, indicating how all doctrines should be judged in conformity with the Word of God" (ibid., Heading). This means, quite simply, that the Confessions state what we Lutherans believe to be the teachings of Scripture and what we therefore believe, teach and publicly confess.

3. Other good Christian writings, that is, "good, useful, and pure books, such as interpretations of the Holy Scriptures, refutations of errors, and expositions of doctrinal articles" have their place too. They are not to be rejected or spurned. "If they are in accord with the aforementioned pattern of doctrine (namely, the Confessions), they are to be accepted and used as helpful expositions and explanations" (ibid, 10).

Scripture, the Confessions, other good Christian literature! Scripture's authority is divine and absolute. The Confessions' authority is derived from their agreement with Scripture and is binding for everyone who professes to be a Lutheran. Other Christian writings are authoritative and useful too when they agree with Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions.[18]

In the Formula of Concord there is respect for the Scripture, but not in the fundamentalist sense that there is a total gap between the days of the apostles and our time. There is also respect for the on-going confession of the church down through the ages, a confession which is reached after careful and prayerful discussion and study. There is no place for the grandstander, the individualist, the loner in Lutheranism. By the time of the Formula many of the "fathers" of Lutheranism had developed clay feet—Melanchthon, Osiander, Amsdorf, Flacius, John Agricola, and many others. Even Andeae, after the adoption of the Formula, was told to go home and stay there.

B. *Resolutions by Church Bodies*

The Lutheran Church, in the adoption of its last confession, had stated that the day of the individualistic theologian, be he left-wing or right-wing, ecumenical or exclusivistic, honored for his learning or despised for his irascibility was over. From

this point on the Lutherans were a church, not just a confessional movement, not just a disorganized rabble, not a massive case of rampant congregationalism, not a case where "everyone did what was right in his own eyes." We work by church decision and collective deliberation. The Missouri Synod, in this sense, is a true child of the Book of Concord. We have often been criticised for our use of "synodically adopted doctrinal resolutions," for "voting on doctrine," for denying the individual rights of the congregations (which is often a euphemism for the predilections of individual pastors or professors), and of being guilty of denying the Gospel by weeding people out of the church. If we are guilty, so were the framers of the Formula, who had only the one motive of keeping Lutheranism together and confessing the pure Gospel and the sacraments. The willingness of the writers of the Formula to come to grips with the problems facing Lutheranism itself, to condemn men who had at one point or another been heroes of the faith and honored professors, to hold to the Lutheran understanding of the Scripture in the face of threats from the papists, infiltration by the crypto-calvinists, and treachery by their own theologians — all of this we honor and admire. And well we should, for they built well, they called us back to the sources (*ad fontes*), they gave us a heritage which we treasure today.

C. Our Present Problems, Direction, and Responsibility

As we look back to this era in the history of our church, we can draw some conclusions. The writers of the Formula tried for unity and peace. They did not resort to name-calling. They did not demand the impossible. Chemnitz, for example, who was a Gnesio-Lutheran, who hesitated to work with Andreae because he had at one time been interested in peace at any price, this same Chemnitz was willing to leave some questions to be settled in "the heavenly academy," because they could not be solved in this world. We must be careful in our synod that we do not expect more of people than they can bear (cf. Luke 11:46) or than Scripture clearly states. Nor dare we, on the other hand, allow any, be he a modern Melanchthon or Flacius, gifted and honored by the church, to chip away at our cherished doctrinal stance and then cover it up by denial, evasions, and failure to take proper disciplinary action. Souls are at stake as is the doctrinal integrity of our church.

Thus we must punctiliously observe our synodical regulations regarding changes in the doctrinal position of Synod. The rules are there. We must use them or stop harassing the church. We must not use students or immature pastors to fight our battles for us. Melanchthon, Osiander, Flacius, and others all misused their offices and teaching positions to undermine the position of their church, and they ultimately were destroyed. Imagine the embarrassment for the Lutherans of the time of the Formula to have to add the word "unaltered" every time they mentioned the Augsburg Confession. The very writer of their basic confession betrayed it. What an embarrassment it was for our synod to have the faculty of a seminary where Walther, Pieper, and Stoeckhardt taught trying to mislead the entire synod. How tragic it would be if, after this sad episode, we would fritter away our energies on issues not clearly settled in Scripture and allow major deviations from the clear teachings of Scripture, the Confessions, and our doctrinal heritage to remain unchallenged because of cronyism or timorousness. Faculties have had a special responsiblity and a special temptation, both in former days and in our own time. Unfortunately, we are witnessing today an incredibly swift deterioration of confessionalism in Lutheranism, led by faculties and officials who are intimidated, incompetent, or, worst of all, have abandoned the Scripture as the highest authority in the church. In such an environment. the wisdom and guidance of the church fathers is often glibly overlooked. However, the stalwart example of the authors of the Formula of Concord and their attitude towards the fathers should give to all of us a renewed determination and resolution to make every effort to keep our church faithful to the Scripture, the confessions, and the theological heritage given to us by the fathers down through all the ages of the church.

FOOTNOTES

1. All confessional references in this paper are quoted from *Concordia Triglotta. The Symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921).
2. *Luther's Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut Lehmann (St. Louis and Philadelphia: Concordia Publishing House and Fortress Press, 1955–1972), 38:58ff.
3. *Triblotta*, pp. 1106–1113.
4. [Martin Chemnitz], *Oratio de lectione patrum* Wittenberg, 1154).

5. Martin Chemnitz, *Loci Theologici. Quibus et Loci Communes D. Phillip Melanchthonis explicantur*, 3 vol. (Frankfurt: Polycarp Leisur, 1591-1592).
6. [Chemnitz], *Oratio de Lectione patrum.*
7. Martin Chemnitz, *De duabus naturis in Christo* (Leipzig, 1578); trans. J.A.O. Preus, *The Two Nature of Christ* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970).
8. Martin Chemnitz, *Fundamenta sanae doctrinae de vera et substantiali praesentia...Domini in Coena*(Jena: Donatus Richtzenhain, 1590); trans. J.A.O. Preus, *The Lord's Supper* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1979).
9. Martin Chemnitz, *Examen Concili Tridentini* (Frankfurt: Georg Nigrinus, 1578); trans. Fred Kramer, *Examinatin of the Council of Trent*, 4 vol. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971-).
10. Matthias Flacius, ed., Ecclesiatica historia...secundum singulas centurias...per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburgica, 14 vol. (Basel: Ioannem Oporinum, 1559-1574).
11. *Triglotta*, pp. 1106-1149.
12. Jacob Anreae, Disputatio de duabus naturis in Christo atque earundem idiomatum... (Tuebingen, 1569).
13. Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent*, 1:260.
14. *Triglotta*, p. 1107.
15. Chemnitz, Examinatin of the Council of Trent, 1:258.
16. *Ibid.*, 1:256.
17. John Chrysostom, *De proditione Iudae*, 1.6 (Migne,*PG* 49. 380).
18. Robert D. Preus, *Getting into the Theology of Concord*, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1977), p.22.

Dr. J.A.O. Preus is Immediate Past President of the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod, and a former President and professor of Concordia Theological Seminary Springfield, IL (now Fort Wayne, IN)

Clergy Mental Health and the Doctrine of Justification

Robert Preus

The purpose of this study is to find and describe the connection between clergy stress and burnout and the doctrine of justification, often called in Lutheran circles the chief doctrine ("praecipuus locus," Apology of the Augsburg Confession, IV, 5) of our religion. It will address these questions:

- Does the gospel of justification help pastors to cope with the tensions of their office?
- Does it alleviate clergy stress?
- Does it mitigate burnout and help the pastor to transcend the causes of it?

I am using the term "gospel" as the "doctrine of the gospel"; that is, as the cognitive and true message of God's grace and forgiveness of the sinner for Christ's sake. I am using the term "justification" as I believe St. Paul and our Lutheran confessions employ it—as an event; a real, divine action; a verdict of acquittal which has happened and is happening vis-a-vis the world of concrete sinners. The terms "stress," "burnout" and "mental health" are meant here as they are uniformly described and defined by the many psychologists and clergy who have studied the subject.

Burnout is found most often among those in helping or people-related professions, among those who bear heavy responsibilities—therefore often among pastors. The causes cited for burnout are role overload, role confusion, inability to shed continual responsibility and inability to get time off. Christian psychologists, pastors and therapists suggest that burnout can be headed off or overcome by prayer, Scripture reading, physical therapy and exercise, spiritual development, free time and having a support system.

Charles Rassieur in "Stress Management for Ministers" suggests that "the issue" for the church as it copes with pastoral burnout is how to keep it at a manageable level so that the pastor does not conclude that the only viable option is to leave the ministry.[1] If he is correct, the issue of this paper might be this: What role does theology or the gospel—more specifically, the fact of the sinner's justification before God—play in a

pastor's reaction to stress and incipient burnout? Does it help the pastor to handle stress, and if so, how?

Rassieur offers some statistics to show that ministers, despite periods of career-related stress, generally do not leave their calling due to burnout or nervous exhaustion as do other professionals. But his statistics do not tell us whether more pastors leave the ministry today than in former years due to inability to cope with stress, nor do they inform us about Lutherans. I suspect that many more Lutheran pastors are quitting their ministries today than sixty or even thirty years ago, due in large part to the inability to cope with stress. Figures on this subject would be most helpful.

Even if few pastors are leaving the professional ministry, how many pastors just "cave in," as one old Norwegian Lutheran pastor used to put it, for lack of another job or profession to enter? Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod statistics, and no doubt those of other church bodies, indicate that thousands of our congregations do not gain members throughout a given year. Certainly that does not mean merely that there is no mission work to be done or that thousands of pastors (and congregations) are just lazy. It could indicate that many pastors have just "gone to seed," in the words of that same Norwegian pastor, in that they just endure the ministry. A valid relationship between the purely secular concept of burnout and the theological concept of justification can be found in an almost parenthetical statement in Cary Cherniss' "Staff Burnout": "When a worker burns out, what was once a 'calling' becomes merely a job."[2]

As Christians we believe that the gospel of justification impacts the total life of the Christian, including bodily and mental functions. As Christians we would agree with stress analysts on the basis of Scripture and experience that stress in itself is neutral and may be either beneficial or detrimental to one's physical, mental and spiritual health. Pressure, along with prayer and Scripture study, makes on a theologian and therefore can be a blessing to a pastor. Just as, according to a secular understanding, two people in the same job or profession respond in utterly different ways—one experiencing frustration, discouragement and demoralization (symptoms of burnout), the other enthusiasm for work, fulfillment and happiness—so two pastors under stress, believing the gospel and trying to apply it to themselves and their flocks, may well react in totally different ways. We cannot guarantee that a Christian

pastor will attain a higher degree of mental health under extreme stress than a social worker or some similarly highly motivated person in a helping profession.

Clergy burnout's symptoms include not only fatigue, tension and exhaustion but also anxiety, worry, insecurity and even guilt. Therefore the biblical doctrine of justification by faith and of the monergism of grace bears directly on the matter, for it is calculated to remove anxiety, worry, insecurity and guilt. Burnout can be construed as indicative of failure, lack of vocation and even the breakdown of faith in God's providence and of communion with Him as well as with the staff structure within which the pastor labors. Here too the doctrine of free justification for Christ's sake alone can be applied to help immeasurably the victim of burnout.

Perhaps the gospel of justification has not been comforting, therapeutic or encouraging to the pastor under stress because it is misunderstood, distorted or manipulated. I believe this must be the case. So I propose to review justification in its broad scope with the hope that it might be better understood and applied to the broad subject of clergy mental health.

The Centrality of Justification

Following Martin Luther the church of the Augsburg Confession has consistently treated its article on justification as the "articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae" (article on which the church stands and falls). This phrase is not a hermeneutical cipher but a principle of theology and religion which affects and permeates the life of the church and the faith and life of the Christian. Luther says: "This is the highest article of our faith, and if one should abandon it as the Jews do or pervert it like the Papists, the church cannot stand nor can God maintain His glory which consists in this, that He might be merciful and that He desires to pardon sins for His Son's sake and to save."[3] Again he says: "This doctrine can never be urged and taught enough. If this doctrine is overthrown or disappears, then all knowledge of the truth is lost at the same time. If this doctrine flourishes, then all good things flourish—religion, true worship, the glory of God and the right understanding of all conditions of life and of all things."[4]

This article alone makes one wise for salvation, forgives and comforts sinners and affords them the spiritual equipment to endure, although imperfectly, crosses—such as stress—of God's

sending. Luther asserts that "...he who does not hold to this article and this basic truth, to wit, true faith and trust in Christ, is no theologian. All the other articles flow into and out of this one, and without it the others are nothing....Those who are disturbed and afflicted, those who are troubled and tempted relish this article; they are the ones who understand the gospel."[5]

When Luther speaks of the justification article, he is referring not primarily to a doctrine but to a real, objective event, a divine action which we experience and which controls dynamically the life of a Christian. In this the article is like no other article of faith or divine work. "The other articles are rather far from us and do not enter into our experience; nor do they touch us...," Luther observes. "But the article on the forgiveness of sins comes into continual experience with us, and in daily exercise, and it touches you and me without ceasing."[6]

One's justification for Christ's sake, the fact of one's righteousness before God, often becomes obscured and slips away in times of tension and stress, temptation and testing. In his commentary on Galatians Luther speaks with great sensitivity on this point: "...the question of justification is an elusive thing—not in itself, for in itself it is firm and sure, but so far as we are concerned. I myself have had considerable experience of this, for I know how I sometimes struggle in the hours of darkness....But when in a struggle we should use the Gospel, which is the Word of grace, consolation and life, there the Law, the Word of wrath, sadness and death, precedes the Gospel and begins to raise a tumult. The terrors it arouses in the conscience are no smaller than was the tremendous and horrible spectacle on Mount Sinai (Exodus 19:18)."[7] This central article which alone offers consolation (Apology IV, 5) therefore must be well taught and understood. It must be seen and applied in the context of a right understanding of sin and grace.

Presuppositions of Justification: Sin and Guilt, Divine Wrath and Grace

God's justification of the sinner is a response to two realities: on the one hand, human sin and guilt before God and God's wrath against the sinner; on the other hand, God's grace by which He justifies the ungodly. It is highly significant that throughout the Lutheran Confessions sin is portrayed as what

humanity is rather than what it does. Original sin, the corruption of human nature, is the source of all evil affections and actions. This "Erbsuende" or inherited corruption is not a mere term, weakness, lack or doctrine. It is "vere peccatum" (Augsburg Confession, II, 2), as our Augustana puts it, an actual "morbus" (vice) which is an active force and power toward evil.

Philip Melanchthon says: "Original sin is a sort of living power ['vivax quaedam energia'], in no way and at no time bringing forth any other fruit than vice. . . but the most noble affections few people feel. True, there are those who live honorable lives outwardly. . . But such persons have no reason to glory, for their souls are subject to the most base and miserable affections while they are not even aware of it."[8]

This sin brings damnation to everyone who is not regenerated through the means of grace (AC II, 2). Hardly a mention is made of actual sins as our confessions relentlessly describe man's terrible predicament, his status before God: he is guilty. What people are renders them guilty before God more than what they do, proceeding from what they are (Mark 7:21). "As the proverb of the ancients says, 'Out of the wicked comes forth wickedness...' " (1 Samuel 24:13). The exemplary prayer of the publican asks God to be propitiated to him, "the sinner." He repents of what he is by nature. He confesses not his actual sins but his sin or condition.

If sin is a reality which must be repented of, so guilt is a reality. It is not a subjective reality—merely an experience, a feeling of guilt or estrangement. Scripture seems never to speak of guilt as a subjective emotion or affection resulting from sin or anything else. The terms for guilt always refer to the fact that the sinner or offender is under judgment (Romans 3:19; Matthew 26:66), even though the sinner may feel no repentance nor even awareness of his or her status (Leviticus 5:17).

God's wrath and grace are the presuppositions for any presentation of the sinner's justification. As Rudolph Bultmann points out, in Paul's theology they are not emotions of God primarily but actions of God's truthfulness and justice.[9] Therefore to be justified and to stand in a state of grace (Romans 5:1–2) means not that God is not angry with sin and the sinner nor that there is no divine judgment but that we have been rescued from His wrath (Romans 5:9). God's grace is the grace of the living God who acts, gave His son (Romans 3:24) and justifies sinners. God works and gives and determines the

life of the individual believer (1 Corinthians 15:10; 2 Corinthians 12:9). Grace and power are linked in Scripture. In Lutheran theology God's wrath and His grace that removes His wrath (law and gospel) must be preached and applied to both Christian and unbeliever alike and certainly also to the stress-ridden pastor. These two themes which pervade the entire Scriptures must be portrayed and applied not as mere ideas, gimmicks or metaphors for something else, but as realities which, if they do not always affect the greatly troubled pastor, are the only real spiritual therapeutics he has.

The Basis of Justification

The basis of the sinner's justification is Christ's righteousness, the obedience of His doing and suffering, as our Formula of Concord puts it (Solid Declaration III, 30, 58). Luther emphasized the reality of Christ's atoning work as he continually counseled people who were depressed, fearful, discouraged and ready to quit the ministry. This is what must be done for those who, because they make too little of the sin that has caused their depression, fear and discouragement, cannot apply the gospel of justification to themselves.

To stress his point, Luther makes seemingly outrageous statements at times. But in effect these statements are profoundly comforting. To the troubled Melanchthon he said: "If you are a preacher of God's grace, then preach not an invented but a real grace. If it be real grace, then you dare not bring up any invented sin. God does not justify imaginary sinners. Be a sinner and sin boldly [pecca fortiter], but believe more boldly and rejoice in Christ, the Victor over sin, death and the world. We must sin as long as we are here; life is no house of righteousness. It is enough to confess the Lamb who carries the sin of the world. From Him no sin can separate us, even if we whored and murdered a thousand times a day. Do you think the redemption and price is so small which such a Lamb paid for our sins? Pray boldly for you are a bold sinner."[10] Luther never tired of preaching the cost of our redemption: the innocent life and death of God's own Son.

The Nature of Justification

What does it mean to be justified? According to the Formula of Concord, the word "justify" means "to declare righteous

and free from sins and from eternal punishment of these sins on account of the righteousness of Christ which God reckons to faith" (Philippians 3:9; FC SD III, 17; cf. Apology IV, 305). I believe pastors under severe stress can be benefited greatly by recognizing this objective, forensic, "extra nos" nature of their personal justification. They need to know that justification before God, strictly speaking, is not a subjective experience any more than my acquittal of a charge for speeding, although concomitant with God's gracious verdict of forgiveness are regeneration and the gift of faith (Apology XIV, 72; FC SD III, 19).

The troubled sinner who perceives the objective and forensic nature of justification will not look inwardly to feelings, experiences or quality of faith to gain assurance that he or she is right with God. Rather, such a person looks to Christ crucified and risen "for our justification" (Romans 4:25) and to the Word which proclaims and confers this justification. Of course, justified sinners feel joy and at peace with God, but these emotions are the results, not the criteria, of their justification, God's acceptance of them for Christ's sake.

The Nature and Function of Faith in Justification

What is the nature of justifying faith ("fides justificans" or "fides specialis") in Christ in contrast to "fides generalis," or faith in doctrine? We all know the pat answer: faith is trust. But what is trust? This question may be answered best by a study of the Hebrew word *batach*, the term in the Old Testament which most nearly approximates the *pistis* of Paul and John when they speak of justification or salvation through faith. The term means to lean on another (Proverbs 3:5), to prostrate one's self and fall on one's face in utter dependence upon another, to trust another for everything. The object of our trust is always the Lord throughout the Old Testament, no one and nothing else. In the New Testament the object of our trust is the same: Christ the Lord and His Word of gospel and pardon (John 1:11-19; Luke 8:13; Acts 8:14; 2:41; 1 Timothy 1:14).

In the Apology of the Augsburg Confession Melanchthon beautifully portrays the nature of this trust as it pertains to the sinner's justification. He describes this "justifying faith" as confidence or trust in Christ's promises of mercy ("fiducia promissae misericordiae propter Christum," Apology IV, 79). In

essence, the faith through which we are justified is receptivity, whether it be called trust or knowledge of Christ. As Theodore Mueller says in a very perceptive article,[11] faith is not an action verb but a stative verb. The faith through which we are justified is not to be considered "the act of faith,"[12] but an "actio passiva" or, better, an *organon leptikon*—that is, a receiving instrument.

Pastors who suffer stress and affliction, like any Christian in similar circumstances, may be tempted to look to their faith as a reason for self-esteem and assurance rather than to the only object of faith, Christ and His pardoning Word. They conclude that failure and inability to cope are due to weak faith or the lack of faith altogether. They are viewing faith as their act rather than as their reception of God's mercy.

Mental and Spiritual Health

Pastoral burnout or nervous exhaustion is not necessarily a sign of weak faith, works righteousness, spiritual malaise or a particular guilt. Poor mental health does not necessarily denote poor spiritual health. Too many factors pertain to both to allow for any sure correlation.

Luther had periods of deep depression owing largely but not entirely to physical ailments. He was often given to anger and impatience, the inability or unwillingness to cope and to suffer adversities and afflictions and wrongs with calmness and love and without complaint. But he understood what it meant to be right with God. Certainly no legalist, he had experienced the forgiveness of sins. So too had the Apostle Paul, with all his failures and complaining—or rather boasting—of his infirmities, persecutions and frustrations (Romans 7; 2 Corinthians 11:18ff.; 7:5). Pastors who become dependent or aggressive in response to stress are not necessarily so because they are living with a guilt template over their lives. It is perfectly possible for pastors who know they are forgiven, are certain of their salvation and live in the grace of God to suffer burnout and mental exhaustion.

Perhaps an old theologian who knew nothing of psychology or mental health in the modern sense has something helpful to say at this point. C.F.W. Walther offers as his seventeenth thesis in his well-known book, *The Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel*, the following: "The Word of God is not rightly divided when a description is given of faith, both as regards its

strength and the consciousness and productiveness of it, that does not fit all believers at all times."[13] Pastors like any Christian may in their own minds be under-achieving, guilt-ridden, uncertain even of their salvation, lazy, despondent and unhappy—and still be believers.

Walther was speaking to young pastors about their preaching, warning them not to paint a false picture of a Christian lest Christians confused and weak in faith conclude that they are not under grace—a terrible tragedy. But I think that today his principle might apply well to pastors or counselors treating victims of nervous exhaustion. They must be cautious in drawing conclusions concerning another's spiritual life in Christ and the inability to cope with the stress and strains of a calling.

While justification before God surely has a profound effect of eternal significance upon a life, nevertheless it cannot be said to be a prevention or cure for nervous exhaustion in any given case. In many cases justification before God, properly applied, will prevent burnout or alleviate it. There is no iron curtain separating the realms of nature and grace, the psychosomatic and the spiritual. But if we pastors are to "use" the gospel of justification at all in reference to mental health, we ought to do so pastorally, not as the medical doctor or psychologist might treat a patient.

In speaking about the psychological and physical effects of the gospel, we must be very cautious as we try to judge empirically what it does or does not do. Even as we trust in providence without seeing its ways, we believe firmly in the gospel's power to heal. We see its effects, but we dare not dogmatize about these effects in given cases.

Justification, Election, and Providence

One pericope from Scripture has been brought to bear on the subject of mental health remarkably often: Romans 8:28–39. It brings together three great theological themes: justification, which Paul has been speaking of throughout the preceding chapters; election, which he introduces with this verse; and providence, which he so beautifully illustrates throughout and especially in verse 32. God's providence serves His grace. His kingdom of power is in the service of His kingdom of grace. Those who are made elect by God likely will suffer stress and strain and cross and affliction in this life, but all of these ultimately are blessings in God's gracious economy. The

justified sinner is reminded that Christ's atonement has removed totally and forever the guilt and punishment and burden of sin; that the sins of the flesh, which still remain, are continually forgiven for Christ's sake; but that sickness and pain, the results of sin, are nevertheless the predicted and expected portion of every child of God. Among these chastenings God sends His chosen people may be nervous breakdown and clergy burnout.

If the justification of the sinner is not a prevention or cure for pastoral burnout or mental breakdown, what is its purpose? First, the sinner is justified in order to be saved eternally and to live forever with God, to praise Him in this life and in the life to come. Paul and all of Scripture continually link justification and the forgiveness of sins, together with all the soteriological themes such as redemption and reconciliation, with eternal life, an eschatological reality.

Secondly, God justifies the sinner in order to sanctify him or her (1 Peter 2:9), in order that the justified sinner might love and serve God and neighbor. Melanchthon puts this matter eloquently in the Apology: "We are justified for this very purpose, that, being righteous, we might begin to do good works and obey God's Law. For this purpose we are reborn and receive the Holy Spirit, that this new life might have new works and new impulses, the fear and love of God, hatred of lust, etc." (Apology IV, 348–349).

But what of those pastors who feel unable to cope even in the light of or because of what Melanchthon has said? What of those who see themselves as failures, suffer guilt and have a low self-esteem? They should give heed to Melanchthon's assertion that all the works of a Christian are pleasing to God even though in themselves they are quite neutral and seemingly unimportant. "The incipient keeping of the Law does not please God for its own sake but for the sake of faith in Christ," he says (Apology IV, 166; cf. 177, 172). If this is true, then surely we should be able to carry out our calling with great joy, even with all the tensions and failures, knowing that however things turn out God is using us, and we are the apple of His eye. My self-esteem is in Christ, not in myself. In Christ all my works and activities are pleasing to God.

Can and ought a pastor view mental breakdown or nervous exhaustion as a chastening from a loving God calculated only to bless and bring the pastor (and the congregation) closer to Him? The answer must be a resounding "yes." Yes, if the pastor believes in a loving God who sent His Son to be our Savior. Yes,

if the pastor believes in a faithful God who has promised again and again, "I will never leave you." Yes, if the pastor believes in an almighty and providential God who through His Apostle Paul has assured us, "He who did not spare His own Son but gave Him up for us all, will He not also give us all things with Him?" (Romans 8:32). Yes, even if the pastor has difficulty believing all these things or in confusion rejects them for a time. This is not a theology of failure but a theology of victory in failure. God's divine calling and providence allows us to believe and practice this theology of the cross.

FOOTNOTES

1. Charles L. Rassieur, *Stress Management for Ministers* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1982), p. 20.
2. Cary Cherniss, *Staff Burnout* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980), p. 25.
3. *Luther's Works,* Erlangen edition, 10, p. 137.
4. *Ibid.,* 21, p. 12.
5. *Luther's Works,* Weimar edition, Table Talk, no. 1583.
6. *Ibid.,* 28, pp. 271-272.
7. *Luther's Works,* American edition, 26, pp. 63-64.
8. *Loci Communes (Melanchthons Werke,* herausgegeben von Hans Engelland [Guttersloh: Bertelsmann Verlag] II, 1) p. 21.
9. Rudolph Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament,* trans. Cedrick Grobel (London: SCM Press, 1952), p.288-289.
10. *Luther's Works,* Weimar edition, Briefe 2, p.372.
11. Theodore Mueller, "Repentance and Faith: Who Does the Turning?" *Concordia Theological Monthly,* 44, numbers 1-2, January-April 1981, p. 29.
12. Collin Brown, ed., *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1978), I, p. 358.
13. C. F. W. Walther, *The Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel,* trans. W. H. T. Dau (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1929), p. 308.

Luther's Last Battles

Mark U. Edwards, Jr.

Martin Luther[1] was thirty-four years old when his Ninety-five Theses swept the German nation. He was thirty-seven when he was excommunicated by the Roman Catholic church, forty-one when he married the former nun Katharine von Bora, and forty-six when the Augsburg Confession was read to the Imperial Diet. On 10 November 1530 he turned forty-seven, and already behind him were his "breakthrough" to Reformation theology, his rejection of the Roman Catholic church, the Peasants' War, the major battles of the Sacramentarian controversy, and the submission of the Augsburg Confession. Although the vast majority of historical studies on Luther deal exclusively with the events through 1530, Luther did not die at the closing of the Imperial Diet of Augsburg. On the contrary, he lived another fifteen years, dying of heart failure on 18 February 1546, at the age of sixty-two.

It may seem puzzling that biographers and historians neglect the older Luther, for we are extraordinarily well informed about his activities in these later years.[2] In his home Luther was the center of attention and surrounded by children, students, friends, and guests. At meals, various students and guests assiduously copied down all Luther's utterances, preserving a vast wealth of *obiter dicta* for posterity. From these remarks, and from his voluminous correspondence and the observations of friends and guests, there emerges a picture of Luther as a devoted, often tender-hearted father, a loving, teasing, and sometimes irritable husband, a man of strong friendships, and a compassionate pastor and counselor.

Luther also continued his labors at the University of Wittenberg. In 1531 he presented a series of lectures on Galatians. From time to time he lectured on selected Psalms. Beginning in 1535, he undertook to expound the book of Genesis, a labor that occupied him until 1545. He also participated in the reform of the theological faculty in 1533 and in the reorganization of the university curriculum in 1536. He frequently took part in disputations. In 1535 he became dean of the university, a position he held for the rest of his life. Many hours were spent in training students for the ministry and placing them in parishes.

He also served his university and community as pastor and preacher. For years Luther and his coworkers had labored on a German translation of the Old Testament, publishing their efforts a part at a time. In 1531 they completed a revision of the Psalms, in 1532 a German edition of all the Prophets, and in 1533 various other books. Finally, in 1534, the full German Bible appeared. After Luther's death, a revision of the translation, begun in 1539, appeared in the year 1546.

Clearly, the older Luther remained intensely involved in academic, pastoral, and familial activities. But Luther was also very much concerned in these later years with affairs beyond Wittenberg. Through written opinions and published treatises he participated fully in several bitter controversies. It is this activity, and especially his published polemics, that historians find most difficult to explain and integrate into their overall view of Luther. In some of the treatises, Luther apparently retreated from positions of principle established earlier in his career. In others, he contributed to disputes that seem so petty or mundane as to be unworthy of a man of his religious stature. And some of the later polemics were so violent and vulgar that they offended contemporaries and remain offensive to this day.

In the last five or six years of his life, for example, Luther published violent attacks on Catholics, Turks, Jews, and other Protestants. The most notorious of these polemics are his attacks on the Jews, especially his *On the Jews and Their Lies* and his *On the Ineffable Name* and *On Christ's Lineage,* both of 1543. These treatises contain considerable exegesis of the Old Testament, but this is overshadowed by the pervasive vulgarity of Luther's language and by the incredibly harsh recommendations he offered for the treatment of contemporary Jews. Their synagogues and schools should be burned, their homes destroyed, their books seized, their rabbis forbidden to teach, and their money taken away from them. They should be put to work in the fields or, better yet, expelled from Germany. Even contemporary Protestants were shocked by these writings. Rivaling his anti-Jewish treatises for vulgarity and violence of expression is *Against Hanswurst* of 1541. Luther outdid even the violence and vulgarity of *Against Hanswurst* in his 1545 *Against the Papacy at Rome, Founded by the Devil.* On the heels of these treatises he published a series of scatological and violent woodcuts that, in most graphic terms, suggested how good Christians should treat the papacy. In these and other treatises, Luther bestialized his opponents, most frequently

likening them to pigs or asses, or called them liars, murderers, and hypocrites. They were all minions of the devil. He directed the devil to his ass, he renamed the papal decretals "decraptals" [*Drecketalen*] and the Farnese pope "Fart-ass" (*fartz Esel*) and "Her Sodomitical Hellishness Pope Paula III," and he threw around words for excrement with great abandon. In the woodcuts by Lucas Cranach that Luther commissioned at the end of his life, he had the papal church depicted as being expelled from the anus of an enormous she-devil and suggested, once again in picture, that the pope, cardinals, and bishops should be hung from gallows with their tongues nailed alongside.

Not all of his later polemics were vulgar; many had strong political overtones, and so raise the question whether religious principle was occasionally being subordinated to politics. By the late 1520's, most of the leaders of the Protestant estates were prepared to use armed force to defend their faith, even against an imperially led attack. In *Warning to His Dear German People* (1531) and *Concerning the Three Hierarchies* (1539), Luther appeared to sustain the ruler's decision, even though in earlier years he had most adamantly rejected armed resistance to the emperor in defense of faith. In the 1530's the Protestant rulers also decided to reject out of hand a papal invitation to a general council of the church, although for years they and Luther had called for a council. Although Luther disagreed with their decision, he was given the task of discrediting the council called by the pope and justifying the Protestant refusal to participate in it. He was also given the task of justifying in print the seizure of the bishopric of Naumburg by Elector Johann Friedrich, and he defended and applauded the two offensives of the League of Schmalkalden against Brauschweig-Wolfenbuttel. He was much criticized at the time for many of these activities and publications, which have cast a shadow over the older Luther's reputation to this day.

It is not the historian's job to save Luther's reputation on matters where he deserves censure. But the historian must insist that those who wish to dispense praise and blame first understand what they are judging. At the heart of this paper rests the conviction that in both popular and scholarly works the older Luther is being judged without a full understanding of the circumstances he faced. It is only as we enlarge our view to consider the changed character of the Reformation movement by the late 1520's, the new pressures impinging on Luther, and the severely limited alternatives that he faced, that we can fairly

judge the polemics of his later years. To view Luther as entangled within his net of time and circumstances is to transcend the need to accuse or to excuse.

Illness and Anger

It is sometimes argued that the polemical excesses of the older Luther are attributable to his age and poor health—he was violent, abusive, vulgar, and overly verbose because he was a sick, irascible, and slightly senile old man. It is true that throughout his career as a reformer Luther was often not well.[3] At one time or another he suffered from constipation, diarrhea, frequent headaches, dizziness, an open ulcer on his leg, severe and recurring uric acid stone attacks, probable arthritis, and severe angina, among other afflictions. Spasms caused by stone attacks are among the most painful experiences that one can have. It seems unlikely that these medical problems would have failed to contribute to Luther's infamous irascibility. His generally poor health, and especially his probable arteriosclerosis with its usual circulation impairment, raises the question of possible senility, or at least of reduced intellectual acuity, in his later years. Renal damage may have been caused by extended retention of urine during the acute stone attacks of 1537.[4] Each condition may have exacerbated the other conditions. Finally, it has been argued by some that Luther, especially the older Luther, was mentally ill, a manic-depressive.[5]

That Luther suffered from severe illnesses and depression cannot be denied. That he was mentally ill, a manic-depressive, is another matter altogether, and has been hotly disputed.[6] Although it seems highly unlikely that illness played no role in shaping some of the later polemics, it is, as we shall see in a moment, difficult to discern a pattern of influence.

Luther's repeated complaint that his illnesses kept him from his work suggests at least one way to test for the effects of illness and age: how productive was Luther during these later years? This is not, actually, an easy question to answer, as there are many confounding factors; but statistics on publications are suggestive.[7]

To begin with, it must be remembered that by almost any standard, Luther was enormously productive throughout his life. In 1531 he was sick for six months and still produced 180 sermons, wrote at least 100 letters and 15 treatises, lectured on Galatians, and worked on his translation of the Old Testament.

And in 1537, when he suffered his most severe and debilitating stone attack, he preached some 90 sermons, lectured, wrote at least 55 letters, and produced some 25 treatises. Many of the treatises of this year were written during his convalescence from the stone attack. By themselves these statistics represent truly remarkable productivity. Only when such figures are compared with Luther's earlier years can the effects of illness and age be assessed.

If attention is turned to 1530 as a plausible dividing line between the younger and the older Luther, it is seen that two-thirds of his first editions issued from the press during the period 1516–1530. In the remaining fifteen years of his life, the period 1531–1546, Luther produced the remaining third of his original works. The decrease in Luther's publishing activity is even more dramatic than these figures suggest, since nearly thirty percent of the original publications during the later period are short forewords to the works of others. Only about eleven percent of his original publications in the earlier period are forewords. As large as this decline was, it must be understood in relation to the prodigious productivity of the earlier period. Excluding Bible translations, some 360 of Luther's original works were printed in the period 1516–1530. The latter period saw only 184 original works, yet this is still a staggering number by any measure.

It must be stressed that the major decline in Luther's productivity came in the late 1520's, years before his most severe illnesses; 1523 witnessed the greatest number of first editions of Luther's works. The real decrease in publication did not come until after 1525. The most significant decline in first editions occurs between the period 1521–1525 and the period 1526–1530: 192 first editions in the earlier period and only 95 in the following period. Given its timing and character, this sharp decline in the second half of the 1520's may be more plausibly explained by the development of the Reformation beyond Martin Luther, by effects of the Peasants' War, or by changes in the printing industry rather than by changes in Luther's health.[8]

The decline in the number of original publications during the last fifteen years of Luther's life was very gradual, with no sharp discontinuity in, for example, 1537, that might point to the effects of renal failure or the onset of acute senility or manic-depressive psychosis. From 1531 to 1535, some 74 original works appeared, from 1536 to 1540 the figure dropped to 61, and in the last five years, 1541 to early 1546, there appeared 49 original works.

It seems likely that aging and ill health played some role in the gradual decline during the last fifteen years of Luther's life. The quantitative evidence does not allow us to go beyond this bland conclusion. The evidence does not support any hypothesis positing a sharp discontinuity in the late 1530's indicating the onset of senility or mental illness.

What about a qualitative decline? It is true that his most infamous polemics, his most vulgar and violent attacks, occur during the last five or six years of his life. But once again the pattern is not clear, and a precipitating cause, or causes, is difficult to discern. Luther continued to produce lucid, well-reasoned argument and exegesis up to his death. For example, his masterwork *On the Councils and the Church* (1539) was composed after his major stone in 1537; he continued to lecture on Genesis until 1545; and massive and important revisions of his Bible translation occurred during this period.

Every polemic Luther produced during these later years contained sections devoted to clear and persuasive exposition of doctrine and exegesis of Scripture. One may take, for example, *Against Hanswurst* (1541), a politically inspired treatise, and one of the coarsest Luther ever produced. Fully two-thirds of the treatise is given over to violent, uninhibited attacks on Duke Heinrich and his Catholic allies. Yet the treatise is remarkable for the great eloquence of its insults and for the injection of some theological considerations into an otherwise largely secular debate. Sandwiched between the invective and abuse is a lucid discussion of the characteristics of the true and false church and a briefer comment on the distinction between person and office. The independent worth of this section on the true and false church was attested to by its later publication in combination with the "Schmalkadic Articles."

Luther's notorious vulgarity and violence of expression shows no clear pattern that demonstrates the influence of mental or physical illness. Throughout his later years, Luther produced both violent and temperate polemics. For example, Luther's violent and abusive *Against Hanswurst* was followed four years later by the moderate *To the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse Concerning the Captured Heinrich of Braunschweig* (1545). The differences between these two treatises can best be explained not by changes in Luther's physical or mental health but by changes in external circumstances.

The abuse and coarseness found in the earlier treatise was a

deliberate polemical tactic, and it was in keeping with the general tenor of the dispute. In the later treatise Luther sought to dissuade the landgrave from releasing Duke Heinrich, who had been recently captured by the Protestants. This goal called for a calm, reasoned argument, which Luther easily produced.

The Struggle Between the True and False Church

The polemics of the old Luther cannot be adequately explained by pathology, nor can they be fully explained by reference to Luther's Augustinian view of history or his apocalpytic expectations, although both these factors were probably more influential than his ill health. Early in his career as a reformer, Luther's reading of the Bible had convinced him that practically from the beginning of the world there had been a perpetual, unchanging struggle between the true and false church.[9] He saw this struggle involving a recurrent contest between true and false prophets and apostles. Believing that mankind did not change and that the devil never slept, he saw the struggles that went on in the days of the prophets and the apostles as being no different from the struggles going on in his own time. Their experiences established a paradigm of the dynamics of all sacred history.

Within this paradigm, the papacy was the antichrist; the Turks were Gog; contemporary Jewry was the remnant of a rejected people suffering under God's wrath; and his Protestant opponents were contemporary false prophets and apostles. They were all members of the false church; behind them loomed the figure of the devil, the father of lies. More often than not, Luther directed his polemical attack at the devil he saw behind his opponents rather than at the opponents themselves. Furthermore, since Luther was always drawing comparisons and parallels between these opponents and the opponents of the prophets and apostles, it was only natural that he would see the true prophets and apostles as having provided a precedent for the way in which one should deal with such opponents. As a result, he could explain and justify his polemics and his stubbornness on points of doctrine by pointing to the example set by these men of God.

Luther's view of history and of his own role in it can help explain some of the polemics of the old Luther. It can help us understand how Luther could recommend such harsh and inhumane treatment of Jews and supporters of the papacy. He thought he was attacking the devil himself. Some of Luther's

language may also be attributed to this biblically-based view of the struggle. When, for example, he rebuked his age for its failings, it was a prophet like Jeremiah from whom he often borrowed his style, his tone, even the language itself. And when he blasted the papacy as a wanton whore, he was borrowing polemics from Hosea and Ezekiel.

But this explanation, also, is insufficient. Luther's view of the world and his role in the struggle between the true and false church develops early and is fully formed by 1531. It cannot fully account for the peculiar polemics of the last years.

Luther's apocalyptic expectations must also be considered.[10] It cannot be denied that the passion of Luther's polemics was increased by his conviction that he was living in the last times. In his writings and in his prayers, he was torn between bewailing these signs of his time and hailing them as a certain prelude to the Last Judgment. However, as important as his apocalyptic beliefs were for his later polemics, this apocalyptic dimension does not account for a change. An apocalyptic mood suffuses nearly all of the older Luther's polemics. One may consider, for example, some of his most overtly apocalyptic writings:[11] *On War Against the Turks* and *The Army Sermon Against the Turks* (1529), *Admonition to Prayer Against the Turks* (1541), and *Admonition to the Pastors in the Superintendency of the Church of Wittenburg,* co-authored with Johann Bugenhagen (1543). In all these writings the true antichrist for Luther was the Pope, but the Turks were seen as the devil incarnate, Gog, and the little horn in the Book of Daniel. The only striking difference between the earlier writings and the later ones, however, is the greater pessimism about the likelihood of imperial success against the Turks. Not only was there the intervening record of constant defeat to sour Luther's expectations, but there was also what he viewed as an increasing ingratitude of the Germans toward the renewed gospel and an ever-expanding worldliness and sinfulness at all social levels.

This last point suggests certain personal factors that may have compounded Luther's general apocalyptic expectations. The older Luther was sorely disappointed with the course of events from the mid-1520's onward. Such disappointment is often adduced to explain how Luther could pen the tolerant and sympathetic *That Jesus Christ was Born a Jew* in 1523 and then display such total intolerance, and make such inhumane and violent recommendations concerning the Jews, in the anti-Jewish treatises of his last years.[12] Luther's apocalyptic mood

may also have been reinforced by his fears for the fate of the Reformation movement after his own death. These fears were shared by others. Elector Johann Friedrich commissioned the "Schmalkaldic Articles" partly to serve as Luther's "last testament" both against Catholics and against deviants within the Lutheran ranks. Luther himself seems to have viewed as his last testament against these different opponents his anti-Jewish treatises of 1543, his *Short Confession on the Supper* (1544), and *Against the Papacy at Rome, Founded by the Devil* (1545) along with the associated cartoons. When asked why he had published the cartoons, Luther replied that he realized that he did not have long to live and yet he still had much which ought to be revealed about the papacy and its kingdom. For this reason he had published the pictures, each a whole book's worth of what ought to be written about the papacy. It was, he stated, his testament.

I freely concede that Luther's health, world-view, apocalyptic expectations, and fears for the Reformation movement after his own demise are all significant for an understanding of his later polemics. But I would add that the external circumstances and challenges that he and his movement faced in these later years may be even more significant for an understanding of Luther's polemics.

From Movement to Church

The Peasants' War of 1525, the visitations of 1527 and 1528, the threatening recesses of the diets of 1529 and 1530, the formation of the Protestant League of Schmalkalden in 1531—these and similar events in the late 1520's and early 1530's were both cause and effect of a transition from a revolutionary movement consisting primarily of ideologically committed individuals to a more conservative movement led by rulers of territories and city-states.

This transition was unavoidable if the Reformation was to endure. It is one thing to initiate a revolution; it is quite another to pass it on to your descendants. The former may be accomplished with belief and individual effort; the latter requires institutions and bureaucracy. But these new circumstances imposed new and difficult requirements on Luther. They called for a willingness to compromise, to accommodate belief to political necessity, to take sides publicly in disputes where no great prin-

ciples were at stake and where ideological conviction found itself leagued with political self-interest. Too great a readiness to compromise or reach accommodation would have opened him to the charge of hypocrisy and insincerity, accusations fatal to his authority. Too great a rigidity and dedication to complete consistency and purity would have deprived him of influence over crucial events. Principles had to bend to necessity.

The years after 1530 saw a shift in Luther's correspondence and his published polemics that reflected the change in the character of the Reformation movement itself. A much larger percentage of his total correspondence in these later years was directed to secular authorities.[13] A similar change occurred with his polemics. The polemics of the previous decade or so included a significant number of treatises that were directed towards the unconverted, open-minded Catholics and dedicated to the exposition of the Protestant faith. In contrast, the polemics of these later years were largely works of exhortation, aimed at the converted and designed to deepen beliefs already held; these were often politically inspired and of direct political significance.

This shift in the character of Luther's polemics and their intended audience is manifested also in the locations where the works were printed and reprinted.[14] In contrast to the earlier years where a number of printing centers throughout Germany accounted for a substantial percentage of works by Luther, the later years saw most of the printings and reprintings being done in Wittenberg, supplemented by the production of a few staunchly Lutheran cities in central and northern Germany. Luther, statistics suggest, had become the publicist for an established, territorially defined ideology.

Of course, the greatly heightened role of politics and the accompanying shift in the character and audience of Luther's polemics come a good decade before the 1540's. For example, in the matter of armed resistance to the emperor for the sake of the Gospel, Luther, under pressure from Landgrave Philipp, from the elector, and especially from the jurists and political advisors, grudgingly "allowed" the Protestant estates in 1530 to adopt a positive legal justification for such resistance.[15] This stance left him profoundly uncomfortable. In fact, the tension he felt seems to have spilled over into the polemics he wrote on this issue. Despite his own theological reservations, in *Warning to His Dear Germans* (1531), Luther encouraged the Protestants

to resist a Catholic attack on the basis of practical considerations, even if the attack was led by the emperor. With its impassioned language, abusive characterizations of opponents, and almost summary discussions of the theological issues involved, it was obviously intended to be a treatise of exhortation rather than explanation. It may have deepened convictions already held, but it was unlikely to convert anyone from outside the Protestant ranks. In short, its intended audience was Protestant, not Catholic or any third party. And its intended purpose was to rally Protestants to the defense of their faith, not to convince them to resist passively an unjust attack by the Catholic emperor. It was a political polemic, and it was written at the request of Landgrave Philipp. It and *Concerning the Three Hierarchies* (1539), which justified resistance to the empereror when he was acting as a servant of the papacy, served the interests of the League of Schmalkalden and were reprinted whenever there was a threat of Catholic attack.

Many of the polemics of Luther's last six years were similarly political and written at the express request of Luther's elector. The issues on which they were written were normally not of Luther's choosing. On a number of occasions, Elector Johann Friedrich quite deliberately used Luther's rhetorical skills in political matters. Luther's participation in the dispute with Duke Heinrich of Braunschweig-Wolfenbuttel and his justification of the electoral seizure of the bishopric of Naumburg are the two more prominent examples, but not the only ones.[16] In fact, except for *Against the Bishop of Magdeburg, Cardinal Albrecht* (1539), all the major anti-Catholic and anti-Turkish polemics of his last years were written at the instigation of the elector. Even *Against the Papacy at Rome* (1545), the most violent and vulgar treatise to issue from Luther's pen, was written at the behest of Elector Johann Friedrich. In short, the elector was using Luther's extraordinary polemical abilities as one more weapon in the ongoing struggle between Protestant and Catholic forces. Luther's task was to exhort Protestants to stand fast in the face of the Catholic and Turkish threat and to reassure them that God was on their side. The elector encouraged and commended Luther's vehemence and even vulgarity, not only for the works that he himself had commissioned, but also for works which attacked the Jews and the Sacramentarians. The vulgarity and violence of the treatises of the old Luther may be partly attributable to Luther's ill-health, world-view and beliefs, but some of the responsibility must be apportioned but

to the changed, more political circumstances in which the Reformer found himself, and to the encouragement he received from Landgrave Philipp and Elector Johann Friedrich.

But like earlier explanations, this one is only partial, and potentially misleading if not qualified. The old Luther was not a docilely obedient publicist for the League of Schmalkalden or the elector of Saxony. When his conscience demanded it, he defied even a direct electoral prohibition and refused to count the political costs of his action. As he saw it, if he did not respond to public attacks on his teachings, it was equivalent to denying and forsaking them. So when the Catholic Duke Georg of Saxony publicly attacked the *Warning to His Dear German People* and *Glosses on the Alleged Imperial Edict* (1531), Luther replied, ignoring his elector's command that he not publish an attack on the duke. In the negotiations that followed the public dispute, Luther stated the limits of his obedience. He would refrain in the future from anti-Catholic polemics, but only "to the extent that it is possible in respect to my conscience and the [Protestant] teachings." Some years later, in his public dispute with Cardinal Albrecht over the death of Hans Schonitz, Luther once again followed his conscience rather than the dictates of political wisdom. Unable in good conscience to remain silent in the face of the Cardinal's wrongdoing, Luther did what he could to minimize possible adverse effects on the Protestant cause, but he published his attack nonetheless. Finally he forced the elector to abandon plans to attack the city of Halle and refused to countenance publicly Landgrave Philipp's bigamy despite threats that the landgrave would defect to the Catholics or attack him in print.

An examination of Luther's last battles reveals a man who saw the world engaged in a metaphysical struggle between good and evil. He was a man gripped by apocalyptic hopes and fears; a man who had given his name to a movement that had taken, from his perspective, a painful and frustrating direction. He was a man deeply involved in the politics of his time—as an advisor to his prince and coreligionists, as an indirect participant in colloquies between Protestants and Catholics, as a worried observer of wars and threats of war, and as the most influential publicist within Protestantism. Through compromise and accomodation to political realities, he tried to maintain his influence in order to preserve his central insights into Christian faith. But opponents and circumstances disappointed his hopes

and marred his efforts. He often found himself mired in petty disputes that brought neither him nor the movement any credit. He was misunderstood and held responsible for actions that he himself deplored. As his own death neared, bringing with it both promised relief and fear for the fate of the movement, he became ever more pessimistic, praying not only for his own release but for the end of the world.

Luther remained involved and productive to his death. Sustained by his faith, his trust in God as the author of history, and his robust sense of humor, he continued to learn and grow, especially in his study of history. He was vulgar and abusive when he wished to be, moderate and calmly persuasive when it suited his purposes. But, most importantly, all the treatises of his old age, even the most crude and abusive , contained some exposition of the Protestant faith. Luther could never just attack; he always had to profess and confess as well.

FOOTNOTES

1. This essay is drawn from my *Luther's Last Battles: Politics and Polemics, 1531-46* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983), where the various issues are discussed in detail with appropriate references. [Ed. This book is available through the seminary bookstore.]
2. The most thorough and authoritative study of the older Luther is the study by Julius Kostlin, revised in 1903 by Gustav Kawerau (*Martin Luther, Sein Leben und Seine Schriften,* fifth edition (Berlin, 1903); volume two deals with the older Luther). A two-volume collection of essays on the older Luther was recently edited and published by Helmar Junghans, *Leben und Werk Martin Luthers von 1526 bis 1546* (Gottingen, 1983). H. G. Haile, *Luther: An Experiment in Biography* (New York, 1980) offers a fine, sprightly overview that focuses on the older Luther.
3. There is considerable literature on Luther's physical and mental health. Among the best is Annemarie Halder, *Das Harnsteinleiden Martin Luthers* (Munich, 1969). See also Friedrich Kuchenmeister, *Dr. Martin Luthers Krankengeschichte* (Leipzig, 1881); Wilhelm Ebstein, *D. Martin Luthers Krankheiten und deren Einfluss auf seinen korperlichen und geistigen Zustand* (Stuttgart, 1908); Erwin Mulhaupt, "Luthers Kampf mit der Krankheit," *Luther* 29(1958):115-23; and Ethel Bacchus and H. Kenneth Scatliff, eds., "Martin Luther: A Panel Postmortem," *Chicago Medicine* 69(1966):107-16.
4. This is suggested by H. G. Haile, *Luther: An Experiment in Biography,* pp. 220-221.

5. Four of the more prominent, and notorious, diagnoses are Heinrich Deinifle, *Luther und Luthertum in der ersten Entwicklung* (Mainz, 1904); Albert Maria Weiss, *Lutherpsychologie als Schlussel zur Lutherlegende: Erganzungen zu Denifles Luther und Lutherthum* (Mainz, 1906); Hartmann Grisar, *Luther,* 3 vols. (Freiburg, 1911–12); and Paul J. Reiter, *Martin Luthers Umwelt, Character und Psychose,* vol. 2 (Copenhagen, 1941). Drawing heavily on these Catholic works is Erik Erikson, *Young Man Luther* (New York, 1958). Erikson's book, in turn, has generated considerable secondary literature. For a bibliography and several of the best articles on the subject, see Roger Johnson, ed., *Psychohistory and Religion: The Case of Young Man Luther* (Philadelphia, 1977).

6. For several replies to the works cited in the previous note, see Gustav Kawerau, *Luther in katholischer Beleuchtung: Glossen zu H. Grisars Luther* (Leipzig, 1911); Heinrich Boehmer, *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung,* fifth ed. (Leipzig, 1918); and Eberhard Grossmann, *Beitrage zur psychologischen Analyse der Reformatoren Luther and Calvin* (Basel, 1958).

7. On Luther's productivity, see Alfred Dieck, "Luthers Schaffenskraft," *Luther* 27(1956):35-39, for a year-by-year summary of Luther's productivity. In chapter one and the appendix of *Luther's Last Battles,* my own statistical survey of Luther's publication is discussed, which is partly summarized here.

h. The older Marxist argument that the Peasants' War marked the end of the popular Reformation was challenged by Franz Lau's classic article "Der Bauernkrieg und das angebliche Ende der lutherischen Reformation als spontaner Volksbewegung," *Luther Jahrbuch* 26(1959):109–34. The debate is far from over, however. (The best recent work on the Peasants' War, now translated into English, is Peter Blickle, *The Revolution of 1525: The German Peasants' War from a New Perspective,* translated by Thomas A. Brady, Jr. and H. C. Erik Midelfort (Baltimore, 1981). The editors have provided a useful bibliography of relevant English publications). On the face of it, this decline in publication would appear to support those who see an end to the popular Reformation in these years. Miriam Chrisman, however, has shown in the case of Strasbourg that all types of printing declined at this time, and not merely religious materials. So this decline may reflect economic changes rather than a waning of interest in Luther's works (Cf. Miriam Chrisman, *Lay Culture, Learned Culture: Books and Social Change in Strasbourg, 1480–1599* [New Haven, 1982]).

9. The literature on these issues is immense, See Mark U. Edwards Jr., *Luther and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, 1969); Scott Hendrix, *Ecclesia in Via: Ecclesiological Developments in the Medieval Psalms Ex-*

egesis and the Dictata super Psalterium (1513-1515) of Martin Luther (Leiden, 1974); Ernst Schafer, *Luther als Kirchenhistoriker* (Gutersloh, 1897); John M. Headley, *Luther's View of Church History* (New Haven, 1963); Hans von Campenhausen, "Reformatorisches Selbstbewusstsein und reformatorishes Geschichtsbewusstein bei Luther, 1517-1522," *Archiv fur Reformationsgeschichte* 37(1940):128-49; Wolfgang Gunter, "Die geschichtstheologischen Voraussetzungen von Luthers Selbstverstandnis," in *Von Konstanz nach Trient. Beitrage zur Kirchengeschichte von den Reformkonzilien bis zum Tridentinum. Festgabe fur August Franzen, ed. R. Baumer (Paderborn, 1972), pp. 379-94; Wolfgang Hohne, Luthers Anschauungen uber die Kontinuitat der Kirche* (Berlin-Hamburg, 1963), pp. 124-56; and Ulrich Asendorf, *Eschatologie bei Luther* (Gottigen, 1967), pp. 214-21.

10. This aspect is heavily stressed by Heiko Oberman in *Luther: Mensch zwischen Gott und Teufel* (Berlin, 1981) (This volume will soon appear in English translation, published by Yale University Press).
11. On the Turks and on Luther's writings against the Turks, see John W. Bohnstedt, *The Infidel Scourge of God: The Turkish Menace as Seen by German Pamphleteers of the Reformation Era,* Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 56, part 9 (Philadelphia, 1968); George W. Forell, "Luther and the War Against the Turks," *Church History* 14(1945):256-71; Stephen A. Fischer-Galati, *Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism, 1521-1555* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959); H. Lamparter, *Luther Stellung zum Turkenkrieg* (Munich, 1940); Harvey Buchanan, "Luther and the Turks, 1519-1529," ARG 47(1956):145-59; Egil Grislis, "Luther and the Turks," *Muslim World* 64(1974):180-93, 275-91; and chapter five, *Luther's Last Battles.*
12. *The literature on Luther's relation to the Jews is so vast that a monograph recently appeared on the liturature itself (Johannes Brosseder, Luthers Stellung zu den Juden im Spiegel seiner Interpreten. Interpretation und Rezeption von Luthers Schriften und Ausserungen zum Judentum im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert vor allem in deutschsprachigen Raum* [Munich, 1972]). See also Kurt Meier, "Zur Interpretation von Luthers Judenschriften," in *Vierhundertfunfzig Jahre lutherische Reformation, 1517-1967* (Berlin-Gottingen, 1967), pp. 233-52; C. Bernd Sucher, *Luthers Stellung zu den Juden. Eine Interpretation aus germanistischer Sicht* (Nieuwkoop, 1977), pp. 125-99.). For detailed examination of this issue, see especially Wilhelm Maurer, "Die Zeit der Reformation," in *Kirche und Synagoge,* edited by Karl-Heinrich Rengstorf and Siegfried von Kortzfleisch (Stuttgart, 1968), 1:363-452; Heiko A. Oberman, *Wurzeln des Antisemitismus: Christenangst und Judenplage im Zeitalter von Humanismus und Refor-*

mation (Berlin, 1981) (soon to appear in English translation, published by Fortress Press); and chapter 6, *Luther's Last Battles.*

13 *See Karl Trudinger, Luthers Briefe und Gutachten an weltliche Obrigkeiten zur Durchfuhrung der Reformation* (Munster, 1975), 8–10.

14. Cf. *Luther's Last Battles,* chapter 12.

15. The literature on Luther and resistance is vast, especially if the many pieces on Luther's two kingdoms doctrinear-??onsidered. For a general overview of the recent literature, see Rudolf Ohlig, *Die Zwei ± Reiche ± Lehre Luthers in der Auslegung der deutschen lutherischen Theologie der Gegenwart seit 1945* (Bern, 1974); and the bibliography in Heinz Scheible, ed., *Das Widerstandsrecht als Probl ± ???y? deutschen Protestanten* (Gutersloh, 1969). Very useful is the older work by Karl Muller, *Luthers Ausserungen uber das Recht des bewaffneten Widerstands gegen den Kaiser* (Munich, 1915). Two recent works are also useful: Hermann Kunst, *Evangelischer Glaube und @o?W?ische Verantwortung: Martin Luther als politischer Berater seiner Landesherrn und seine Teilnahme an den Fragen des offentlichen Lebens* (Stuttgart, 1976); and Eike Wolgast, *Die Wittenberger Theologie und die Politik der evangelischen Stande* (Gutersloh, 1977). Wolgast's discussion is by far the best recent consideration of the matter, and should be consulted by those interested in all the legal and theological details. In English one might consult Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought,* vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1978); W. D. J. Cargill Thompson, "Luther and the Right of Resistance to the Emperor," in C. W. Dugmore, ed. *Studies in the Reformation: Luther to Hooker* (London, 1980); and chapter 2, *Luther's Last Battles.*

16 Luther's Last Battles, chapters 7 and 8.

Dr. Mark U. Edwards, Jr., is a professor of history at Purdue University.

The Doctrine of Man:

Christian Anthropology

Eugene F. Klug

Centuries ago Protagoras confidently claimed that "man is the measure of all things." But how accurate could that measure be if man did not even know himself? Time has not erased the wringing of the hands, expressed so vividly by Schopenhauer concerning the why and wherefore and whence of man: "How I wish I knew!"

Man has broken into the powerplant of the atom and demonstrated almost unlimited potential with his technological triumphs; but along with his mushroom clouds he has merely lighted up the central problem of human existence, which is man himself. Quite rightly Reinhold Niebuhr assessed the situation in his famous work, *Nature and Destiny of Man,* thus: "man has always been his own most vexing problem."[1] Herman Dooyeweerd, the Dutch thinker, chimes in, saying that the world of every day experience is not and has not been man's main problem as much as he is the problem himself.[2]

Who is this creature who struggles constantly to understand himself, who stands in the midst of miriads of triumphs of all kinds and yet is afraid of his own shadow, as it were? Anatomically man has been described as the most ingenious assemblage of portable plumbing (when it is working); biologically, as the most formidable of all the beasts of prey; psychologically, as noble in reason and infinite in faculties. Just as often he is delineated as a hopeless mess. Garcin, a leading character in Jean-Paul Sartre's *No Exit,* enlarges on this last point: "So this is hell. I'd never have believed it. You remember all we were told about the torture-chambers, the fire and brimstone, the 'burning marl.' Old wives' tales! There's no need for red-hot pokers. Hell is —other people!" This fatalistic note in modern existentialistic philosophy is vividly expressed by Samuel Beckett's characters in *Waiting for Godot:*

Vladimir: "Nothing you can do about it."

Estragon: "No use struggling."

Vladimir: "One is what one is."

Such a sense of futility concerning human existence, of life itself, has plagued man from earliest times. Time and time again poets, novelists, thinkers from various schools have repeated the refrain so often voiced by the ancient Greek thinkers: "For men on earth 'tis best never to be born at all; or being born, to pass through the gates of Hades with all speed."

The Philosophical Views

Yet carefully developed, closely reasoned philosophical systems have attempted to define the nature of man and offer the solution for his perplexity concerning himself and his existence. Idealism (Hume, Kant, Jefferson, Emerson, Whitehead, Dewey) bravely maintains faith in man and his capacities. The concept of sin has no place in this thinking, except perhaps as a kind of negative inertia. The light of reason will in time enable man to emerge from the innocence of nature to a fuller, more mature knowledge, understanding, and virtue.

Naturalism (Huxley, Teilhard de Chardin, and the host of evolutionists) views man as a more highly developed animal. Infinite progress in the future is man's hope. Increase of knowledge will enable him, as the most highly cultured animal, to effect increasing harmonization of the now seemingly hostile forces around him. Louis Leakey and his son Richard have moved gravel around in search of fossil remains in central Africa, meanwhile feuding with each other as to their meaning. With the optimism characteristic of a typical evolutionist the younger Leakey portends: "By searching our long-buried past for an understanding of what we are, we may discover some insight into our future." Amoralistic, naturalism admits nothing like sin, recognizing only that man is influenced and shaped by forces within (heredity) and without (nature), over which he needs to triumph. The mistake of naturalism is obvious: it puts man too low on the scale of creation.

Romanticism represents a reaction against rationalism. In the vein of Whitman, it is highly ego-centric. Man is sinless, something divine. Evil is a minus quality, a mere negation, an unreality. Man is inherently good and needs only to let the power of good come to expression through his own inner mystical resources.

Modern psychology pictures man as caught up in his efforts to try to deal with his predicaments through various mechanisms: withdrawal, activism, or placebos of various kinds

by which to tranquilize his fears. Freud's answer was to rid the self of repression, to deny guilt feelings. Others, like Jung and later contemporaries, urge man's need for confession, to "let it all out," for truth's sake, not for the sake of forgiveness, unless it be forgiving oneself in a kind of self-justification.

Existentialism (Sartre, for example, rather than Kierkegaard) paints a gloomy picture for man, holding out no hope really, other than that of using his freedom to act. To do this in closest connection with what appears to be right and relevant to life's problems at any given moment is to achieve authentic existence, or being, or self-realization. This is one's redemption, if redemption is to be spoken of at all. Sin or moral wrong simply do not exist. Albert Camus portrays existentialist thinking perfectly through the mouth of his leading character in *The Fall:* "Since finding my solution, I yield to everything, to women, to pride, to boredom, to resentment, and even to the fever that I feel delightfully rising at this moment. I dominate at last, but forever. Quickly I crush everything, people and things, under the weight of my own infirmity, and at once I perk up."[3]

Marxist socialism preaches that man is not inherently evil. The only evil is estrangement from nature, self, or others. God does not fit into the picture. In dialectical materialism God simply is out of style. The sources of alienation are especially money, with its corrupting greed impulse, and self-aggrandizement through the accumulation of wealth. The goal for man is the non-acquisitive life in which workers, so goes the theory, enjoy work again, gain control over nature, disclaim all class distinctions, political competition, and strife. Each worker seeks the good of the state, or the greatest number, the proletariat, according to the Marxist "gospel."

A pathetic sort of optimism courses through these philosophical views of man. He simply becomes more wrapped up in himself and travels further from the truth. None of these natural philosophies deals adequately with the moral issues and problems, especially the fact of man's moral failure before God. The idea of sin is repugnant and offensive, especially original sin. The fall itself is counted as absurd. Even considering it to be significant in a legendary sort of way, as Niebuhr and most modern theologians do, does not help matters at all. Man, as a result, resembles some modern-day Don Quixote, the knight of doleful countenance, with a barber's dish for a helmet, a sway-back nag for a charger, and a rusty sword in his hand, riding off in all directions, fighting battles that really do not

count, against imaginary foes (or windmills) that are not there, for a lady fair who does not even exist. There is no helping a man who refuses to see himself as God sees him, who continues to think that his "destiny is in his own hands" (Alexis Carrel).

The Biblical View

If we ask the Bible the question of what is man, the answer comes through loud and clear, as from a two-manual organ with all stops pulled. Both testaments, Old and New, key in on man's nature. Actually, however, the Bible's great theme is God, not man first of all. Man is the secondary concern of Scripture's revelation; God is first and primary. Thus Holy Scripture, the inspired Word of God, focuses attention on man vis-a -vis God. There is no puzzle here anent man's nature and meaning. Man is the background and foil against which we see God's creation, plan, activity. God, the source of life, is wondrously concerned about man and his relationship to the Creator. "History," notes Walther Eichrodt, "is a movement effected by God, which challenges man and gives him his destiny and his task."[4]

God's concern for man is present from the beginning, even after the fall. "Adam, where art thou?" sounds the voice of God in the garden (Gen. 3:9). "Where is Abel thy brother?" God asks the angered murderer Cain, who had spilled his brother's blood (Gen. 4:9). "Where wast thou when I laid the foundation of the earth?" is God's question out of the whirlwind to Job (38:4). "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?" David sings in praise of God's all-seeing providence (Ps. 139:7). "Where?"and "Whither?" echo again and again through Holy Scripture. God is asking the questions, and thus man is given to understand his place or station, his existence and being, before God. Both man's greatness and his *Angst* stem from God's intentions and vigilance concerning man, from man's accountability before God, and not *vice versa*. This is a vital point, since it sharply distinguishes between Christian theology's approach to the question concerning man's nature and that of human philosophy, psychology, and biology. In these disciplines man stands before the mirror, and sees and studies himself. He grants the idea of ego or personality to himself. As an afterthought he introduces the idea of God. The answers he gets are no more satisfying than the questions he asks; he creates "God"

in his own image.

How different is the witness of Scripture! Now it is not man asking about himself, but God asking about man. The answer to the question of who he is, or what he is, is not in what man thinks or knows about himself, but in what he is in the judgment of God. Self-understanding is thus embraced in the understanding of God, God's intent and purpose for man. Though of lowly origin, dust and clay (Gen. 2:7; Job 4:19), and, since the fall, like grass that withers and like flowers that fade, to be lost in the ground from which they sprang (Ps. 90:5,6; 103:15,16; Is. 40:6,7,22), man is still the most elevated part of God's creation, fearfully and wonderfully made (Ps. 139:14–18) in the image and likeness of his Creator, with dominion over the created realm (Gen. 1:26,27; Ps. 82:6). How different is this view from man-oriented anthropocentric investigations which lead either to the virtual apotheosis of man, as in idealistic thinking, or the naturalistic denigrating of man to animal status. It is little wonder that man is troubled by what he sees, or rather by what he does not see; for as man increases in knowledge of and power over nature, he advances not an inch in knowledge of himself.

The question concerning man's nature and destiny is so very vital in every way. It impinges on every point of life and existence: man's vocation and work; marriage and family; government and social structure; education and culture. These all take their stamp and shape from the nature of man. Precisely for this reason the testimony which Scripture gives concerning man is extremely important, as God speaks concerning man's origin, meaning, destiny—answering the questions of whence, why, and whereto.

Whence Man

The question of man's origin is answered by the Bible on its very first pages, though not exclusively there. With united voice the inspired writers of Holy Writ account for man's existence through God's wondrous creation of him out of the dust of the ground (Gen. 2:7), much as a potter shapes a clay vessel (Jer. 18:6; Is. 64:8), but with the breath of life, so that man becomes a living soul by divine inbreathing (Gen. 2:7). How could the *gift* of life be more powerfully taught? Physically tied to the ground or to matter around him, by the creative power of God man becomes a living, beautiful person who throbs with life,

formed from the elemental creation around him (Ps. 139:13–16). Biologically like the animals, psychologically or personally like God who made him, man stands in a unique place before his Creator and in the created realm. A sharp line is drawn between his coming into being and that of all other animal life. Man is not just one in the multitude of animal forms, but a very special creation. The animals were created in groups; not so man. The creation of man and woman in the image of God was a special, distinct act for each.

Some have tried to distinguish sharply between image *(zelem)* and likeness *(demuth)*, as though the first referred to man's bodily and rational faculties, and the second to his spiritual likeness with God. There is no solid linguistic evidence supporting such a division; scripture uses the terms interchangeably (cf. Gen. 1:26,27; 5:1; 1 Cor. 15:49; Col. 3:10). Both mean the same thing, referring especially to the fact that man desired what God desired. Thus there was true knowledge of God in the mind, full conformity of the will to God's will, and uprightness of the soul in all its faculties. In this way man was patterned *after* his Maker *(Abbild)*; he was not *of* God's essence *(Ebenbild)*. This was a blissful condition; there was no fear, no sorrow, no evil, no terror, only perfect harmony with God and His created realm. This image, or likeness with God, was lost by the fall; man by nature was now ignorant of God, hostile to Him and His will, disdainful and incapable of things spiritually sound (1 Cor. 2:14). Only by his regeneration, or conversion, that is, by faith, are these new qualities once again *begun* in man, in the new man, the man of faith who has been transformed, not in essence, but in the sense of passessing new qualities of the mind, soul, will. Of these the Apostle Paul speaks in Ephesians 4:24 and Colossians 3:10. God has, in spite of man's fall and loss of the image (likeness), shown His loving intent for the sinner in seeking his redemption and reclaiming him as a child of God.

Why Man?

Man's destiny or purpose, under God, as the foremost of all the creatures which God made, was a most exalted one. Scripture details it in a threefold manner. First, God created man for His own enjoyment. Starting from the "very good" which expresses God's pleasure over man's creation in the first chapter

of Genesis, there is a consistent witness throughout the Scriptures to God's delight "in the sons of men" (Prov. 8:22–24, 30ff.). Man is created as God's intended counterpart by virtue of His delight in him, as an artist sculpts or paints by virtue of his pleasure in his craft. Even with the fall in the picture, this attitude of God towards man does not alter—even though by sin man became the target of God's just wrath. At the announcement of the Savior's birth, for example, the angels sang of God's "good will toward men" (Lk. 2:14). In a similar way the apostle Paul wrote of the kindness and love of God shown toward man through the Savior's coming (Tit. 3:4; 2:11). These verses, along with the whole New Testament (and the Old Testament Messianic promises), focus clearly on the gracious intent of God to send His only begotten Son for man's redemption, to restore men to the adoption of sons (Gal. 4:4,5; 2 Cor. 5:19). It is hard to conceive of a more wonderful truth in connection with man's destiny and purpose than that man was made and intended by God to give joy to God Himself.

Included in this purpose was God's intent to commune with His creature, man. Man's whole nature, different from the other creatures, was made for communication. The animals have brains, certain faculties, and remarkable instincts. Man is a communicating *person,* with soul and mind, and not just brain and body (cf. Wilder Penfield's *The Mystery of the Mind* and Mark P. Cosgrove's *The Essence of Man*).[5] Woman was placed at his side by God's special creation as a helpmeet, with whom he might communicate; and both were made for communion with their Creator in a manner totally unique among all creatures. Even after the fall, though now in different manner, God still has graciously revealed Himself to man, addressing him in his own language. Man rightly has been termed the "seeing eye on the body of creation" (Wilhelm Vischer) by virtue of his unique place in God's purposing.

Scripture speaks very pointedly of man's unique equipment as a specially created being. His God-given attributes included, first of all, his spiritual nature, that by which he was most distinguished from the rest of created things. Here was the source and fulcrum of his moral sense. The Hebrew term is *ruach*, equivalent to the *pneuma* of the Greek New Testament. It is regularly used of man only, not of animals; it designates the highest of inner properties in man and is immortal. The life principle in man is regularly identified with the Hebrew term *nephesh*, or the Greek *psyche;* and while it is sometimes also used

of animals, its standard application is to man, particularly when it refers to the center of the human personality. At that point it is indistinguishable from *ruach* or *pneuma*. The "heart" of man (*leb* in the Hebrew) denotes the hub of man's volitional and emotive powers; hence it is not used of animals in general. In a passage like Ezekiel 36:26, "a new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you," it is virtually identified with the spirit. Man's body (*basar* in Hebrew, *soma* in Greek) is a vital part of his created being, in no way denigrated in Old or New Testament. While it, too, like the soul, has been deeply affected by the fall into sin, it shall one day put off those shackles and be resurrected in glory.

Thus, man's body is no mere "prison house of the soul," as the Greeks taught, and as dualistic philosophy, within or outside of Christian theology, has held. Body and soul (or spirit) are man's constitutive make-up by God; both are vitally tied to his person. Yet each is distinct, with its own properties; so while it is within the property of the body to be destroyed, it is not the soul's to die. The picture Scripture gives is one of disarming simplicity and sobriety, free from all idealistic notions and abstruse speculation, also every vestige of nihilism. Man was intended by God to be a holy, perfect creature with perception and understanding, fit for rule over this created realm, a noble creature, whose body throbbed not only with life but with a living soul, or spirit, capable of fulfilling every function as God's trusted steward over the created realm. Man's destiny and endowment were wisely and wondrously planned by God.

For the sake of genuine fellowship God placed man under His divine will (Gen. 2:16). We may wonder at the strangeness of the test in connection with the trees in the Garden of Eden, but the fact is that man was to will freely the righteousness and goodness with which he had been constituted by God, for only a freely willed obedience would then have been true obedience and holiness. It was to be man's true beauty and glory (*Schmuck und Ehre*). He was to regard his Creator as Lord and God, with due respect, and obey Him willingly and eagerly, not as a mere puppet, of course, but as a free, responsible agent under his Creator. It is important to note that, even after man's fall, God's holy will remained the same; and so God's word to Abraham was the same as it had been to Adam in his purity before the fall: "I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect" (Gen. 17:1).

God also entrusted the earth to man as his habitation and do-

main, "to dress it and keep it" (Gen. 2:15). Thus God's estate was given as a bequest to man; he was to populate it, settle it with his descendants, and rule over it with all its mysterious resources and powers. This would afford him a full and rewarding life. Work itself thus was designed as a happy activity, not a negative, demeaning sort of drudgery as it became in the aftermath of the fall. Building, agriculture, scientific pursuits, cultural activity, technology, industry are all still in man's dominion; but now, at the same time that he engages in them, he corrupts them, even as he is corrupt through sin. "The hatred of work," states Dorothy Sayers in *The Zeal of Thy House,* "must be one of the most depressing consequences of the fall."[6] Nonetheless man's progress, in spite of his fallen nature, is one of the amazing records of history; and we might rightly wonder what his mastery might have been had he kept his first estate, pure and untarnished by sin. God gave man the earth not for irresponsible exploitation but as a sacred trust (Gen. 2:15; Ps. 24:1). Man was to deal carefully and discreetly with his entrusted possessions; he was personally endowed with gifts that uniquely prepared him for the high trust.

Whereto Man?

Man's end or goal, the "whereto," is set into a similar perspective by both Old Testament and New Testament. Life and death both issue from God, according to Scripture, though the latter only as a result of sin. Because of sin man faces death with puzzlement and horror, releasing his hold on life very grudgingly and with lament (Ps. 30:9). Man's fear, of course, is connected with man's knowledge of God's anger over his sin. Not to be overlooked, however, because of God's promise of salvation, are the triumphant notes, the brave "yets," as man faces the inevitable (Ps. 73:23–26). He can face it with the confidence of Job (Job 19:25–27).

Scripture accounts for death in man's existence as a direct result of his fall into sin. It was man's fateful mistrusting of God's command and Word, and his deferring to Satan's deceitful promise, which brought this now feared consequence upon him. Man's futile attempt to run and to cover himself from guilt, which had fallen upon him like a cloud, finally ends with the tearing apart of body and soul and the corruption of the grave. But mortality was not man's original lot; he dies because of the stain or mark of sin upon him. Death marks the final end

on this earth for man in his sorry, broken relationship with his Creator. Death is a steady drummer, and none escapes this appointment (Job 7:1-6).

Meanwhile man exists in *Angst* and passes through life troubled in mind and body, if not reconciled with his God. We know from Scripture, and from experience itself, that God has not withdrawn life from man, nor left him entirely alone. Solicitously God cared for Adam and Eve, even after the fall (Gen. 3:21), especially in preparing for them the way back to Him through His glorious promise of a Helper or Savior (Gen. 3:15). This *protevangelium,* or first Gospel, was so cheering and so real for our first parents, that when Eve bore her first son, she exclaimed: "I have the man, the Lord." This is the literal translation of Genesis 4:1 and betokens her earnest trust of God's promise.

The New Testament takes up the theme of the Old Testament concerning man's life of pain and death as a result of sin. By nature man stands under the same curse with Adam whose sin is in each of us. Original sin is the root sin, the sin of origin, and it is in every human being since the Fall; we bear Adam's sin and Adam's guilt upon us (Rom. 5:12-19). Man has lost his righteousness before God and come short of His glory (Rom. 3:22f.). He is enslaved by sin (Rom. 6:17) and, as a result, inherits sin's wages—death (Rom. 6:23).

But the New Testament especially takes up the joyous theme of salvation, notably so in the inspired writings of the Apostle Paul. God has provided for man's redemption. Eternal life is God's gift, freely given through Jesus Christ, our Lord (Rom. 6:23; 3:24). God did not leave man to languish hopelessly in his sin. He sent His own Son into the flesh and under the Law for man's sake, that we might again become God's adopted children (Gal. 4:4,5). Of this happy truth the angels sang as the announcement came to the shepherds: "Unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord" (Lk. 2:11). It was a salvation Christ worked out through His vicarious suffering and death, the Sinless One for all sinners, His death for all, for our life, that in Him we might be new creatures again (2 Cor. 5:15-17).

Thus Christ, who is the second Adam whose death removed the offence of the first Adam through whom all were made sinners (Rom. 5:15), is "the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of His person" (Heb. 1:3). He purges us from sin and delivers us from death and the devil by becoming a partaker

of our flesh and blood and tasting death for us (Heb. 2:14,15). With the Apostle John we can now joyfully exult: "Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is" (1 John 3:1f.). Through Christ the believer becomes fellow-heir with Christ (Rom. 8:17), an heir of salvation (Heb. 1:14), and comes to a station more lofty and exalted, in a sense, than was Adam's state in the first place; at least, it is no less so. For now that Christ has become the first-fruit of them that slept by His resurrection (1 Cor. 15:20f.), so also we, in the resurrection of our mortal bodies, shall put on immortality and be clothed with a spiritual body, whereby "as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (1 Cor. 15:49). In the resurrection Christ "shall change our vile (lowly) body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:21). Into this wondrous inheritance of everlasting communion with God in heaven—an inheritance lost in the fall—Christ earnestly desires to bring all men, for He "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2:4).

Nothing uncertain, therefore, is connected with God's gracious purpose towards man, for, as Paul says, "whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29). The promise is unto faith, as Luther states: "Glaubst du, so hast du," "if you believe, it is yours."

With this point the Bible closes its story of man and the Creator's gracious, saving purpose for him. We can only say, standing back in awe and amazement, that there is nothing amidst all the contradictory pictures and philosophies which men themselves have proposed which can compare with the truth, grace, and glory of God which now is ours in the face of Christ Jesus in whom we believe.

FOOTNOTES

1. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1964), I, p. 1.
2. Herman Dooyeweerd, *The Twilight of Western Thought* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1960).

3. Albert Camus, *The Fall* (New York: Knopf, 1961), p. 142.
4. Walter Eichrodt, *Man in the Old Testament* (Chicago: Henry Regner, 1951), p. 27.
5. Wilder Penfield, *The Mystery of the Mind* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975)l; Mark P. Cosgrove, *The Essence of Human Nature* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977).
6. Dorothy Sayers, *The Zeal of Thy House*, in *Religious Drama*, ed. Marvin Halverson (New York: Meridan, 1957), I, p. 274.

Luther the *Seelsorger*

George Kraus

Seelsorger is a German word that resists our best attempts to offer a one word equivalent in English. For the purpose of this paper the time-honored and well-known Lutheran term "pastor" for the person, and "pastoral care" for the practice of caring for the spiritual needs of Christ's people will be used. In the Lutheran tradition it is the pastor who practices the art of giving spiritual guidance and care to God's people. Luther was no mere academician in the field of theology. He was a practitioner of the theology he proclaimed. In his letters, sermons, lectures, table talks, and interpretations of Scripture we quickly discover a genuine *Seelsorger*, a man of God who cared *about* and cared *for* Christ's redeemed souls. Luther did not live with his head in clouds of mystical theological abstractions. Rather, he was a warm, loving, caring, humorous and sometimes irascible shepherd of the flock—ready, able and willing to handle precious souls with tenderness, feeling, insight and, when needed, sternness.

I. The Doctrine of Justification

When one approaches Luther's theology, he must begin with the main article of the Scriptures—justification by faith. Without an understanding of the centrality of this doctrine one never grasps Luther the *Seelsorger*. For Luther the justification of the sinner is not simply the primary doctrine, but the core of all Christian theology. All theological disciplines and practices emerge from this blessed revelation of God.

Righteousness, or the forgiveness of sins, was at the heart of all of Luther's theology in doctrine and practice. Commenting on Galatians 2:16 Luther applies the comfort of this epistle of justification to the suffering child of God:

> Then whatever there is of cross or suffering to be borne later on is easily sustained. For the yoke that Christ lays upon us is sweet, and His burden is light (Matt 11:30). When sin has been forgiven and the conscience has been liberated from the burden and the sting of sin, then a Christian can bear everything easily. Because everything

> within is sweet and pleasant, he willingly does and suffers everything. But when a man goes along in his own righteousness, then whatever he does and suffers is painful and tedious for him, because he is doing it unwillingly [*Lectures on Galatians*].[1]

One quickly notes the centrality of justification to pastoral theology. Everything in life—good and bad—points back to the justification wrought by the Son of God on the cross. It is from this point of view that we perceive Luther the *Seelsorger*.

II. The Assurance of Salvation

The assurance of salvation because of justification forms the bedrock for pastoral ministry in Luther. In the care of souls the pastor must speak with authority, conviction and certainty in regard to one's salvation. To stand with uncertainty under God's wrath or grace places the soul in a desparate, unstable situation. If the Christian doubts forgiveness, how can he be sure of anything from the Creator and Judge? When a person *knows* that God is his loving Father, that his sins are forgiven, that he already has the gift of everlasting life, then proper, comforting pastoral care may follow:

> True faith draws the following conclusion: "God is God for me because He speaks to me. He forgives me my sins. He is not angry with me, just as He promises: 'I am the Lord your God.'" Now search your heart, and ask whether you believe that God is your God, Father, Savior, and Deliverer, who wants to rescue you from sins and from death. If you become aware that you are wavering or uncertain, consider how to correct that doubt through constant use of the Word of God. Accordingly, let us strengthen ourselves against the doubts of the papists, and let us learn that for God the only completely pleasing worship and obedience is faith, that is, to believe and trust our God when He swears so solemnly [*Lectures on Genesis*].[2]

The Christian who stands in doubt of his salvation cannot be sure of God's help in time of trial and trouble. If the Christian questions God's most basic and grandest promise—namely the forgiveness of sins—how can he depend upon God for any other promises? Assurance of salvation for Luther was crucial to healthy soul care.

III. The Word of God

A correlative to this assurance of salvation is reliance on the Word of God. The *Seelsorger* must speak from the Word of God. He addresses all human need from God's point of view. The *Seelsorger* confronts the suffering soul with the living God, the Christ, via His living, dynamic Word. For Luther, when Scripture speaks, God speaks.

God's Word is effective and powerful. As a *Seelsorger*, Luther plants both feet firmly in the Word (LC, 100):

> Therefore you must continually keep God's Word in your heart, on your lips, and in your ears. For where the heart stands idle and the Word is not heard, the devil breaks in and does his damage before we realize it. On the other hand, when we seriously ponder the Word, hear it, and put it to use, such is its power that it never departs without fruit. It always awakens new understanding, new pleasure, and a new spirit of devotion, and it constantly cleanses the heart in its meditations.[3]

Indeed, the use of the Word is evident in Luther's dealing with Christ's people. The use of God's powerful Word is not optional. All contributing disciplines of the *Seelsorger* must remain subsidiary and qualified by the inscripturated word.

IV. Caring for Souls

This study of Luther the pastor will touch seven areas of soul-care: cross-bearing, fear, feelings, faithfulness, contentment, death, and eternal life. There are more, but these will give adequate examples of Luther's pastoral application of the Word.

A. Cross-Bearing

Bearing a cross should come as no surprise to the child of God. Luther clearly understood the immanence of the cross in the Christian's daily life. He knew well the struggles one has to endure in order to remain loyal to Christ. Cross-bearing is not simply suffering (i.e. cancer, emotional distress, etc.). It is carrying the cross of oppression, persecution and even physical abuse *because of* one's commitment to Christ:

> When I lie in bed and am sick, or when a person is put to death by fire, water, or the sword because of his misdeeds,

> this is not the cross of Christ. But the shame and persecution endured for righteousness' sake is the cross of Christ. This is why true Christians must be dubbed heretics and evildoers. They must be so condemned, despised, and judged by all that everybody wipes his feet on them [Sermon in Erfurt, October 22, 1522].[4]

Luther wants it clearly understood that crossbearing is primarily a suffering because one carries the name of Jesus. This approach to suffering and evil forces the Christian to develop a different perception of his lot in life. Life is not intended to be a bed of ease for Christ's people. To be Christ's is to be ready to bear a cross.

B. Fear

Fear is part and parcel of our humanity. If prayer is the Christian's daily breath, then fear is natural man's daily breath. Luther was well aware of this:

> The poets fancied that souls were terrified by the bark of Cerberus; but real terror arises when the voice of the wrathful God is heard, that is, when it is felt by the conscience. Then God, who previously was nowhere, is everywhere. Then He who earlier appeared to be asleep hears and sees everything; and His wrath burns, rages, and kills like fire [*Lectures on Genesis*].[5]

Here one is reminded that fear is the result of sin, the product of an evil and rebellious heart:

> From this let us learn the real art and skill of extricating ourselves from all distress and fear. To do this, we must first of all take note of our sin, forthwith make a clean breast of it, and confess it. That disposes of the most urgent danger and need. For help must first be brought to the heart; this must be lightened and given air to breathe. Then it is easier to aid the whole person. Thus the conscience must first of all be disencumbered and given room to breathe, and then aid can be found for all trouble. Two things are involved when God's anger strikes, sin and fear. Imprudent hearts cope with this situation incorrectly. They let the sin remain and are intent only on ridding themselves of the fear. That will not profit them, and they must despair *[Lectures on Jonah]*.[6]

Luther shows the troubled, fearful Christian that dealing with

fear leads one first to confession and faith. In short, when one discovers he has nothing to fear from Christ, then he is able to deal with the lesser fears of life and death. Commenting on Isaiah 43:5 Luther writes:

> *Fear not for I am with you.* Why does He say: *Fear not*? Because there are fears within and terrors without, the church is a tumult and a frightened people, beset by fear, despair, and sins. For that reason it has the Word, which is the breath of its life, so that it may be consoled by the Word. "Why are you afraid? Don't be afraid. I am with you." The opposite appears to be the case: "I am very far away from you." Since the conscience feels that God is very far away from us, it is necessary for Him to say, "I am with you." These are hidden words. It seems that God is against us and with our opponents, because everything is going well for them. However, their end will be a most wretched one, even though their beginning was most favorable [*Lectures on Isaiah*].[7]

Luther is a sensitive and observant *Seelsorger*. He understands how one feels in the vicissitudes of life. When fear clutches at the heart, Luther is one who grasps its psychological and theological meaning. Luther points the Christian to the ultimate resolution of all fear.

Commenting on Romans 5:1 Luther speaks of the peace of Christ that undergirds life and is the Christian's refuge in time of fear:

> Thus Christ is called the Prince of Peace and a Solomon. But note how the apostle places this spiritual peace only after righteousness has preceded it. For first he says, "Since we are justified by faith," and then, "We have peace.". . . Here the perversity of men seeks peace before righteousness and for this reason they do not find peace [*Lectures on Romans*].[8]

Luther instructs fearful and anxious people that they must first look to Christ's righteousness and His victory on the cross. Christ lives! Satan is *already* defeated; *ergo* the Christian will despise him. Fear is real; *Luther* no where denies it; yet the Christian is to understand his victory is already assured. He is to resist fear in Christ's power.

C. Feelings

Our modern culture encourages us to rely on our feelings: "If it feels good, do it!" Feelings take on theological significance in

different ways. The rise of the enthusiasts in Luther's day is one such occurrence. Christians who verify their faith by their feelings about God offer a special problem to themselves, the unbelieving world, and the church.

Luther understood the feeling of despair, the sense of abandonment, that the child of God could experience:

> It is no small comfort, however, to know that grace has not been taken away but is truly immovable and unchangeable, although the awareness and experience of grace is taken away for a time, and dread and fear rush in, discouraging and troubling the spirit. Then man becomes impatient, concludes that he cannot bear the wrath of God, and simply makes a devil out of God [*Lectures on Genesis*].[9]

Luther makes a clear distinction between the *feeling* of the loss of grace and the actual loss of grace. Here the believer does not trust his feelings; but trusts the promises of God in His Word.

Dr. Weller, a friend of Luther's, said during a period of trouble and depression: "The devil is a master at taking hold of us where it hurts the most." To this Luther replied:

> Yes, he doesn't learn this from us. He is quite agile. If he hasn't exempted the patriarchs, the prophets, and the Prince of the prophets, Christ, he will not spare us. He can make the oddest syllogisms: 'You have sinned. God is angry with sinners. Therefore despair!' Accordingly we must proceed from the law to the gospel and grasp the article concerning the forgiveness of sins. You are not the only one, dear brother, who suffers from such anguish. Peter admonishes us not to be surprised when the same experience of suffering is required of the brotherhood. Moses, David, and Isaiah suffered much and often. What kind of trials do you suppose David was going through when he composed the psalm, "O Lord, rebuke me not in thy anger" (Ps 6:1)? He would rather have died by the sword than to have experienced, these *horrible feelings* against God and of God against him. I believe that confessors have to endure more than martyrs, for day after day they see idolatries, offenses, and sins, the prosperity and security of the godless, and on the other hand the anxieties of the godly who are accounted as sheep for the slaughter [*emphasis added*].[10]

Here, Luther is dealing with a depressed friend who is at the bottom of his emotional life. Note Luther's identification with

Weller's failures in this area of his life and and the inclusion of the goodly fellowship of the prophets, not to mention the Prince of the prophets. He identifies the culprit as Satan and reminds his friend no one in this life can escape this reality. The Christian is to learn from those who have preceded him and place his absolute confidence in the promises of Christ, not in his feelings:

> A Christian lives on in full, assured hope. He eats, drinks, works, does what he has been commanded to do. Yea, I dare say, he also suffers with joy whatever suffering is placed before him. For his ears hang on the voice and Word of his Shepherd, and he schools himself not to judge by what he experiences and feels but by what the voice and the Word says."[11]

D. Faithfulness

Can anyone doubt Luther's commitment to faithfulness to the Gospel? Luther writes in his great Reformation hymn: "Take they our life, goods, fame, child, and wife; let these all be gone!"[12] Luther does not follow a theology of glory, but faces the fact that in this world the child of Christ may well lose child, wife, and life because of his faith.

Luther's exposition of Abraham's offering of Isaac provides a perfect example of a faithful servant of the Most High:

> This account deserves to have each word carefully examined. Abraham rose early in the morning. He did not delay; he did not argue. Nor did he ask, as Adam did in Paradise: "Why does God give this command?" He listened neither to his flesh nor to the serpent. Indeed, he did not make the matter known even to Sarah; but when he heard God's command, he hastened without any hesitation to carry it out.
>
> This is an extraordinary example and a description of *perfect obedience*, when so suddenly and at one and the same time Abraham thrusts out of sight and does away with everything he used to hold dearest in his life; his home, his wife, and his son who had been so long expected and upon whom such grand promises had been heaped [*Lectures on Genesis*, emphasis added].[13]

The act of Abraham in carrying out God's command is an ex-

traordinary act of obedience and faithfulness to God. Under this kind of pressure any child of God would be greatly tempted not to remain faithful. Luther would have God's people realize that the call to be God's servants demands obedience and faithfulness under the most dire circumstances. Luther is compassionate with people, but demanding. Christ was faithful to us, now we are to remain faithful to Him, no matter the cost.

E. Contentment

The search for contentment is not a modern phenomenon; people in Luther's day, too, were looking for a better life. Luther dealt with the problem of discontented Christians. Commenting on the Sermon on the Mount, Luther writes:

> Daily there have to be many troubles and trials in every house, city, and country. No station in life is free of suffering and pain, both from your own, like your wife and children or household help or subjects, and from the outside, from your neighbors and all sorts of accidental trouble. When a person sees and feels all this, he quickly becomes dissatisfied, and he tires of his way of life, or it makes him impatient, irritated, and profane. If he cannot avoid this trouble or get rid of it, he wants to change his station in life, supposing that everyone else's station and condition are better than his own. After changing around for a long time, he discovers that his situation has progressively deteriorated. A change is a fast and easy thing, but an improvement is a rare and doubtful thing [*The Sermon on the Mount*].[14]

Commenting on Ecclesiastes, Luther writes:

> Tranquillity is not attainable except from the Word and work of God. . . .What is condemned is human striving and planning, when we ourselves want or try to create happiness without respect to the will of God.[15]

Contentment is found in obedience to God and His Word, even when our reason and earthly perspective tell us God is mistaken.

F. Death

For Luther death was not the planned natural end of man; rather, it was caused by sin. Luther did not agree with the morbid Christian who would like to make death an enjoyable affair to which the Christian ought hasten:

> I don't like to see examples of joyful death. On the other hand, I like to see those who tremble and shake and grow pale when they face death and *yet go through*. It was so with the great saints; they were not glad to die. Fear is something natural because death is a punishment, and therefore something sad. According to the spirit one dies willingly, but according to the flesh the saying applies, 'Another will carry you where you do not wish to go' (Jn 21:18). In the Psalms and other histories as in Jeremiah, one sees how eager men were to escape death. 'Beware,' Jeremiah said, 'or you will bring innocent blood upon yourselves' (Jer 26:15). But when Christ said, 'Let this cup pass from me' (Mt 26:39), the meaning was different, for this was the Same who said, 'I have life and death in my hand' (Jn 5:21,24). We are the ones who drew the bloody sweat from him.[16]

One can readily sense Luther's close observation of the act of dying. Luther lived in the real world of flesh and blood. His attitude towards death was not flippant. He understood its horror and the comfort of Christ for the soul who must face this evil. What a relief Luther offers to the individual Christian who may feel guilty because he does not feel he should hasten towards death.

Man faces no worse event in life than death. It is the ultimate curse, disgrace, and loss. Luther counseled his people on the basis of the death and resurrection of Christ:

> Behold, thus Paul teaches us to defy death through faith in Christ as One who is death's powerful foe, who is resolved to do away with death and exterminate it utterly. And death has richly deserved this from Him, because he attacked and assaulted Christ without cause. He attacked Him with the intent of devouring Him. But death met such a warm reception that his jaws and belly were torn apart. Now he must pay and return all whom he devoured. . . . For here you perceive that Christ is a King for the express purpose of destroying death completely as His enemy [*Commentary on I Corinthians*].[17]

The Christian near death or in bereavement is urged to defy death through faith in the Lord; for Jesus has overcome death on our behalf.

F. Eternal Life

The comfort the Reformer gave to Christians in the face of death is a clear testimony to his conviction that after the grave there is a crown of life for all who have loved Christ:

> For, after all, that is the goal of our faith in Christ, of Baptism, of sermon, and of Sacrament, that we hope for a new life, that we come to Christ, that we rule eternally with Him, delivered from sin, devil, death, and every evil.... For what would it amount to if we had received nothing better from Him than this wretched life and if we relied on Him in vain and suffered all that devil and world can inflict on us, and if He proved a liar with His great promises to us? As St. Paul himself says later: "If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most to be pitied" [*Commentary on I Corinthians*].[18]

Eternal life is our present possession and heaven our final goal. Luther stresses this glorious truth to his parishioners. The resurrection is a key doctrine in the Christian faith; without it there is no Christian faith and no content to the message of the *Seelsorger*:

> So you see that it is all-important that this article be firmly maintained among us; for if it begins to totter or is no longer regarded as valid, all the other articles will also be useless and invalid, because all that Christ did in coming to earth and establishing His kingdom in the world was done for the sake of the resurrection and the future life. Where this article, which forms the foundation, the reason, and the aim of all other articles of faith, is overthrown or removed, everything else will also topple and disappear with it. Therefore it is indeed necessary to foster and to fortify this article with diligence *[Commentary on I Corinthians].*[19]

Conclusion

Luther the *Seelsorger*—pastor, curate, and shepherd of souls—based all his practice of pastoral care on the Word of God. Luther gave direct, Biblical answers to the troublesome questions that plagued his people. He did not simply reflect on the misfortunes he encountered nor practice present-day

non-directive counselling techniques. He brought God's Word to bear on the issues that faced God's people. This is not a condemnation of the accomplishments of modern psychology, but it does remind the *Seelsorger* where his realm of expertise lies. Theology shapes his practice of psychology and counselling, not *vice versa*. His entire ministry is based upon, formed by, and given content by the Word of God.

FOOTNOTES

1. *Luther's Works* (American Edition [*LW*]; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955-), 26:133.
2. *LW* 4:149.
3. Theodore G. Tappert, ed., *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 379.
4. St. Louis Edition, 10:1774.
5. *LW* 2:22.
6. *LW* 19:63.
7. *LW* 17:89.
8. *LW* 25:285.
9. *LW* 3:8.
10. *LW* 54:275.
11. Weimar Ausgabe, 52:281.
12. *The Lutheran Hymnal* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1941), hymn 262, verse 4.
13. *LW* 4:102-103.
14. *LW* 21.95.
15. *LW* 15:29-30.
16. *LW* 54:65.
17. *LW* 28:134.
18. *LW* 28:60.
19. *LW* 28.150.

Wittenberg and Canterbury

John Stephenson

The recent bouts of dialogue between Lutheran and Anglican Christendom, in both North America and Western Europe, have been a product of the modern ecumenical movement in which those set in political authority over us have shown little or no interest. The first instalment of theological conversation between our Church of the Augsburg Confession and the newly autonomous Church of England was, by way of contrast, brought about by sheer political necessity. In 1535, when the breach with Rome was barely two years old, Henry VIII was discomfited at the thought that his ex-wife's nephew, Charles V, and Francis I of France might join forces to restore England to the papal obedience. Expediency therefore dictated that the king must seek an alliance with the Lutheran princes of Northern Germany. As far as Henry was concerned, the purpose of any such accommodation would be purely political and military, but Elector John Frederick had been schooled to apply Augustana VII even to his foreign policy. Accordingly, if the king of England wished to take out full or merely associate membership in the League of Schmalkalden, doctrinal consensus must be achieved between the English Church and the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. We may safely assume that the prospect of resuming dialogue, however indirectly, with Martin Luther filled Henry VIII with dismay. For the relationship between the two men already went back a decade and a half, and it had got off to a disastrous start. While Luther pondered spiritual things in Wittenberg, Henry brooded on the unfairness of a world where the kings of Spain and France boasted the titles "Most Catholic" and "Most Christian" respectively, while their counterpart across the Channel lacked a similar honour. Henry desperately coveted an equality of dignity with his brother monarchs, and the label "Most Orthodox King" was probably the title that he had in mind. Leaping to the aid of a harrassed papacy would be one way of prompting the Pope to confer a grand title on the English Crown, and Henry duly burst into print in 1521 with the *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum,* a polemical work which purported to refute

Luther's critique of the Roman sacramental system of the previous year. It appears likely that the royal foray into theological controversy was in fact the work of those future martyrs for papal supremacy, John Fisher and Thomas More, but Henry VIII got all the credit, with the result that a grateful pontiff conferred on Henry for his lifetime the title "Defender of the Faith."[1] As is well known, this style was tenaciously maintained by Henry's Protestant successors, and the Latin abbreviation "Fid. Def." still appears on British coins. As Henry settled down to enjoy his new title, Luther resolved that, if the king of England wished to engage in theological polemics, then he must be treated no differently from the rest of the Reformer's literary opponents. Works published in both Latin and German[2] taking issue with the theology published under the king's name did nothing to foster affection for Luther in Henry's heart. Nor were things helped when, later in the decade, the then Archdeacon Thomas Cranmer was sent to Germany to gather theological opinions favourable to Henry's desired divorce from Catherine of Aragon. With his opposition to the dissolution of the marriage, the Reformer found himself in the unlikely company of the Bishop of Rome; but while Clement VII dithered and dallied on the issue of the marriage and was finally brought to oppose the divorce only by the armed might of Charles V, Luther consistently denounced the fragile case brought forward by Henry against the validity of his marriage.

During the winter of 1535 and 1536, laborious negotiations were conducted between the Wittenberg theologians and a delegation of English divines headed by Edward Foxe, Bishop of Hereford, and including the future Lutheran martyr, Robert Barnes. A cordial relationship developed between Luther and Foxe. Bishop and Reformer discovered that they shared a common affliction with kidney stones. They swapped remedies for their painful ailment, and on his return to England Foxe was to display a marked enthusiasm for the Wittenberg theology. The theological discussions between the English and the German theologians were based on the recent Augsburg Confession and the two sides were able to draw up thirteen articles of agreement covering the topics dealt with in the Augustana. As one reads these Wittenberg Articles of 1536, one cannot avoid the impression that each side is holding something back while at the same time going out of its way to avoid offending the other. The treatment given to such themes as justification and good works

cannot be considered as evidence of genuine theological agreement, but rather as a papering over of the real differences between the two sides: the English Church was not yet ready to give serious consideration to the material principle of the Reformation, and, besides, the English negotiators were patently continually looking over their shoulders at the spectre of the king to whom they would have to render an account and who was celebrated for his adherence to the traditional concept of merit. As far as we know, Cranmer did not broach the delicate matter of *sola fide* with his king until Henry was safely on his deathbed. All the more remarkable, then, is the matter-of-fact agreement reached between the English and the Germans concerning the Real Presence. The sixth of the Wittenberg Articles presents us with a slight amplification of Augustana X, being a straightforward avowal of the Real Presence in the Lutheran sense.[3]

What Henry VIII would concede in his foreign dealings he was by no means prepared to tolerate on the home front. The Wittenberg Articles content themselves with confessing the real presence, exhibition and distribution of the sacred Body and Blood in the Holy Supper, while refraining from propounding the novel theory of transubstantiation as the sole way in which this mystery may be understood. The so-called Supreme Head of the Church of England was an unreflective traditionalist in matters of faith, being minded to preserve the whole body of late mediaeval religion with the single exception of the papal supremacy. That the religion of the ruled should perfectly mirror that of their ruler was a principle that held good also outside the German Empire, with the result that Henry VIII obliged his subjects to conform to his own belief in transubstantiation. Failure to comply with the royal wishes led a steady stream of men and women to the stake, and we witness the pathetic spectacle of Thomas Cranmer, who by the end of Henry's reign had not only ceased to hold transubstantiation but had also passed beyond a temporary espousal of Lutheran eucharistic theology to embrace radical Swiss views of the Holy Supper, prosecuting and condemning brave spirits who were prepared to state publicly what he, the archbishop, believed privately.

The death of Henry VIII in January of 1547 freed Thomas Cranmer to undertake the reformation of the Church of England in earnest. By the end of the reign of the boy-king, Edward VI, in the summer of 1553, the archbishop had piloted through both the convocations and parliament a series of momentous changes in the liturgy and confessional formulae of

the English Church which patently relegated the sixth of the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 to the status of a dead letter. Dr. Peter Brooks has afforded us a lucid and convincing account of the progression of Archbishop Cranmer's eucharistic beliefs during the reign of Henry and his son, injecting a welcome element of clarity and certainty into an area which has been hotly contested in Anglican scholarship during the last century and a half. Along with Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, Thomas Cranmer holds a prime place of honour among the architects of Anglican Christendom; so that the archbishop's beliefs concerning the nature of our Lord's presence in the Holy Supper cannot be a matter of indifference to the schools of divinity that compete for predominance within the Anglican Church. We may broadly say that the Anglican Evangelicals are happy with the most unforced construction that can be placed on Cranmer's statements, namely, that he was a convinced proponent of the Swiss Reformed understanding of the eucharist. The Anglo-Catholic party stemming from the Oxford Movement of the last century, on the other hand, has often been obliged to argue with a straight face that black is white in order to rescue the archbishop by hook or by crook from the charge that he was a Zwinglian. Dr. C.W. Dugmore, for example, will concede that Cranmer now and then fell under the baleful influence of the continental Reformed theologians who flooded the realm in the years following Charles V's victory over the League of Schmalkalden. In the end, though, it is an article of faith for Dugmore that Cranmer — and, along with him, the gifted Bishop Ridley of London — was deep down a good chap who held some sort of Real Presence doctrine.[4] Despite such special pleading, the facts of the case are highly embarrassing for the Anglo-Catholic cause. Even though Ridley of London had won him over to the Swiss understanding of the Holy Supper before the old king's death, the cautious Cranmer resolved to make haste slowly, with the corollary that his first essay in a complete English liturgy has often been judged as a remarkably Lutheran piece of work. "The Supper of the Lorde and the Holy Communion commonly called the Mass" of the Book of Common Prayer of 1549[5] suppresses the understanding of the Holy Supper as a propitiatory sacrifice offered by the priest for the living and the dead, and is clearly congruous with the Lutheran understanding of the Real Presence. Traditional vestments are retained for a celebration in which the *verba testamenti* are prefaced by the following consecration epiclesis: "Heare us (o

merciful father) we beseech thee; and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to blesse and sanctifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christe." The host is delivered to the communicant with the words, "The body of our Lorde Jesus Christe whiche was geuen for thee, preserue thy bodye and soule unto euerlasting lyfe"; and a similar formula attends the administration of the chalice. Clearly, the Prayer Book of 1549 was intended by its chief author as a halfway measure of merely temporary duration. The more vocal partisans of the Swiss theology lost no time in pointing out the deficiencies of the communion liturgy in comparison with the allegedly more perfect rites of Geneva and Zurich, and the archbishop pointedly requested critiques of his work from two distinguished continental theologians who at that time were occupying the Regius Chairs of Divinity at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Luther's death had released Martin Bucer at Cambridge from any restraints that might have been imposed by the lingering memory of the Wittenberg Concord of 1536; so that he and his Oxford colleague, Peter Martyr Vermigli, made plain to the archbishop their dissatisfaction with the strongly Lutheran doctrine of consecration characteristic of the rite of 1549. Presently the old guard of Henrician Catholics exchanged the luxury of their episcopal palaces for less comfortable lodgings in the Tower, thereby assisting Cranmer to gain the necessary majorities in Convocation and the House of Lords for the consummation of his scheme of reformation. In 1552 Convocation approved the Forty-Two Articles of Religion, and a revised Prayer Book was issued with the sanction of both Convocation and Parliament. The eucharistic doctrine of the new liturgy stands in stark contrast to that of the old. Traditional vestments are abolished, their place being taken by the simple surplice; the consecration epiclesis is reduced to ambiguity; and the elements are delivered to the accompaniment of the following formula: "Take and eate this, in remembraunce that Christ dyed for thee, and feede on him in thy hearte by faythe, with thanksgeuing. Drinke this in remembraunce that Christ's bloude was shed for thee, and be thankefull." The contemporaneous Forty-Two Articles surely offer an authoritative commentary on the liturgy of 1552.[6] In the relevant article, I Cor. 10:16 is remoulded in such a way that, while the English Church clearly parts company with the crassest statements of the early Zwingli, participation in the

sacred body and blood is restricted to the believing communicant. Notwithstanding this opening invocation of I Cor. 10:16, though, all talk of participation in the sacred body and blood here must be meant metaphorically, for the article goes on to assail not only the theory of transubstantiation but also the doctrine of the Real Presence itself in ringing tones of condemnation. Reformed Christology rears its head in the following sentences: "Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one, and the self same man, cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place; therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places. And because (as holy scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue until the end of the world: a faithful man ought not, either to believe, or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper." "As *they* term it" — the third person nominative plural pronoun clearly embraces Lutherans as well as Romans. An identical Christology found its way into the rubrics of the 1552 Communion Service, being inserted at the last minute on the orders of the Privy Council and speedily printed in black. The notorious Black Rubric defends against John Knox the custom of kneeling to receive the Blessed Sacrament "for the sygnificacion of the humble and gratefull acknowledgyng of the benefites of Chryst, geuen unto the woorthye receiuer." At the same time, since "the naturall body and blood of our sauiour Christ ...are in heauen and not here," there can be no question of "anye reall and essencial presence" of His "naturall fleshe and bloude" in the elements.

The swift capitulation of the English Church to the Swiss Reformed camp on matters eucharistic once the restraining hand of Henry VIII was taken away demands explanation. Factors other than the persuasiveness of the continental Reformed and their English allies played their part here. We do well to remember that burning for alleged heresy was not first introduced to England by Mary I as the secular arm of the beginning Counter-Reformation. On the contrary, the burning of condemned heretics was a regular feature of fifteenth-century England, and Henry VIII and his father encouraged this process well before the European Reformation began. In the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries it had seemed as though the followers of John Wycliffe might even take over the English state. This danger soon passed, but Wycliffe's characteristic

tenets passed in vulgarised form to the lower classes, and the so-called Lollards came to represent a religious underground in fifteenth-century and early Tudor England of unknown quantity but certain menace to the authorities. Now John Wycliffe, who died in 1384, anticipated many of the tenets of "Protestantism." He had no inkling of the material principle of the Reformation, and — what is significant for our present purposes — he was the first major figure in the Latin Church of the West to offer a scholarly rejection of the dogma of the Real Presence since Berengar of Tours back in the eleventh century. Wycliffe was given his recompense by Luther in the great *Confession concerning Christ's Supper* of 1528.[7] The Englishman's argument went as follows: Aristotle teaches — and who shall gainsay him? — that in any meaningful statement the subject and the predicate must be of identical content. In this case, our Lord's words over bread and wine on the night that He was betrayed are puzzling, not to say downright odd. The mainline scholastics were bound by the dogmatic definitions of the church to uphold the full reality of the divinely uttered predicate. Whatever else is present in the Sacrament, the sacred body and blood must be present. In this case, the subject — that is, "this" bread and "this" cup — must be interpreted in such a way as to do no violence to the predicate. The mainline scholastics were obliged to engage in all kinds of contortions to avoid interpreting the eucharistic words as simply propounding the obvious tautology that Christ's body and blood are Christ's Body and Blood. Wycliffe, on the other hand, harboured certain doubts concerning the papal supremacy and was in the process of switching over to a *sola scriptura* theology which would no longer be beholden to the constraints of tradition. Accordingly, he took the liberty of interpreting the eucharistic words from the other end. Plainly, Christ referred to real bread and real wine; therefore — since He too must be a good Aristotelian — He could not possibly have meant the predicate nouns "My body" and "My blood" in their straightforward sense. In this way, Wycliffe anticipated the Reformed symbolical understanding of the Lord's Supper. Significantly, he identified the theory of transubstantiation as the point where Antichrist had made terrible inroads into the Christian Church. His Lollards followed him here, one of the chief planks in their platform being the denial and indeed the ridiculing of the mystery of the Real Presence. The significance of the Lollards in the English Reformation is this: they provided a ready-made constituency

for the reception into English religion of the tenets of the Swiss Reformation. More especially, they supplied fertile soil for the development in England of a eucharistic theology which is the polar opposite of the one enshrined in the Book of Concord.

Depending on his brand of churchmanship, the Anglican is apt to regard the Prayer Book and Articles of 1552 as either the high water mark or the low water mark of English religion. For the purposes of forming a balanced judgment on the intercommunion arrangements now coming into effect between wide segments of Lutheran and Anglican Christendom in Europe and North America, we must realise that the Anglican understanding of the Holy Supper did not reach definitive form in 1552. Three further episodes in the Anglican development fitly merit our attention before we dwell in greater detail on the recent happenings in Lutheran–Episcopal dialogue.

In the first place, we must consider the effects of the personal intervention of Elizabeth I on Anglican eucharistic doctrine. The queen, on her accession in 1558, favoured the reintroduction of the liturgy of 1549, and she is known to have expressed her predilection for what she termed the "Augustanean Confession."[8] Zwingli's successors in Zurich were for a time greatly fearful lest England might swing into the Lutheran camp, and Bullinger wrote that "the possibility of English adoption of the Augsburg confession 'gives vexation to all the purer churches and would infect them all with its leaven.'"[9] Alas, Elizabeth could count on no strong body of support for her own religious designs within the nation. With one single exception, her sister's bishops deserted her, and the exiles returning from southern Germany and Switzerland, along with the Protestants who had lain low during Mary's reign, were solid supporters of the 1552 settlement, which was now sealed with its author's blood. The queen was obliged to settle for the Prayer Book of 1552, but not before she had wrung from the radical Protestants certain minor but significant changes. First, the Black Rubric was omitted, and the 1549 formula of distribution was prefaced to the Zwinglian words of 1552. Secondly, the queen insisted on the insertion of rubrics into the 1559 Book of Common Prayer which encouraged the crucifixes to remain in the churches and the traditional vestments to remain on the backs of the clergy. Outside her own private chapel, Elizabeth was not obeyed, but her personal intervention in the early days of her reign did provide a loophole for higher eucharistic doctrine and practice which the Anglo-Catholics three centuries later would gratefully exploit.

Liturgy having been fixed in 1559, the doctrine of the Elizabethan Church was fixed at the Convocation of 1563. The Thirty-Nine Articles were now drawn up, with the nature of our Lord's eucharistic presence being defined in Articles XXVIII and XXIX. The most obvious interpretation of the latter is that it denies that unbelievers partaking of the Holy Supper receive the sacred body and blood. This article was the cause of great distress to Bishop Richard Cheyney, who was much disapproved of by his brother bishops on account of his Lutheran propensities, nor did it sit well with Bishop Edmund Guest. Now Elizabeth herself is credited with having authored the following rhyming verses: "He was the Word that spake it: He took the bread and brake it: And what that Word did make it, I do believe and take it."[10] After Convocation drew up the Articles, the queen gave her imprimatur by issuing them in the guise of a royal proclamation. In fact, only thirty-eight articles received Elizabeth's *nihil obstat,* Article XXIX being simply omitted. In 1571, though, when the Articles were set forth in their definitive and enduring form, Article XXIX reappeared. Bishop Cheyney realised what this meant, refused to ratify the article, and was promptly excommunicated.[11]

The interpretation properly given to Article XXVIII is of crucial importance in the context of the recent agreements. The Christological section found in the parallel article of 1552 is quietly dropped, a decision which, when taken in tandem with the removal of the Black Rubric from the liturgy, may be taken as pointing in a hopeful direction. As in 1552, the revised version of 1563 and 1571 alludes near its outset to I Cor. 10:16: "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." "Rightly, worthily, and with faith" — a doubt-begetting element of subjectivism creeps in here. Would it be fanciful to see, in this intimation that Almighty God is not objectively present in the fullness of His perfect work and sacramental gift unless "I" deign subjectively to perceive the fact, the first stirrings of Kantianism? The second paragraph of Article XXVIII contains an unmistakable rejection of transubstantiation, which is denounced as not only unscriptural but also incongruous with the Augustinian definition of a sacrament. And that nagging subjective strain recurs in the third paragraph, whose wording seems explicitly to exclude the *manducatio oralis.* "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the

Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." Admittedly, the first sentence of the third paragraph could be construed to express the dogma of the Real Presence. At all events, its author, Bishop Guest, did precisely this in 1566. Upon Bishop Cheyney's complaint that the statement that the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten "*only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner" tended to exclude the Real Presence, Guest replied that his controverted adverb "did not exclude ye presence of Christis body fro the Sacrament but onely ye grossnes and sensebleness in the receavinge thereof."[12] Even so, the repeated stress on the faith of the communicant as the organ which receives the sacred Body and blood would justify one's placing Article XXVIII in the mainstream of Reformed thinking. We may, of course, doubt whether the sharp demarcation between Lutheran and Reformed theology would have appeared so clear-cut to those who took part in the Convocation of 1563. The teaching of the *Invariata* had not yet been underscored by the final decision of Article VII of the Formula of Concord, and many observers of the contemporary German scene may have been expecting the Philippists to emerge victorious within Lutheranism.

The Thirty-Nine Articles themselves cannot be allowed to have the last word on what is and is not Anglican doctrine. All confessional documents are to be interpreted within the lively context of their actual exposition in the ongoing history of the church which first formulated them. If Bishop Guest's private interpretation of Article XXVIII were to find strong corroboration in the Anglican theology of the ensuing centuries, then we should perhaps be obliged to list Anglican Christendom as unequivocally teaching the Real Presence. While conceding that the Elizabethan Settlement had left the door open for an escape from Reformed eucharistic theology, we are compelled regretfully to note that hardly anyone availed himself of this loophole before the Oxford Movement of the nineteenth century. Reasons of space require me to gather together the lessons of three centuries in four observations.

First, Richard Hooker, who died in 1600, is often claimed as the father of distinctively Anglican theology; indeed he is sometimes presented as a forefather of Anglo-Catholicism. Selective quotation can make Hooker sound like a solid advocate of the Real Presence, but an awareness of the larger picture leads to the irrefutable conclusion that Hooker was a

Calvinist in his understanding of the Lord's Supper. Hooker devotes much energy to attacking the Christology of the Formula of Concord, and he is unsparing in his criticism of the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence. Hooker alleges that there are but three possible expositions of the dominical utterance, "This is My body," namely, the Lutheran, the Roman, and one other. Hooker paraphrases the Lutheran interpretation of "This is My body" as follows: "this is in itself before participation really and truly the natural substance of My Body by reason of the coexistence which My omnipotent Body hath with the sanctified element of bread." Hooker, who took pains to be well informed, understood the Lutherans of the last decade of the sixteenth century to teach that the presence of the sacred body and blood in the Holy Supper is not restricted to the moment of their distribution. Hooker finds the Lutheran exposition unconvincing, and puts into our Lord's mouth another, to Hooker more cogent, interpretation: "this hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power, is in verity and truth unto faithful receivers instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation, whereby, as I make Myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as My sacrificed Body can yield, and as their souls do presently need, this is to them and in them My Body."[13] This paraphrase, urges Hooker, offers the clearest and simplest interpretation of our Lord's words.

Secondly, Hooker's Calvinising eucharistic theology was continued in the seventeenth century by those classical Anglicans who, like him, were far from inclined to Calvinism in other areas of theology. Admittedly, one does stumble across individual theologians whose belief and expression are very much in the vicinity of the Real Presence. Even so, encounters with strongly realist language often turn out in the end to be disappointing. Seventeenth century writers — and here the name of Bishop John Cosin leaps to mind — are apt to begin with fulsome confessions of the Real Presence and to end with heated and indignant denials of the *manducatio impiorum*. One is struck by the fact that the space in between is usually taken up with lengthy and fearsome denunciations of transubstantiation. The seventeenth century Anglican obsession with transubstantiation is a sure indicator of an underlying aversion not merely to a particular theory but to the *res* of the Real Presence itself.

Thirdly, when we turn to the definitive revision of the Book of Common Prayer of 1662, we hit upon a certain discord in its

treatment of matters relating to the Real Presence. On the one hand, secular considerations led to the reintroduction of the Black Rubric, much to the distress of Archbishop Juxon, the prelate who had attended Charles I on the scaffold. Even here the evidence, as is so typical of Anglicanism, is not entirely clear-cut. In 1552, the Black Rubric denied "anye reall and essencial presence ...of Christ's naturall fleshe and bloude" in the Sacrament; now, in 1662, the revised Black Rubric contents itself with rejecting "any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood" in the consecrated elements. With such a definition, theologians could quibble interminably about the precise significance of the Black Rubric, but the reiteration here of Reformed Christology is an ominous pointer to its Reformed character. On the other hand, we must take into account the introduction into the Communion Office of 1662 of a novel rubric dealing with consecrated but unconsumed elements: "...if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest, and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." This directive would seem more consonant with Luther's understanding of consecration than with what we have so far encountered of Anglican eucharistic teaching. If this is so, then we have here an instance of felicitous inconsistency on the part of seventeenth century Anglicanism. Can we suppress the question whether much Lutheran practice in this matter betrays an infelicitous inconsistency on our part?

Fourthly, in the century and a half between the 1662 Book of Common Prayer and the rise of the Oxford Movement, we find no evidence that the Real Presence was taught in the Church of England. The Norwegian scholar, Alf Haerdelin, has distinguished between three conceptions of the eucharistic presence held in the Church of England during this period.[14] First, there was the Zwinglian notion of the Real Absence, to which Haerdelin gives the label "memorialism." Notwithstanding its popularity, pure Zwinglianism was usually recognised as inconsistent with the plain sense of the Anglican formularies. In second place there was "receptionism," a teaching not identical with the view of some Lutherans that the Real Presence is temporally limited to the moment of distribution. The Anglican receptionists were in fact Calvinists, men who located the Real Presence not in the elements but in faith's participation in the sacred body and blood at the same time as the elements are ex-

ternally received. As in the case of Calvin himself, one finds it difficult to see how the high-flown language used here about participation in the sacred body and blood can be taken other than metaphorically. The greatest advocate of receptionism was Daniel Waterland, an eighteenth century Oxford Professor of Divinity, who deserves grateful commemoration for his learned and devout defence of the doctrines of the Trinity and the deity of our Lord against Arian subversion. Nor may Waterland be regarded as simply a private theologian who spoke for no one but himself: his great work, *A Review of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,*[15] was reissued in 1880 with the imprimatur of the archbishops of Canterbury and York. In other words, Calvinist receptionism was, only a century ago, officially regarded as the public eucharistic teaching of the Church of England and, by implication, of the worldwide Anglican Communion of Churches. The third brand of eucharistic teaching Haerdelin calls "virtualism." The high church divines of this period who were not receptionists taught that, while the sacred body and blood are not present in the elements in their substance and reality, nevertheless the "spirit, power and effect" of Christ's body and blood are communicated to the faithful through the instrumentality of the consecrated bread and wine, which can therefore be dubbed the Lord's body and blood, as it were, *honoris causa.*

The Oxford Movement of the nineteenth century can be credited with having restored the Real Presence to the teaching and life of the English Church. John Keble and Edmund Bouverie Pusey campaigned with great courage and deep scholarship for what they called the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence" of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements. It is noteworthy that both men had no truck with the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, and that each of them acknowledged the substantial identity of his eucharistic teaching with the statements of the Lutheran Confessions concerning the Real Presence. Keble and Pusey purposely adopted a dual approach in demonstrating the legitimacy of the Real Presence in the Church of England. On the one hand, they took the Anglican appeal to antiquity, enunciated by Jewel and Hooker in the sixteenth century, at face value. Patristic perspectives were pushed through the loopholes left open by Queen Elizabeth I, with the result that the maximum and not the minimum content was discovered in the Anglican formularies. At the same time, we dare not minimise in any way the

thoroughly Scriptural basis established by both men for the Real Presence. Keble's beautiful writing *On Eucharistical Adoration* is written by an unwavering lover of Christ and Scripture. Both Keble and Pusey held fast to the end of their days to the historic Christian understanding of their Bible. Pusey's successor, Liddon, considered it a terrible betrayal of the Oxford Movement when, in the closing years of the nineteenth century, certain young high churchmen began to embrace the historical critical method. In the last century and a half, the Oxford Movement has succeeded in transforming the whole face of the Church of England. During this period countless thousands of Anglican laypeople have been taught the Real Presence in the classical sense, and not a few clergymen have invoked the name of Martin Luther in their battle with sceptical Zwinglians in the pew.

One must not suppose, though, that the eucharistic teaching of Keble and Pusey has reigned or reigns unchallenged in the Church of England. No more than one third of the parishes in the Church of England stand firmly in the tradition of the Oxford Movement, and one of the major trends of recent decades has been the reinvigoration and numerical growth of the Evangelical wing of the Anglican Church. The Oxford Movement made it possible for the recent ARCIC "Final Report" to set forth the Real Presence as the common teaching of the Roman and Anglican Churches. But one section of the Anglican Church cannot with impunity speak for the whole, so that John Stott in 1982 composed a robust critique[16] of the ARCIC "Final Report" on behalf of the "Church of England Evangelical Council." Mr. Stott laments the unwillingness of the central authorities of the Roman Church to adopt the notion of "trans-signification" which has been propounded by certain post-Vatican Two Dutch Roman theologians of the wilder sort. For his part, Stott invokes the "well known dictum" of Richard Hooker that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament." In 1981, another leading spokesman of the Anglican Evangelicals, Roger Beckwith, of Latimer House, Oxford, delivered himself of the following pungent critique of the christological and eucharistic sections of the Formula of Concord: "The Formula of Concord ... on which the dogmatic treatises of the so-called Lutheran scholastics of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century were based, is a most dangerous document, in which the doctrine of the incarnation is restated with the primary purpose, not of

stating it more biblically, but of justifying Luther's questionable belief in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the eucharistic elements. The main fault of Lutheran scholasticism derives from this fact, and not from its doctrine of biblical inspiration or its use of philosophical categories, as is often supposed. In consequence, while claiming to be biblical, Lutheran scholasticism became, in its essential character, a new form of traditionalism, and just as vulnerable as the forms existing in Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy. And when, because of the contradiction at its heart, it collapsed, it was followed by a welter of subjectivism which has continued down to our own day."[17]

Beckwith's forthright polemic conspires with the evidence which has been presented here to prompt one to regard with a certain scepticism the claim made in the 1981 Report of the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue in the U.S.A. that "Both communions affirm the real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Lord's Supper."[18] In historical perspective, this assertion will not hold water for an instant. Nor does the recent document seek to illustrate its contention that there is a eucharistic "convergence" between Lutheran and Anglican Christendom on the basis of the history of the two traditions. Instead, past differences are frankly acknowledged, and we are informed that neither the systematicians nor the historians but rather the exegetes are responsible for overcoming the antitheses of the Reformation era. "Modern New Testament exegesis offers a way to cut through all these dilemmas, inherited as they are largely from the Middle Ages." We are instructed that, "In most contemporary exegesis the words "body" and "blood" are interpreted increasingly not as substances but as saving event."[19] The German *Heilsereignis* is supplied in brackets, perhaps in an attempt to enhance the respect of the layman for his learned betters. Of course, the whole notion that the sacred body and blood specified in our Lord's words and in St. Paul's authoritative commentary in I Cor. 10:16 are to be interpreted not "ontologically" but "dynamically" is but a by-product of the present fashionable habit of maintaining that the New Testament writers offer not an "ontological" but a "dynamic" Christology. The late Bishop John Robinson found it possible to argue, in his *The Human Face of God,* that the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews nowhere teaches the divine pre-existence of our blessed Lord. This exegetical fashion, as we all know, is widely emulated in both Lutheran and Anglican

circles. The scholars have their fun, while the Bible-reading and Bible-believing laity, both Anglican and Lutheran alike, look on in perplexity and bewilderment. The intimate connection between Real Presence and incarnation should give us pause for thought. If we stand the Christology richly attested in the Pauline and Johannine literature on its head by dismissing clear statements concerning our Lord's divine pre-existence as mere Gnostic imagery, then Christ's humanity is no longer the human nature assumed by the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, with the corollary that any proclamation concerning Jesus of Nazareth is stripped of universal significance. Indeed, unless it is genuinely rooted in the Holy Trinity, Christology turns into Jesuolatry. Bearing in mind the grave assaults being made today, in both Lutheran and Anglican theology, on the classical Christian dogmas of the Blessed Trinity and the deity of our Lord, we cannot for a moment suppose that the current flight from ontological to "dynamic" categories is in the best interests of either side in the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue.

On page 25 of the LED "Report", we read as follows: "Lutherans defended the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood 'in, with, and under' the forms of bread and wine in order to make the christological affirmation that God meets us in the humanity as well as in the divinity of Christ in this means of grace." Alas, the authors of the "Report" have put the cart before the horse. Of course, we may freely concede that the Real Presence is the focal point of all the great themes of Lutheran Christendom, and beautiful statements of Wilhelm Loehe and Hermann Sasse could be quoted to this effect. It is tiresome to have to argue that Luther's chief motive in confessing the Real Presence was his subjection to his Lord Jesus Christ as that Lord speaks clearly and with the whole authority of God in His inspired Word. The proof of this statement can be gathered from Luther's works by the bucketful. And in his major eucharistic writings of 1525 and 1528, the Reformer offered to his own age and to posterity sparkling exegetical reviews of the eucharistic texts of the New Testament. No one is expected to concur with Luther's exegesis against his conscience; but we may rightfully expect that the exegesis of the Reformer and the Book of Concord be taken seriously on its own terms and not be frivolously dismissed as the injection of systematic insights gained elsewhere into the sacred text.

Dr. Tom Hardt has pointed out that, while much attention has been paid to the Lutheran "is," the equally Lutheran

"this" has tended to suffer neglect. Of course, the primary Lutheran "this is" statement is the confession that "this man, Jesus Christ, is saturated with the glory of God, is true God from true God," and that, through incorporation in this God-man by baptism and faith, we may ourselves look to share the glory of God. Dr. Hardt would have us be equally insistent about the "this is" statements in connection with the Holy Supper, urging that we face up to what he calls "the Biblical fact that the body and blood of the Creator, sacrificed and smitten, rest on the Christian altar." Hardt rightly protests against any temptation to water down in any way the basic confessional statement as set forth by the Reformer in the Smalcald Articles: "We hold that the bread and wine in the Supper are the true body and blood of Christ."[20] Displaying an admirable deftness in handling the complexities of scholastic thought, Hardt demonstrates that, in exchanging biblical realism for the scholastic slippery slope to rationalism, Luther with his confession of the Real Presence makes the chief proponent of transubstantiation look like a Semi-Calvinist by comparison. Listening solely and unashamedly to the voice of the Lord Jesus, we realise that the Real Presence of His body and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar is cause, not for embarrassment, but for exultation. But the whole matter of the Real Presence, which once again becomes acute in the context of the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue, is too momentous to be left in the hands of the academic theologians. Indeed, it cannot even be left to the clergy. Rather, it belongs to the whole people of God. The illustrious founder of Concordia Theological Seminary once remarked that, for him, "the whole of Lutheranism is contained in the Sacrament of the Altar. Here all of the chief doctrines of Christianity, especially those highlighted by the Reformation, have their focal point."[21] But Wilhelm Loehe the pastor did not stop with this well nigh professorial remark. Instead, with the next breath he went on to urge that the Lutheran *doctrine* of the Lord's Supper is not enough. For doctrinal rectitude alone is insufficient and needs to be complemented by a sacramental *life*. Loehe's words carry conviction, and they make it unmistakably clear to us that the battle for the integrity of Lutheran Christendom, which now rages so desperately, can only be won — and will be won, by the grace of God — in the parochial front line.

FOOTNOTES

1. J. J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (University of California Press, 1968), p. 117, against A.G. Dickens, *The Enlgish Reformation* (Fontana, 1967), p. 183
2. *Contra Henricum Regem Angliae*, 1522 (WA 10,I: 180–222); *Antwort deutsch auf Konig Heinrichs Buch*, 1522 (WA 10,I: 227–262).
3. *Die Wittenberger Artikel con 1536 (Artikel der cristlichen lahr, von welchen die legatten aus Engelland mit dem herrn doctor Martnio gehandelt anno 1536)*, ed. Georg Mentz (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968), p.48f.
4. P. N. Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Euchartist* (New York: Seabury Press, 1965); C. W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers* (London: Macmillan, 1958).
5. Cranmer's liturgies are accessible in *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI* (London and New York: Everyman's Library, 1968).
6. The XLII Articles can be found in *The Two Liturgies with Other Documents Set Forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward the Sixth*, Parker Society Documents, XX (Cambridge University Press, 1844), pp. 526–537.
7. *WA*: 437–446; *LW*: 294–303.
8. William P. Haugaard: *Elizabeth and the English Reformation. The Struggle for a Stable Settlement of Religion* (Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 109.
9. Haugaard, *op.cit.*, p. 108.
10. E. J. Bicknell, *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England* (London, New York, and Toronto: Longmans, Green, and Company, second ed., 1935), p. 497.
11. *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 1949–1950), IV, pp. 224–226.
12. Haugaard, *op.cit.*, p. 250f.
13. Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* Book V: LXVII, quoted from the Everman Edition (1968).
14. Alf Haerdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1965), pp. 125–127.
15. Daniel Waterland: *A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (rep. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1880).
16. John Stott, *Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report: An Assessment and Critique* (Bramcote, Notts.: Grove Books, 1982), esp. pp. 4 and 6–8.
17. R. T. Beckwith: *Confessing the Faith in the Church of England Today* (Oxford: Latimer House, 1981), p. 18.

18. *The Report of the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue, Second Series, 1976-1980* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1981), p. 16.
19. *op.cit.*, p. 17.
20. *BS SA* 450, 14–15; *Tappert*, p. 311. See Tom G. AS. Hardt, *Venerabilis and Adorabilis Eucharistia* (Uppsala: Ljungbergs Boktryckeri Klippan, 1971); and idem, *On the Sacrament of the Alter* (available in the library of Concordia Theological Seminary).
21. Johannes Deinze, *Wilhelm Loehes Leben* (fourth ed., Neuendettelsau: 1935), II, p. 523.

Dr. John Stephenson holds an MA from Oxford and the PhD from University College, Durham, England. Dr. Stephenson is a visiting professor at Concordia Theological Seminary,

The Grace of God as the Foundation for Ethics

Jeffery Gibbs

There can be no doubt in the mind of any observer of the modern American scene that a void exists in the areas of individual and social ethics. In society today, there is no agreement, no consensus, no basis for developing and articulating norms for the ways in which human beings ought to be viewed, and how they ought to be treated. The widespread influence of disciplines such as behavioristic psychology and evolutionary theory has reduced the scene in discussions of social and personal ethics to a shambles. Such blatant contradictions as a burgeoning peace movement in the West, side by side with abortion on demand, indicate our modern society's inability to arrive at a consistent and adequate foundation for a system of human ethical behavior.[1] The scenario, if it were not so tragic, would be comic. We live as a society of human beings who are unable to agree on what it means to be a human being, and how human beings ought to deal with one another.

In the midst of the confusion and the inconsistency, the church finds herself with a golden opportunity to proclaim and to demonstrate the existence of an adequate, compassionate Biblical foundation for ethical behavior. Christians everywhere have the chance to give an answer to the question, "Who are we?" Perhaps never has the chance been greater for the church's light to shine, as she answers the question, "How ought I to treat my neighbor?"

But the danger also exists that the church will bring forth an inadequate answer; that Christians will seize upon and use an inappropriate Biblical concept for the building of an ethical perspective. The purpose of this article is to argue that, at least in significant sectors of American Christianity, such an error has taken place. There does exist something of a visible consensus within large portions of the Christian community. The same answer is being given over and over again. For many, there is an accepted Biblical and Christian foundation for viewing persons as valuable and worthwhile. I am willing to call it a consensus because the concept occurs in such diverse contexts as the Marriage Encounter movement (originally a Roman Cathoiic

phenomenon), *Christianity Today* (the leading "evangelical" publication in America), the 1982 national convention of the prolife group, Lutherans for Life, and the writings of leading Protestant theologians and philosophers. But the question must be raised; is this Biblical concept an adequate foundation upon which the church can offer a view of mankind? Does this preferred alternative adequately correspond to the spirit of the Christian faith, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ?

The concept to which reference is here made is the Biblical view of mankind as created in the image of God. Here, we are told, lies the key to Christian views of ethical questions, political issues, social questions, and individual behavior. The value of human beings, and the rationale for treating them as valuable and worthwhile, originates in the understanding of mankind's reception of and present possession of the *imago Dei.* George Ladd clearly sets forth this position:

> The Bible reveals something else about men which evangelical Christians have too often neglected. It is both that I myself and every other man are created in the image of God, and this fact should be determinative of my relationship to other men whatever their status in life....Here is a staggering thought. There is something divine about all men. And the divine element consists in the fact that we are all God's offspring.[2]

Ladd goes on, then, to draw the obvious (and popular) conclusions from this emphasis:

> All men, whatever their race or social status, yes, even whatever their religion, are like us, the offspring of God. It follows, therefore, that I should regard every man and treat him as my brother, whoever he may be. Here is a biblical basis for a social ethic. I must be concerned about the welfare of my fellow man, for he, like myself, is God's offspring.[3]

This same line of reasoning is central to the writings of Francis Schaeffer, the popular and widely-read conservative Protestant theologian. In *Escape from Reason,* Schaeffer maintains that

> we cannot deal with people...on the high level of true humanity, unless we really know their origin—who they are. God tells man who he is. God tells us that He created man in His image. So man is something wonderful.[4]

And, in a later work, Schaeffer consistently advocates this basis

for a Christian view of man and human affairs:

> On the other hand, if one begins with the Bible's position that a person is created by God and created in the image of God, there is a basis for that person's dignity. People, the Bible teaches, are made in the image of God....Each is thus Man with dignity.[5]

And, as the preceptive observer views the scene, this argument rears its head constantly. It occurs as an accepted part of all manner of reasoning. Thus, in a recent article in which he argues for a "humane" treatment of obnoxious cult evangelists, Robert Morey writes this (my emphasis):

> [Christians] seem to have concluded that the Watchtower publicist is somewhat subhuman, beyond salvation, and a dangerous expert in seduction. It is also assumed that he knows the Bible better than most Christians. His zeal and sacrifice make orthodox believers feel inferior. Consequently, they avoid him or roughly rebuke him as though the cultist were not *a man made in the image of God*.[6]

The view of many Christian writers and thinkers appears to be that the image of God in man produces the needed basis for ethical behavior. Because man in some sense still possesses the divine image, he therefore is of supreme worth, and ought to be treated with love, respect, and responsibility.

I should like to argue, rather, that it is theologically inadequate and unfaithful to the primary New Testament witness to base a social or personal ethic upon the image of God in man. My argument will take two directions. The negative task will demonstrate that the uncertainty which surrounds the definition of the *imago Dei* can lead to dangerous theological conclusions which, at their root, are the very antithesis of the Christian Gospel. The positive alternative argument will show that, on the basis of the clear New Testament witness, the redemption accomplished for all mankind in Jesus Christ is the cornerstone of Christian ethics and not the creation of man in the image of God.

What exactly is meant by the "image of God in man"? There has never been complete agreement on this point, either in reference to pre-Fall or post-Fall mankind. Genesis 1:27 records the fact of mankind's unique creation in the image of God. And the debate begins at this point. Most have agreed that a significant part of the image included a moral perfection. (Luther, indeed, apparently held that this righteousness *com-*

pletely constituted the image of God. He therefore regarded the divine image as having been completely lost through the Fall.)[7] But there are other emphases often included in the discussion and definition of the image of God in man. Many have pointed to man's rational and intellectual powers as a part of the image.[8] Apparently some early church fathers thought that some of man's bodily traits also should be included.[9] Some have championed the dominion of Adam and Eve over the creation, granted by God in Genesis 1:28, as part of the divine image.[10] It is clear that, even when the exotic opinions of some are ignored,[11] there is nothing that even approximates agreement in defining the image of God as Adam and Eve first possessed it in the garden. The objection, then, naturally comes to mind; if no one knows exactly what it is, how can it occupy such an important place in the area of Christian thinking?

The waters become even muddier when one attempts to define in what sense human beings have retained the image of God after the Fall. Two oft-cited references are Genesis 9:6 and James 3:9. But again there is no agreement about what these passages say about the continuation of God's image.[12] Indeed, only a vague distinction between mankind and the rest of creation can be drawn.[13] And it is precisely this inability to define the image of God in fallen man which leads to a number of serious difficulties. To emphasize that fallen mankind is still the possessor of an undefined, vague "image of God" is tantamount to saying, "there is something nice about fallen mankind." And when one thinks through the implications of a system of ethics that so completely depends upon this concept, the shortcomings and dangers of this approach become immediately evident.

The most obvious difficulty that occurs when the image of God in fallen man is emphasized is the tendency to trivialize and minimize the reality of sin. Although the church does not teach that sin is of the very essence of what it means to be a human being (also Christ, in partaking of our nature, could then be said to have become sinful), nevertheless the Scriptural testimony concerning the deep and all-pervasive corruption which sin works in fallen humanity is an essential dogma in the Christian faith. Those who insist upon the divine image in fallen man as the source of man's worth run the danger of reducing sin to the status of a subordinate clause. Thus, Harold Kuhn writes (my emphasis):

> History may in the long run undergird the imperative necessity for recognition of the biblical view of humankind as God's special creation. *Even if now marred by sin*, men and women assume a new worth when recognized as bearing the marks of a high image and ancestry.[14]

Pertinent to this discussion is the recent activity of Robert Schuller, pastor of Garden Grove Community Church. In mailing his new book, *Self-Esteem: The New Reformation,* to 250,000 clergymen free of charge, he has brought his views forcibly to the attention of many. In this rather confusing book, Schuller aggressively attacks the traditional view of sin. He maintains that the classic Christian and Reformation views of sin have robbed people of their rightful dignity as those who have been created in the image of God.[15] He gives his own definition of sin: "Any human condition or act that robs God of glory by stripping one of his children of their right to divine dignity."[16] Schuller totally rejects any view of sin that would cause me to "feel bad about myself." Thus, in a noteworthy comment in which he claims to give "a clear and Christ-like understanding of sin," Schuller writes:

> ...at the deepest level, the heart of sin is found in what it causes us to do to ourselves. The most serious sin is the one that causes me to say, 'I am unworthy. I may have no claim to divine sonship if you examine me at my worst.' For once a person believes he is an 'unworthy sinner,' it is doubtful if he can really honestly accept the saving grace God offers in Jesus Christ.[17]

How does this potential (and in at least Schuller's case, actual) de-emphasis and downplay of human sin square with the view of the Holy Scriptures? Refraining at this time from the endless listing of proof texts, perhaps a telling comment by Martin Franzmann would suffice. The reference in his comment is Matthew 7:11:

> "If you, then, *who are evil (sic)* know how to give good gifts to your children..." Jesus is here taking man at his very best, in his fatherhood, where the very structure imposed upon his life by the Creator forces a certain selflessness upon him—Jesus is taking man as the giver of good gifts to his children and is *there* calling him evil. Man's incapacity for real righteousness, for a real actualization of the will of God, could hardly be more strongly stated.[18]

And, of course, the confessional view of sin's serious and pervasive corruption matches the quotation above.[19] Clearly, a heavy emphasis upon the present possession of the *imago Dei* in fallen man runs the risk of losing a clear and Biblical doctrine of sin and its effects. Sin is not just something that partially obscures and dirties creatures of innate "divine dignity" (Schuller's phrase.) Rather, sin affects every aspect of who we are, what we think, and say, and do. Any anthropology which does not reckon adequately with this reality is to be avoided.

A second difficulty with the "image of God" approach to human worth and ethics stems from this first one. And it is, in its essence, antithetical to the Gospel itself. Simply stated, it is perilously easy to reason thus:

> *Proposition 1:* I (and all other human beings) are of worth and significance because we are made in the image of God.
>
> *Proposition 2:* God loves me, and all other human beings, and He sent His only Son, Jesus, to be our Savior.
>
> *Conclusion:* Therefore, God loves me and sent His Son to die for me *because* I am of worth and significance.

When men insist that they themselves are of special worth because they possess, even in the fallenness of sin, the divine image, the anthropocentrism of such a view inherently seeks to assert itself idolatrously. Even though the divine image is originally God's gift, nevertheless, "it belongs to me." And, most naturally, then, sinful men can fall into the error of perverting and changing the nature of God's love as expressed in Jesus Christ. For, to insist, however subtly or mildly, that God loves me because of some wonderful quality in me, is to destroy the Christian faith.

God's grace, by its very nature, is free from any influences caused by the nature of its objects. The love of God for sinful men is not only undeserved—it is undeservable. Although one fears to say dogmatically what God cannot do, it seems consistent to say that conditional love, evoked in some way by some quality in love's object, is never present in God. He cannot love in that way. Even if there existed a humanity, confirmed in bliss like the holy angels, and therefore perfectly worthy of God's love, still God would not love that humanity *for that reason.* But rather, the love of God is a free giving which is not increased, decreased, or changed by the qualities possessed by the recipients of that love. "You did not choose me; I chose you" (John 15:16). C.S. Lewis writes most beautifully on that aspect

of God's "gift-love":

> In God there is no hunger that needs to be filled, only plenteousness that desires to give. The doctrine that God was under no necessity to create is not a piece of dry scholastic speculation. It is essential.[20]

Lewis himself was aware of the dangerous tendency in man to misunderstand God's grace in exactly the manner of which I have spoken above. He writes again:

> No sooner do we believe that God loves us than there is an impulse to believe that He does so, not because He is Love, but because we are intrinsically loveable. The Pagans obeyed this impulse unabashed; a good man was "dear to the gods" because he was good. We, being better taught, resort to subterfuge. Far be it from us to think that we have virtues for which God could love us. But then, how magnificently we have repented! As Bunyan says, describing his first and illusory conversion, "I thought there was no man in England that pleased God better than I." Beaten out of this, we next offer our own humility to God's admiration. Surely He'll like *that!* Or if not that, our clear-sighted and humble recognition that we still lack humility. Thus, depth beneath depth and subtlety within subtlety, there remains some lingering idea of our own, our very own, attractiveness. It is easy to acknowledge, but almost impossible to realize for long, that we are mirrors whose brightness, if we are bright, is wholly derived from the sun that shines upon us. Surely we must have a little—native luminosity! Surely we can't be *quite* creatures![21]

Now, lest anyone think that I have here erected a convenient "straw man," let me assure you that not only have I heard people and counselors reasoning in the manner described above, but I have also read it. In the Portland *Oregonian* July 24, 1982, Robert Schuller is credited with this statement: "But Christianity's central point is that humans are of such value that God forgives and saves." Granted, this statement could be merely a reporter's misunderstanding of Schuller. (That in itself would be important to note—that others could *draw these conclusions!) But the book, Self-Esteem: The New Reformation,* just barely stops short of saying the same thing. Schuller describes the plan of salvation thus (my emphasis):

> How can God forgive us when we are sinful? How can

> he save us? The biblical and theological answer is by grace—"God's love in action for people who don't deserve it." (*I may not deserve it, but I am worth it, so don't say I am unworthy.*")[22]

To begin by emphasizing an intrinsic worth in mankind, stemming from any source, is to begin falsely. And to infer, as Schuller seems to do, that the cause for the incarnation and the redemption resides in the worth of human beings is to create a new religion, not a new reformation.[23] The love of God in Christ is "disinterested" (Lewis' phrase). It is not brought forth, or changed, or destroyed by anything in us.

"God, after He spoke long ago to the fathers in the prophets in many portions and in many ways, in these last days has spoken to us in His Son" (Heb.1:1–2a). God's final and full word to mankind is Jesus Christ. It is precisely the lack of an appropriate Christocentric awareness which is the greatest weakness of the perspective with which this article has been dealing. On the basis of the assertion that fallen man still retains the divine image, some would build a system of human ethics and value and worth. The dangerous anthropocentrism of this view alone makes it suspect. Christ, God's final Word, is not part of it. The church must not be satisfied with this answer. It does not square with Christian theology. It has not the strength to bear the load which many desire to put upon it. And, most importantly, it does not reflect the thrust and message of the New Testament. For the New Testament documents do not focus chiefly, or even significantly, upon the image of God in man as the basis for ethical assumptions and behavior. Rather, the apostolic writings insist that the love of God for men and the redemption accomplished for all mankind in Jesus Christ provide the perspective within which human beings can be valued and prized and loved.

It is the express teaching of the New Testament that Christ's sacrifice on the cross has effected a dramatic change in the vertical relationship which men have with the living God. But, not only has the atonement accomplished this vertical change; it has also brought about a new relationship of human beings, one with another. It is on the basis of what Christ's suffering, death, and resurrection have wrought that the apostle Paul makes his appeals to his churches. Paul explicitly follows this line in his letter to Rome. The context of the most obvious example is the Christian's duty to set aside cheerfully his own rights in order to defer to and care for his weaker brother in the faith. "For if

because of food your brother is hurt, you are no longer walking according to love. Do not destroy with your food him for whom Christ died"(Rom.14:15). The brother is to be treasured, valued, and loved—*because Christ died for him.* This is the theme which again and again appears in the ethical sections of Paul's correspondence. The basis for mutual acceptance of one another is Christ's gift of forgiveness and acceptance (Rom.15:7). The appeal for kind, harmonious relationships between Christians flows out of the tenderhearted forgiveness which all Christians have received (Eph.4:32). Long-standing social and religious prejudice crumbles before the onslaught of Christ's reconciling love; Jews and Gentiles are reconciled into one body through Christ's sacrifice on the cross (Eph.2:13–22). The perspective toward others which Christians are now to exhibit grows out of their awareness of the new creative work which Christ has wrought. "Therefore, from now on we recognize no man according to the flesh... Therefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature" (II Cor.5:16–17). In no place does Paul base his ethics for his churches upon the present possession of the image of God. For Paul, all of God's promises are fulfilled in Jesus. "For as many as may be the promises of God, in Him they are yes" (II Cor.1:20). For Paul, it is the great act of salvation accomplished in Jesus Christ which provides the base and rationale for human relationships in the church.

For Luke as well, this is the obvious conclusion. Paul's farewell speech to the Ephesian elders includes the charge to tend the flocks entrusted to their care. The necessary motivation for fulfilling their pastoral responsibilities is stated: "Be on guard for yourselves and for all the flock...to shepherd the church of God which He purchased with His own blood" (Acts 20:28). It is hard to imagine a substitution such as, "...shepherd the church of God which is created in the image of God."

The manner in which the Spirit is bestowed in the book of Acts also provides insight into Luke's approach. There are four "signal" receptions of the Spirit in Acts. With each occurrence, Luke demonstrates that the coming of the last days has ushered in a new era also for relationships within the church. Of course the Chosen People, the Jews, receive the gift of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2). It is just as crucial that the Samaritan believers should receive the same gift; Peter and John are sent to insure this happening (Acts 8). And, as astonishing as it was to Peter and his companions that even the Gentiles were to receive the Spirit, Peter himself draws the inference that a new

era of human relationships has begun: "If God therefore gave to them the same gift as He gave to us also after believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could stand in God's way?" (Acts 11:17). This new era embraces all kinds of people—even the "oddball" group of "John's disciples" who heed the preaching of Paul (Acts 19:1–7). The redemption accomplished for all in Jesus Christ has created a new way of dealing with one another. The old hatreds between Jew and Gentiles, Jew and Samaritan, have been erased by the blood of Christ. Forgiveness and love are now the hallmarks of relationships in the church. It is Christ's sacrifice on the cross which has created this ethical system.

The obvious objection which may be raised at this point is this: what about unbelievers? All the citations above are applied specifically to the dealings of Christians with one another. The blessings of Christ's work have not yet been received by unbelievers. They are not "in Christ." Can the redemption wrought by God in Jesus be the foundation for dealing with them also?

"So then, while we have opportunity, let us do good to all men, and especially to those who are of the household of the faith" (Gal.6:10). All persons, regardless of their present spiritual state, are to receive love, respect, and care. Even those who are naturally the least loveable—our enemies—are to benefit from our loving concern. Why? Does their value spring from their possession of the divine image, even though horribly marred by sin and corruption? Are we to love our enemies, and all other people, because of their "high ancestry"? No. There is not a word of that from the lips of Jesus. Rather, it is the love of God for all men, even His enemies, which moves the Christian to a position of universal human value and human rights (Matt.5:44–45):

> But I say to you, love your enemies, and pray for those who persecute you, in order that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for He causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous.

It is the grace of God, not the creative power of God, which provides the rationale for Christian ethics. Just as men must receive an "alien righteousness" through faith in Christ in order to be saved, so has all mankind received an "alien value," coming from the outside, by being the objects of God's love in Jesus. This is the plain teaching of the New Testament. The love

and concern which Christians must offer to all human beings grows out of the universal love of God for all. Christ's death has purchased forgiveness for all mankind. All persons are the objects of His love. And so they are to be for Christ's people.

Given the heavy, uniform emphasis in some circles upon the divine image as the foundation for ethical behavior, the question must be asked almost incredulously, "Does the New Testament have *anything* to say about the image of God?" There is the oft-cited verse, James 3:9. And it cannot be denied that James does draw ethical implications by describing men as originally made in the image of God. But a study of the concept of the "image of God" in the New Testament as a whole reveals that the predominant use of this idea (and it is only Paul who develops it) occurs as a description of Christian sanctification. For Paul, the concept of the image of God as a possession of mankind in general has no importance at all.

First, a few statistics would be appropriate. The use of *homoioosis* in James 3:9 is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament; *homoiooma,* "likeness," is never used in reference to humans. It is the use of *eikoon,* "image," which demonstrates Paul's theological development of the concept of "the image of God."

When Paul uses the idea of the divine image, it is primarily a reference to the deity of Christ. Because the use of *eikoon* (as opposed to *homoiooma*) emphasizes a sharing in the essence of the original,[24] Paul uses *eikoon tou theou* to express Christ's divine nature (II Cor.4:4, Col.1:15). Paul is not at all concerned with human beings as possessing a likeness to God.[25] Rather, he makes the connection of Genesis 1:17 with Christ as the second Adam.[26] The only application of the concept of the divine image to sinful men occurs in the discussion of the Christian's sanctification. Believers are in the process of being transformed into the image of Christ (II Cor.3:18). Redeemed men and women are being renewed after the image of Christ (Col.3:10, Rom.8:29). Part of the glory of the resurrection will be the attaining of the image of the heavenly, second Adam—Christ himself (I Cor.15:49). Exclusively, then, Paul connects the concept of the divine image with being "in Christ."[27] Nowhere does he even mention the present possession of the divine image, much less use it as a source for ethical injunctions. Only the believer shares in the image of God, and that only because of his fellowship with Christ.

If the teaching of the New Testament is so firmly oriented

toward the grace of God in Jesus Christ as the foundation for human ethics, why does the emphasis upon the *imago Dei* exist at all? Although one can only guess, some suggestions can be made. The Calvinist doctrine of the limited atonement certainly would lean in that direction. Since, according to this teaching, Christ did not redeem the whole human race, a more universal concept such as the creation must serve as a source for ethics.[28] Calvin himself did not build upon the redemption; rather, he built his social ethics upon "the endurance of the divine image even in fallen man."[29] This Reformed emphasis upon the sovereign power of God the Creator probably is at work in leading many to an un-Biblical emphasis upon the present possession of the image of God.

Another possible source for this perspective on human worth is Roman Catholic anthropology. The Roman Catholic doctrine of the essential freedom of fallen man's will as "an exceptional sign of the image of God in man"[30] leads in this direction. Thus, one modern Catholic catechetical text makes this statement under the subtitle, "Dignity Rooted in Freedom":

> Since the rise of modern totalitarianism, the main theme of Catholic teaching about the human person has been the subject of liberty. Individuals have rights because they are persons endowed with freedom to co-operate with God's grace in working out their immortal destiny. Three documents—two papal and one conciliar—stand out in a series of statements that read like a Gospel proclamation in today's world: "You are persons, not pawns! You are free, not slaves! You have rights that no one, under God, may take away!"[31]

With all due respect to others' sensibilities, this is an example of a "Gospel proclamation" without Gospel content. For it is precisely the Gospel of God's love in Jesus Christ which is lacking from the emphasis upon the divine image in man. And yet, as we have seen above, the New Testament derives both social and personal ethics from the love of God, especially as it is expressed through the death and resurrection of Jesus.

One other comment might be offered. The original sin in the garden was the attempt to express an existence independent from God. "You will be like God, knowing good and evil" (Gen.3:5). As C.S. Lewis so marvelously describes it,

> ...they wanted, as we say, to "call their souls their own." But that means to live a lie, for our souls are not, in fact, our own. They wanted some corner in the

> universe of which they could say to God, "This is our business, not yours." But there is no such corner. They wanted to be nouns, but they were, and eternally must be, mere adjectives.[32]

And, without necessarily imputing this conscious motive to any particular individual who might stress the image of God in man as the reason for ethical behavior, is not this perspective at least somewhat attractive for the reason mentioned above? "*We* possess it; even as sinners, the image belongs to *us*! We are to be loved, by God and others, because of something that we possess." Sinful human nature, ever repeating the error in the garden, wants to block God out. By stressing the divine image in man in an unwarranted fashion, it can be done.

The Christian church must resist this view, if she is to remain faithful to her Biblical moorings. Jesus Christ must be the source of every aspect of Christian thinking, and the ultimate answer to every question. To glory in what we have become because of His saving actions on our behalf—this is the Christian's response. "In Him you have been made complete" (Col.2:10). And to know that every person is also the object of such love and sacrifice provides the necessary base from which ethical behavior may spring. Even though many are the unwilling or ignorant object of the love of God in Jesus Christ, still He loves them. For *that* reason, so must we.

FOOTNOTES

1. Bernard Nathanson, in his book, *Aborting America* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1979), p.255, writes, "It is worth pondering that the abortion ethic contrasts with the new ecological sensitivity. The same society (and some of the same individuals) that lavishes great care over the peregrine falcon or the Furbish lousewort is willing to accept mass alpha-cide with equanimity. We worry about technological control over nature, while it occurs daily in the vacuuming out of wombs."
2. George Ladd, "Why Did God Inspire the Bible," in Gasque and Lasor, eds., *Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), p.52.
3. Ladd, ibid., p.53.
4. Francis A. Schaeffer, *Escape From Reason* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1974), p.22.

5. Francis A. Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live?* (Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, 1976), p.86.
6. Robert A. Morey, "A Jehovah's Witness? Next Time Open the Door," *Christianity Today,* September 3, 1982, p.37.
7. David Scaer, "Man Made in the Image of God and Its Relationship to the First Promise," *Concordia Theological Quarterly,* 41:3 (July 1977), p.33. See also Louis Berkof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), p.202.
8. H. Cremer, "Image of God," in S.M. Jackson, ed., *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), V, p.451. Also Gordon Clark, "Image of God," in Carl Henry, ed., *Baker's Dictionary of Christian Ethics* (Baker Book House, 1973), p. 312.
9. Berkof, op.cit., p.202. Interestingly enough, no less an Old Testament scholar than Gerhard von Rad, when pressed for an answer, holds to an emphasis upon man's physical nature as essential to the image of God concept in Genesis 1. He writes in Geoffrey Bromiley, ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids,: Eerdmans, 1964), II, p.391, that "the debate whether the divine likeness refers to the spiritual or physical being of man is not very helpful. If we had to think in terms of such an alternative, we should have to decide in favour of a predominantly physical likeness, not in the sense of speculation of God's form or corporeality, but in the sense of a reference to the Elohim nature proper to man. Man is here designated as a creature whose being is not from below but who belongs by nature to the upper region. There are two passages in particular in P which prevent us from interpreting the theologoumenon of the divine likeness in a one-sidedly spiritual sense. In Gn.5:1ff reference is made to the physical progeny of the first man, and it is said of Seth, Adam's son, that he was begotten in the image and likeness of Adam. This statement is most important. It ensures the theological actuality for all generations of the witness to the divine likeness. For in itself the story of a being originally created in the divine likeness would be of no great significance for OT faith. In relation to the particular question, Gn.5:3 tells us that the transmission of the divine likeness is thought of in terms of the physical sequence of generations and therefore obviously in a physical sense. The second passage is Gn.9:6, where the prohibition of murder is grounded in the divine likeness. Here the thought is the same. Attack on man's body is violation of God's honour."
10. Berkof, op.cit., p.205; Cremer, op.cit., p.451; Henry, op.cit., p.312; Jay Adams, *Competent to Counsel* (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1976), p.128.

11. Larry Christiansen, *The Christian Family* (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1970), p.63. Christiansen writes, "He created man in His own image (Genesis 1:26), and part of the image of God in man is found in this, that we share His fatherhood [i.e., that we are able to become fathers and mothers]."
12. Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics* (Saint Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1950), I, pp.518–519. He comments, "The Lutheran theologians are agreed that the image of God, which consists in the knowledge of God and holiness of the will, is lacking in man after the Fall, since Col.3:10 and Eph.4:24 distinctly say that it is being restored in the believer. They differ, however, on the question as to whether in Gen.9:6...and James 3:9...a divine image is still ascribed to man after the Fall. Some deny this and take the passage to describe man as the noble creature who once bore the image of God and in whom God would recreate this image through faith in Christ. Thus Luther...Philippi, Gottfried, Hoffman.Others say that these passages describe man as he is after the Fall, a creature endowed with intellect and will, and contend that this constitutes a certain similitude with God. Thus Baier...Quenstedt...and others. The latter distinguish between the image of God in a wider sense, according to which man, in distinction from the animals, is still a rational being even after the Fall, and the divine image in the proper sense, consisting in true knowledge and service of God, which was lost through the Fall...

    "It has been maintained that not a lost image of God, but only a still extant image could be a sound reason why we are not to shed man's blood or curse him. But Luther and those who share his position see in these texts not only the lost image, but the image that is to be restored again in Christ..."
13. Scaer, op.cit., p.33.
14. Harold Kuhn, "Human Rights, Yes; but Why?", *Christianity Today,* July 16, 1982, p.57. Kuhn's reference to fallen man's "high ancestry" indirectly refers to another line of reasoning that can characterize this perspective. It says this: "Even if I am sinful—very sinful—still I can remember the image of God that Adam and Eve possessed, and I can draw worth and self-esteem from that original image." Francis Schaeffer, in *Escape From Reason,* op.cit., p.21, writes, "Man has value because of who he was before the Fall." But surely this is ludicrous! Can I boast in the distance which I have fallen? Can I assure others that, because they have taken God's marvelous gifts of reason, intellect, and morality and consistently *misused* them, they are of value? The fact that a hardened criminal comes from a well-bred, cultured, moral family is not a cause for boasting—it is a cause for shame.

15. Robert Schuller, *Self-Esteem: The New Reformation* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1982), p.38. Schuller writes, "Where the sixteenth century Reformation returned our focus to sacred Scriptures as the only infallible rule for faith and practice, the new reformation will return our focus to the sacred right of every person to self-esteem!"
16. Ibid., p.14.
17. Ibid., p.98.
18. Martin Franzmann, "Studies in Discipleship," *Concordia Theological Monthly,* XXXVI:11 (November 1960), p.68.
19. *Concordia Triglotta* (Saint Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p.477, Article I of the Smalcald Articles: "This hereditary sin is so deep and horrible a corruption of nature that no reason can understand it, but it must be learned and believed from the revelation of Scriptures." Also pp.875–876, the Formula of Concord, Thorough Declaration, Article I: "Luther himself explains that by nature-sin, person-sin, essential-sin he means not only the words, thoughts, and works are sin, but that the entire nature, person, and essence of man are altogether corrupted by the root of original sin."
20. C.S. Lewis, *The Four Loves* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1960), p.175.
21. Ibid., p.180.
22. Schuller, op.cit., pp.99–100.
23. The Biblical view of God's love always emphasizes its unilateral nature; that is, it comes from God, because of who God is. Thus the perfectly typical statement from Ezekiel 39:25, in which the prophet predicts the future salvation of God's people: "Therefore thus says the Lord God, 'Now I shall restore the fortunes of Jacob, and have mercy on the whole house of Israel; and I shall be jealous for My holy name.'"
24. So G. Kittel, in Geoffrey Bromiley, ed., op.cit., II, p.395, "In the NT the original is always present in the image...When Christ is called the *eikoon* in 2 C.4:4; Colossians 1:15, all the emphasis is on the equality of the *eikoon* with the original." So also J. Schneider's article on *homoiooma* in TDNT, V, p.191: "There is often a distinction between the two words [*eikoon* and *homoiooma*]. This may be formulated as follows; *eikoon* represents the object, whereas *homoiooma* emphasizes the similarity, but with no need for an inner connection between the original and the copy."
25. The one place in which Paul uses *eikoon* in reference to man is in his discussion at I Corinthians 11 on the submission of wives to husbands. He does refer to the man as "the image and glory of God," *eikoon kau doxa theou.* But Paul cannot be referring the divine image in the sense of Genesis 1; else he would be guilty of saying that only males possessed this image.

26. Kittel, op.cit., pp.395-396.
27. Kittel, p.397. In referring to Paul's usage at Colossians 3:10, he writes, "Here it is quite clear that restoration of the divine likeness of creation is identical with the establishment of fellowship with Christ."
28. Robert Brinsmead, "Justification by Faith and Human Rights," in *The Christian Verdict,* Essay 3, 1983, pp.5-6. "Some Christians base their stand on human rights upon creation rather than upon Jesus Christ and His redemption. They probably do this because they see that God is the Creator of all but hesitate, out of deference to their systematic theology, to think that Christ is the Redeemer of all."
29. B.A. Gerrish, "The Mirror of Man's Goodness," *Concordia Theological Quarterly,* 45:3 (July 1981). I was present when Professor Gerrish presented the lecture which later appeared as the article referred to above. After the lecture, I asked him if he was aware of any tendency of development in Calvin's thought which would have based social ethics upon the redemption rather than the creation. His answer was, simply, "No."
30. Austin Flannery, ed., *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents* (Northport, New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1980), p.917. Included in the Vatican II statements concerning human worth is this statement which embraces both redemption and creation as foundational: "All men are endowed with a rational soul and are created in God's image; they have the same nature and origin and, being redeemed by Christ, they enjoy the same divine calling and destiny; there is here a basic equality between all men and it must be given ever greater recognition."
31. John Hardon, *The Catholic Catechism* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975), p.107.
32. C.S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1973), p.80.

Rev. Jeffery Gibbs is pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, Scappoose, Oregon.

Implications of Recent Exegetical Studies for the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: A Survey of the Literature

John T. Pless

Confessional Lutheran theology rightly insists that the doctrine of the Lord's Supper must be firmly grounded on the scriptural texts. It is the word of God that discloses the meaning of the sacrament. The question raised for contemporary Lutheranism focuses our attention on this central issue: "What do the Scriptures actually tell us about the Lord's Supper?" This question calls attention to the fact that theology cannot be divided into neat categories of exegetical studies, dogmatics, historical studies, and practical theology which are unrelated to each other. In fact, when we look at the doctrine of the Lord's Supper we see the complexity of the inter-relatedness of the various theological disciplines. A proper exegetical understanding of the Lord's Supper will have profound and far-reaching effects on dogmatic formulations, liturgical practice, ecumenical encounters and pastoral care.

It is beyond the scope of this study to demonstrate all of the connections of contemporary exegetical studies with dogmatic, ecumenical, liturgical or practical applications with regard to the Lord's Supper. Rather this paper will attempt to provide a "road map" to recent exegetical scholarship in the area of the Lord's Supper, pointing out where certain "detours" have been made into doctrinal theology, ecumenics and liturgics.

Critical scholarship of the nineteenth century developed two divergent views as to the meaning of the Lord's Supper. One view emphasized that the Lord's Supper as an act of Jesus intended to be a symbolic action declaring his coming death (A. Juelicher). The second view identified the central meaning of the Lord's Supper with the reception of bread and wine in the act of communion. Proponents of this theory (David Strauss, Bruno Bauer, and Ernst Renan) maintained that "the action of Jesus at the Last Supper can contain no symbolic representation

of his passion, because he cannot have foreseen his death."[1] The Words of Institution recorded in the Synoptic Gospels and in I Corinthians were regarded as aetiological legends which grew out of the actual practice of the eucharist in the early church or else the Lord's Supper was regarded as simply one of the many fellowship meals that Jesus had with his disciples which was given a special character in the memory of the early Christian community.

Early in the twentieth century the names of Wilhelm Heitmueller and Hans Lietzmann stand out as especially significant. Heitmueller, following some nineteenth century scholars, regarded the accounts of the Lord's Supper as "aetiological cult-legends." These accounts according to Heitmueller are heavily colored by the way the Lord's Supper was being celebrated at the time the accounts were written. Since table fellowship took on spiritual dimensions in the ancient world, Heitmueller argues that the early church recognized in his holy meal a special communion between Jesus, who assumed the role of a Jewish house-father, and his disciples.

In 1926 Hans Lietzmann of Berlin published his massive work, *Mass and Lord's Supper*, in which he attempts to arrive at an understanding of the actual, historical meaning of the original Lord's Supper by starting with the liturgies of the fourth and fifth centuries and working his way back to the New Testament texts. Reu says of Lietzmann's work that it was "a rare example of historical insight and erudition."[2] Lietzmann's investigation of the early eucharistic liturgies led him to conclude that all of the liturgical forms in the early centuries of Christian history could be traced back to two primal forms: the Hippolytus-Roman form and the Egyptian form.[3] Lietzmann writes:

> Our starting points are on the one hand the extant texts of Hippolytus or, alternatively, its Greek reconstruction; and on the other hand the oldest form of the Egyptian liturgy, as it may be derived from Egyptian sources— and in single cases probably also from the Gallican: Sarapion's anaphora being the most important. From here we must at tempt to arrive at the days of the apostles by a comparison of these types with one another and with other witnesses of ancient times.[4]

Next Lietzmann moves on to answer the question, "What were the sources for these two forms of liturgies?" After careful review of the textual evidence, Lietzmann concludes that the

concepts present in the Hippolytan liturgy are derived from Pauline Christianity.[5] The Egyptian liturgy, on the other hand, is traced back to its oldest form in the Anaphora of Sarapion. Lietzmann argues that this form of liturgy was based on a Jewish prototype, perhaps first used in Jerusalem.[6] The Anaphora of Sarapion combines biblical and philosophical language in a single form—it was a rather ecclectic liturgy:

> It is highly probable therefore that the Sarapion Liturgy does not represent one uniform liturgical type, but is rather the outcome of a gradual mingling of different elements. Above all, the narrative of the institution, on account of its subordinate importance, appears as a foreign element; and the way in which it is broken into parts and overlaid with reflections is consistent with this.[7]

Lietzmann is unwilling finally to ascribe the celebration of the Lord's Supper to a common source. The Hippolytan form had its origin in Paul. The Egyptian form was derived from the joyous *agape* suppers of the primitive church, which were in turn quite similar to the Jewish Sabbath meal (*chaburah*).[8] Lietzmann goes on to argue that the Last Supper was not a passover meal but a *chaburah*.[9]

Undoubtedly, the most significant work on the Lord's Supper in our century is Joachim Jeremias' *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Jeremias considers the objections raised against finding the passover meal as the context for the Last Supper. After presenting detailed exegetical information to counter each of the objections, Jeremias concludes:

> ...it should be noted that the report of the synoptic gospels that the Last Supper was a passover meal *is at variance with the rite of the Early Church*. The Early Church did not celebrate the Lord's Supper according to the passover ritual, nor yet only once a year, but daily or on each Lord's Day. The reminiscences of the passover can therefore not have come from the liturgical practice; 'for the liturgy gave no occasion for them'... the synoptic gospels nevertheless describe the Last Supper as a passover meal and do not allow this to be lost in the tradition,... to be removed by the influence of the ritual practice.[10]

Yet the significance of Jeremias' work is far greater than his giving greater historical credence to the scriptural texts than many of the scholars who preceded him. The ultimate result of Jeremias' research was to establish a view of the Lord's Supper as "parabolic action." This view was destined to create

far-reaching results in the world of biblical scholarship as well as in liturgical practice and ecumenical discussion. This action is identified by Jeremias as *anamneesis*. Jeremias interprets this *anamneesis*—this remembrance—as follows:

> Keep joining yourselves together as the redeemed community by the table rite, that in this way God may be daily implored to bring about the consummation of the parousia.[11]

With this definition Jeremias provided a platform upon which scholars from many traditions would build a new understanding of the Lord's Supper as man's action before God.

While not accepting all of Jeremias' conclusions, two notable exegetes, Oscar Cullmann and Eduard Schweizer must be seen as very much influenced by Jeremias. Schweizer maintained that within the New Testament church there were two views of the eucharist in existence:

> To oversimplify, if the question had been posed concerning the nature of the elements (which it had not), then the Palestinian would have given a 'Reformed' answer, 'the bread signifies the body,' and the Hellenist, a 'Lutheran' answer, 'the bread is the body'.[12]

It comes as no surprise, therefore, to learn that Schweizer was a member of the commission of Reformed and Lutheran theologians who drafted the Arnoldshain Theses in 1958, paving the way for intercommunion between these two bodies in Germany. How, then, does Schweizer view the presence of Christ in the sacrament? True to his Calvinistic heritage, Schweizer writes:

> ...the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is exactly the same as his presence in the word—nothing more, nothing less. It is an event, not an object; an encounter, not a phenomenon of nature; it is Christ's encounter with his church, not the distribution of a substance.[13]

Oscar Cullmann, the well-known New Testament exegete from Basel argues like Lietzmann that there were indeed two sources for the Lord's Supper. Originally the Lord's Supper was seen in light of Easter, not the Last Supper, Cullmann maintains. Only with Paul is the Lord's Supper connected with the night prior to our Lord's death. Note Cullmann's description of these early eucharistic celebrations:

> It may be taken as agreed that the oldest celebration of the Lord's Supper took place in the setting of an actual meal, in which the drinking of wine was not absolutely necessary

> as we find in Acts, which speaks only of 'breaking of bread' and of nothing else...It is an essential characteristic of this meal that as Acts 2:46 has it, 'exuberant joy' prevailed amongst them. This was not aroused primarily by the remembrance of the Last Supper, but is explained in the first instance by the remembrance of those other occasions where Jesus, immediately after his resurrection, appeared to the disciples, while they were having a meal.[14]

Accordingly, Cullmann maintains that the central reality of the early eucharist was not the body and blood of the Crucified Christ but a joyful communion with the Risen Lord:

> ... the joy manifested by the early Christians during the breaking of the bread has its source, not in the fact that the assembled disciples eat the body and drink the blood of their crucified Master, but in the consciousness they have of eating with the Risen Christ, really present in their midst, as He was on Easter Day.[15]

As we shall see, Cullmann's words which sound terribly similar to Schleiermacher,[16] strike a responsive chord in a number of ecclesiastical statements on the Lord's Supper as well as in certain liturgical forms.

Cullmann attempts to ground the Lord's Supper in the early church's "experience" of the Risen Christ. Yet the question of the relationship of Jesus to the Supper remains unanswered in Cullmann's research. Willi Marxsen of Muenster attempts to clarify, if not answer, this question. However his answer leaves us with skepticism in regard to the actual origin of the Lord's Supper:

> It is extremely difficult to refer the contents of the Pauline formula back to Jesus; and in the face of all that we can ascertain about the preaching and activity of Jesus, it is still less likely to assume institution of a cult by Jesus. Thus the supposition that Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper on the eve of his death poses so many difficulties that the careful historian must put more than just a question mark here.[17]

Not all New Testament exegetes are as skeptical as Marxsen. A refreshingly positive approach is taken by Aberdeen's I. Howard Marshall. The significance of Marshall's *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, published in 1980, lies not in the theological conclusions at which he arrives—his conclusions are firmly rooted in the Reformed tradition. Rather the importance of the book is that it is an attempt on the part of a conservative

Reformed theologian to deal with the historical data surrounding the Lord's Supper and to come to terms with the theological meaning for contemporary Christians. Marshall states his purpose early in the volume:

> Broadly speaking, we want to ask a historical question, What actually happened at the Lord's Supper?—and a theological question, What was the significance of what happened?[18]

In a very systematic fashion Marshall goes about the task of answering those two questions. Marshall sets forth two methodologies currently used for dealing with the literary and historical data. One begins with the evidence in the New Testament and then proceeds to the early church and her liturgies (Jeremias). The contrasting approach begins with the early church and attempts to work its way back to the Last Supper (Lietzmann). Marshall opts for the first approach, maintaining that the "original accounts of the Lord's Supper were historical rather than liturgical creations."[19] According to Marshall one must use the New Testament texts themselves and not speculative theories concerning pagan cultic meals or Jewish meal practices to construct a doctrine of the Supper. After a review and critique of the scholarship of such notables as Bultmann, Bornkamm, Delling, Goppelt, Jeremias, Lietzmann, Marxsen, Pesch, Schurmann, and E. Schweizer, Marshall argues:

> Our conclusion, then, is that Jesus had a Passover meal earlier than the official Jewish date and that he was able to do so as a result of calendar differences among the Jews.[20]

Last Supper and Lord's Supper is more than a historical study; it is a theological interpretation. At this point the "Reformed bias" of the author is quite evident:

> In fairness it should be observed that the cup contained wine which represented blood rather than the blood itself.[21]
>
> In short, we may be confident that Jesus spoke of the bread as representing his body; that he likened the cup to his blood of the covenant or to the new covenant in his blood; and that he spoke of giving him self or pouring out his blood for many.[22]
>
> The word 'is', which would have been absent from the original saying in Hebrew or Aramaic, can mean 'signify' as well as 'be identified with,' and there can be no doubt whatever that at the Last Supper the word was used with

> the former meaning. The saying was uttered by Jesus while he was bodily present with the disciples, and they could see that his body and the bread were two separate things. One might compare how a person showing a photograph of himself to a group of friends could say, as he points to it, 'This is me'.[23]
>
> ...it must be plainly stated that Paul's remarks require nothing more than a stress on the symbolism of bread and wine and do not in any way require an identification of the bread and wine as the body and blood of Jesus.[24]

Placing great emphasis on the symbolic character of the Lord's Supper, Marshall develops a "visible word" theology of the Sacrament; that is, the Sacrament is basically a visual aid to faith.

Thus far, all the exegetes we have treated have been representatives of one of the Protestant traditions. A very significant impact on both Protestant and Roman Catholic scholars was made by the Roman Catholic theologian, Odo Casel. Casel devoted his career to the investigation of the connection between the concept of "mystery" and the Christian sacraments. Casel's work was to provide a scholarly foundation for the liturgical movement in Roman Catholicism which subsequently would influence the practices of other church bodies as well.[25] According to Casel "mystery" (*mysterion*) is:

> ...the Greek designation for the ancient Hellenic and later Hellenistic secret cults which are unlike the cults of the polis; They give to the worshipers of a god, who have been specially initiated and thereby joined to the god, a closer and more personal union with him; this union reaches beyond death and promises a happy existence in the next world.[26]

Casel argues that the "pagan mysteries" served as a means whereby God prepared the world for "the true mysteries" (i.e., the sacraments). The pagan mysteries provided a "ritual shape" for the sacraments, but Christ provided the "content," Casel maintains. Casel's methodology won general approval in Roman Catholic circles, and with increased ecumenical activity not a few Protestants consider themselves disciples of Casel.[27]

Now we must turn to the implications that the scholarly investigations of the last one hundred years have had for the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. We formulate our findings in terms of three theses:

(1) The use of the historical-critical method as the normative

methodology for understanding the biblical texts regarding the Lord's Supper is unable to provide a consistent answer to the question, "What is the Lord's Supper?"

(2) The input of contemporary exegetical studies to ecumenical discussions has not led to a clear understanding of the institution and meaning of the Lord's Supper.

(3) Contemporary exegetical studies tend toward a spiritualization of the Lord's Supper by connecting the primary content of the Supper with *anamneesis*, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, or eschatology, rather than the Words of Institution.

It cannot be denied that one of the forces at work within American Lutheranism in the 1960's which contributed to the desire for a revised liturgy and new hymnal was the historical-critical approach to the Holy Scriptures. In 1967, David Granskou, then a professor of New Testament at the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago, wrote:

> The liturgy which we have does present the Bible, but it is presented in the only way that the pre-critical age of exegesis could present it.[28]

The new liturgy must conform to the canons of the historical-critical method, argued Granskou (the italicization has been added):

> Liturgies written in a pre-critical age made far different assumptions about the primary historical data, which was supposed to be a direct report of the life and thought of Jesus and the apostles, by the apostles. The Christians who wrote these liturgies were men of good faith who used the Bible as they understood it. However, if we are to be as biblical as they, *we must use the Bible and biblical words according to our under standing*, not theirs.[29]

Granskou leaves open the door for much mischief in his call for an understanding of the "Bible and biblical words" and subsequently the liturgy "according to our understanding."

One of the ironies of the historical-critical method is that it makes a claim to shed light on the actual meaning of the text when in fact it often further obscures the clear intention of the text. Harvey Guthrie contends:

> What critical, historical research has uncovered and the way the results have been used in liturgical revision in the Church have opened up wonderful possibilities. Not only have those discoveries and their application in liturgical revision made it possible for contemporary Christians once

> again to worship in the atmosphere and structures of the *eucharistia* cult of early Christianity. Not only have those discoveries and their application in liturgical revision made it possible for contemporary Christians to reappropriate the truly traditional ethos of their liturgy which was obscured by 'modernizing' accretions in medieval and Reformation times. Those discoveries and their application in liturgical revision have also reintroduced *todah, eucharistia*, as a possible basis for faith and theology which cuts right across medieval and Reformation alternatives.[30]

What do we know of the Lord's Supper in the life of the New Testament Church? Whose picture are we to accept as authentic—that of Lietzmann, Cullmann, Jeremias, Kaesemann? Practitioners of the historical-critical method are unable to come to agreement in providing an answer to our question, "What is the Lord's Supper?" It is sheer romanticism to believe that this methodology will allow us to repristinate the practice of the early church.

The ecumenical movement has capitalized on the divergence of opinion as to the meaning of the Lord's Supper. According to a number of ecumenical statements it is really unnecessary and even dangerous to attempt to define the exact meaning of the Lord's Supper on the basis of the New Testament text since each writer was really an individual theologian with a particular "theology." Pluralism within the New Testament canon, therefore, gives validity to a whole range of different "theologies" of the Sacrament within Christendom today.

Yngve Brilioth gives classic expression to this point of view in his *Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic* where he contends that there are at least five "dimensions" to the Lord's Supper (thanksgiving, communion, commemoration, eucharistic sacrifice, and mystery) in the New Testament and in the history of Christianity. Brilioth writes:

> We have tried to show that in the eucharist there are both a manifoldness of diverse aspects and a central unity; just as the jewel shows endless changes of light and color as it is regarded from different angles. But the light which it refracts is one and the same; the holy Presence, the Mystery. It is true to say that the other aspects of the eucharist are only different ways to approach to it; and the various forms of liturgy and systems of doctrine which we have surveyed have helped to show the richness of its variety in constantly changing forms. But it is also true that

> since the early centuries no part of Christendom has succeeded in expressing all the aspects together, in their harmony and completeness. Is it over-bold to look forward in hope to a future day when a fuller unity of Christendom shall again reveal the great Christian Sacrament in the wholeness of its many-sided glory?[31]

Since 1930 when Bishop Brilioth penned those words a number of ecumenical statements have more or less adopted Brilioth's proposals as a point of departure for interdenominational dialogue. For example, in the third thesis of the Arnoldshain Theses,[32] one can discern Brilioth's dimensions of the Lord's Supper (the headings are mine):

> *Thanksgiving*
>
> The Lord's Supper is an act of worship by the congregation assembled in Jesus' name.
>
> *Communion*
>
> In the Lord's Supper we commemorate the death of Christ, through which God has reconciled the world to himself once and for all.
>
> *Eucharistic Sacrifice*
>
> Accompanied by prayer, thanksgiving, and praise, bread and wine are taken, the Lord's words of institution are pronounced, and the bread and wine are distributed to the congregation to be eaten and drunk.
>
> *Mystery*
>
> In the Lord's Supper...we confess the presence of the risen Lord in our midst and joyfully await his return, as those called into glory in the final consummation.[33]

The influence of Brilioth is even more clearly present in a 1978 document produced by the Lutheran-Roman Catholic Joint Commission (established by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the Lutheran World Federation) entitled *The Eucharist*. Once again, note the influence of Brilioth's categories:

> *Thanksgiving*
>
> Their very nature links proclamation and thanksgiving closely together. Accordingly, the Eucharist is the great

thanksgiving to the Father for everything which He accomplished in creation, redemption and sanctification, for everything which He accomplishes now in the Church and in the world in spite of the sins of men, for everything that He will accomplish in bringing his kingdom to fulfillment. Thus the eucharist is the benediction (*berakah*) by which the Church expresses its thankfulness to God for all his benefits.[34]

Communion

Since Christian faith is essentially something shared with all fellow believers, the Eucharist is primarily an affair of the community and, in and through this, of individuals. Like the 'new covenant', the 'blood of the covenant' given in the Eucharist (Matthew 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; I Corinthians 11:25) is granted to the new people of God and thus to its members.[35]

Eucharistic Sacrifice

Our two traditions agree in understanding the Eucharist as a sacrifice of praise. This is neither the simple verbal praise of God, nor is it a supplement or a complement which people from their own power add to the offering of praise and thanksgiving which Christ has made to the Father. The eucharistic sacrifice of praise has only become possible through the sacrifice of Christ on the cross; therefore this remains the main content of the Church's sacrifice of praise.[36]

Mystery

The Lord's Supper is a mystery of faith in the fullest sense of the word. It belongs to the all-encompassing and incomprehensible mystery of salvation and it participates in its character as mystery.[37]

In both the Arnoldshain Theses and *The Eucharist* we see what might be called an expansion and interpretation of the New Testament eucharistic texts. Both of these documents tend to be ecclectic in their use of contemporary exegetical scholarship. Thus we are left with a "mosaic" portrayal of items certain exegetes and theologians have highlighted as being of importance in understanding the biblical doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The terminology used (i.e., thanksgiving, com-

munion, commemoration, eucharistic sacrifice, mystery, etc.) consist of terms which are defined in different ways by different scholars. We are given no unanimous answer to the Catechism's question, "What is the Lord's Supper?" There is, however, an overall trend in contemporary exegetical studies toward a "spiritualization" of the Lord's Supper. This is apparent in at least three areas: (1) the Lord's Supper as action of the church; (2) the Lord's Supper and the Holy Spirit; (3) the eucharist and eschatology.

In the New Testament accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper it is the Lord who is acting to bless through his giving of his body and blood. The direction of the action is from God to man. It is God who gives and man who receives. For this reason, Luther omitted the so-called "eucharistic canon" from the Mass, leaving the Words of Institution standing alone as the clear testament of our Lord to his people. Without going into the rather complex and at times heated debate over the place of the Prayer of Great Thanksgiving,[38] it must be stated that beginning with Jeremias'[39] interpretation of *anamneesis* as the believer's calling upon God to remember, this "gift-character" of the Lord's Supper has been clouded.

In a 1982 statement by the World Council of Churches, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, we read not of Christ's giving but of the church's "recalling" and "beseeching":

> Representation and anticipation are expressed in thanksgiving and intercession. The church, gratefully recalling God's mighty acts of redemption, beseeches God to give the benefits of these acts to every human being.[40]

Liturgically this idea is given expression in the Prayer of Great Thanksgiving in the *Lutheran Book of Worship:* "Therefore, gracious Father, with this bread and cup we remember the life our Lord offered for us" (p. 67).

A second trend which seems to be the result of the labors of certain exegetical scholars is the grounding of the Lord's Supper in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.[41] In light of the fact that many exegetes who employ the historical- critical method find it difficult to connect the Lord's Supper with "the night in which he was betrayed,"[42] an emphasis on the role of the Spirit in the sacrament becomes a rather convenient way of sustaining the practice of the Supper in the church. Those involved in ecumenical discussions have found that relating the Lord's Supper to the work of the Holy Spirit allows them to maintain "in some sense" the presence of Christ in the Sacrament and at the

same time avoid the historically controversial questions of "how" Christ is present in the Supper.[43] *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry* goes so far as to assert that the eucharist is to be understood as an "invocation of the Spirit":

> The Holy Spirit is the immeasurable strength of love which makes it possible and continues to make it effective...Being assured by Jesus' promise in the Words of Institution that it will be answered, the Church prays to the Father for the gift of the Holy Spirit in order that the eucharist event may be a reality; the real presence of the crucified and risen Christ giving his life for all humanity.[44]

This "spiritualization" of the Lord's Supper is really only a "re-modeled" form of Zwingli's theology. Oscar Cullmann seems to the architect for this way of thinking about the Lord's Supper,[45] as he confuses the Lord's Supper with the post-resurrection meals of our Lord. This confusion has left its mark in contemporary liturgies as well. Note "the Invitation" from "The Holy Eucharist III" of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod's *Worship Supplement* (p. 65):

> Luke the Evangelist wrote of our risen Lord that when he was at table with the disciples at Emmaus, he took bread and blessed it and broke it and gave it to them. Their eyes were opened and they recognized him. This is Christ's table. Our Savior invites those who trust in him to share the feast which he has prepared. Let us open our hearts to one another as Christ opened his heart to us, and God will be glorified. The peace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.

The same misunderstanding is responsible for the wording of this prayer from *The Lutheran Book of Worship* (p. 47):

> O Jesus, our great high priest, be present with us as you were present with your disciples and make yourself known to us in breaking of the bread.

Finally, mention must be made of the trend which views the eucharist eschatologically.[46] According to those who champion this perspective "the bread and cup of the eucharist are to be interpreted eschatologically."[47] That is, the eucharist is a foretaste of the heavenly banquet. Geoffrey Wainwright states:

> Having the form of a meal, the eucharist belongs to that universally known realm of spoken and acted imagery which describes and embodies the relation between God and men in terms of eating and drinking; within the biblical tradition, the eucharist is ranged, and in a pre-emi-

> nent place, among those signs which announce before men, and inaugurate among them, the reality which is included in the eternal purpose of God and which is true for men; it is the sign of the kingdom of God in so far as the kingdom is conceived (and it is perhaps the dominant conception) as a feast for the citizens.[48]

While it cannot be denied that the Lord's Supper does have a relationship to eschatology (cf. Matthew 26:29 and Mark 14:25), it must be maintained that the Lord's Supper is not primarily eschatological but rather historical.[49] Eschatological interpretations of the Supper run the risk of cutting the Lord's Supper loose from its historical meanings and transforming it into the object of endless speculation, if not fantasy.

We have limited ourselves to a consideration of exegetical influences in regard to the contemporary statement of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Other influences such as Dom Gregory Dix's historical-liturgical research culminating in his proposal that the eucharistic liturgy must have "the four-fold shape" of taking, blessing, breaking, and sharing have not been included. Neither have we discussed the debate over the translation of *diatheekee* (testament or covenant)—a debate which seems to be inspired, at least in part, by Barth and certain of the so-called biblical theologians. Instead we have attempted to give an overview of the exegetical scene as it is today, dominated by critical scholarship. In contrast to the attempts of historical-critical scholars to reach behind, beneath, or above and beyond the texts of the words of institution in the synoptic gospels and I Corinthians, confessional Lutheran exegetes[50] must continue to insist that the words of our Lord be taken as they stand without "under-interpretation" or "over-interpretation."

FOOTNOTES

1. Yngve Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic*, trans. by A. G. Hebert (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge), p. 3.
2. Michael Reu, *Two Treatises on the Means of Grace* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1952), p. 54.
3. See page 55ff. in Reu for a concise summary of Lietzmann's research in this matter.

4. Hans Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper*, trans. by Dorthea H. G. Reeve (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), p. 142.
5. Ibid., pp. 147–148.
6. Ibid., p. 154.
7. Ibid., p. 160.
8. Ibid., pp. 170–171.
9. Ibid., p. 173.
10. Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. by Norman Perrin (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 62.
11. Ibid., p. 255.
12. Eduard Schweizer, *The Lord's Supper according to the New Testament*, trans. by James M. Davis (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 34.
13. Ibid., pp. 37–38.
14. Oscar Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, trans. by A. Steward Todd and James B. Torrance (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), p. 15.
15. Oscar Cullmann, *Essays on the Lord's Supper*, trans. by J. G. Davies (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1958), p. 16.
16. M. Reu writes: "Schleiermacher in his *Glaubenslehre*, chapter 139, section 3, had already thrown out the question whether the Lord's Supper as we celebrate it today is, in its principal features, really the same as the farewell supper which the Lord had with His disciples and whether one can really say that Christ gave the command that the supper should be repeated." (*Two Treatises on the Means of Grace*, pp. 40–41.)
17. Willi Marxsen, "The Lord's Supper as a Christological Problem" in *The Beginning of Christology*, trans. by Lorenz Nieting (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), p. 104. In another essay Marxsen comments: "Whether Jesus on the eve of his death expressly instituted the Lord's Supper cannot be adequately discussed in this context. From an historical point of view it is most improbable. But this does not mean that the Lord's Supper does not go back to Jesus at all. The meals of Jesus after all are remembered." Willi Marxsen, "The Lord's Supper: Concepts and Developments," in *Jesus in His Times*, ed. by Hans J. Schlutz, trans. by Brian Watchorn (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), p. 112.
18. I. Howard Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), p. 17.
19. Ibid., p. 35.
20. Ibid., p. 75. Reu, following Strack, Billerbeck and Lichtenstein makes a similar point: "Here he [Lichtenstein] shows that the difference between John and the Synoptics can be explained from the stubborn fight between the Sadducees and Pharisees over the dating of Pentecost, based upon a different exegesis of Leviticus 23:11... Jesus would have held the meal on the day when the Sadducees observed it. Both reports

would be correct: the Synoptics followed the numbering of the days of the month maintained by the Pharisees, while John would follow the numbering of the Sadducees." (*Two Treatises on the Means of Grace*, p. 70.)

21. Marshall, p. 47.
22. Ibid., p. 51.
23. Ibid., pp. 85–86.
24. Ibid., p. 114.
25. For a history of the liturgical movement within the Roman Catholic Church and the role of Odo Casel and his formulation of *Mysterien-theologie* see Ernest Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966), pp. 104–124.
26. Odo Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship and Other Writings*, ed. by B. Neunheuser (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1962), p. 98.
27. The results of Casel's work can be discerned in many of the popular as well as advanced works on liturgy and sacraments in use today. For example, see Leonel L. Mitchell, *The Meaning of Ritual* (New York: The Paulist Press, 1977) as a Roman Catholic example. For a Protestant example see James F. White, *Introduction to Christian Worship* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1980).
28. David Granskou, "Historical Critical Exegesis and the Renewal of Liturgy," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, XIX (February 1967), p. 85.
29. Ibid., p. 80.
30. Harvey Guthrie, Jr., *Theology as Thanksgiving: From Israel's Psalms to the Church's Eucharist* (New York: Seabury Press, 1981), pp. 213–214.
31. Brilioth, p. 288.
32. Skibbe, p. 35. On the relationship between the higher critical method and the Arnoldshain Theses, Skibbe writes: "The significance of this new biblical study for the Arnoldshain Theses is twofold. It tells us something about the theological orientation of the men who wrote the Theses. Of more than twenty theologians who made up the commission, at least nine must be called leading New Testament scholars: Guenther Bornkamm, Oscar Cullmann, Joachim Jeremias, Ernst Kaesemann, Heinrich Schlier, Julius Schniewind, Eduard Schweizer, Ethelbert Stauffer, and Georg Kuhn. None of these men are committed primarily to the traditional dogmatic interpretations of the New Testament" (pp.78–79).
33. Skibbe, p. 91.
34. Lutheran–Roman Catholic Joint Commission, *The Eucharist* (Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation, 1980), p. 11.

35. Ibid., pp. 12–13.
36. Ibid., p. 13.
37. Ibid., p. 4.
38. The literature surrounding the pros and cons of including the *verba* within a prayer is extensive. See R.M. Hals, "The Concept of Sacrifice as a Background for the Eucharist," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, 26 (May 1974), pp. 174 –188, and Gordon Lathrop, "The Prayers of Jesus and the Great Prayer of the Church," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, 26 (May 1974), pp. 158–173, as examples of those scholars who support the practice of such a prayer. Representatives of the opposing position would be Gottfried Krodel, "The Great Thanksgiving of the Inter–Lutheran Commission on Worship: It is the Christian's Supper and Not the Lord's Supper," *The Cresset: Occasional Papers No.1* (Valparaiso, Indiana: Valparaiso University Press, 1976), and Carl Wisloff, *The Gift of Communion*, trans. by Joseph Shaw (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964). For a positive evaluation of Luther's liturgical work by an Anglican see Bryan Spinks, *Luther's Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass* (Brancote Notts: Grove Books, 1982).
39. Jeremias, pp. 234ff.
40. Commission on Faith and Order, *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry* (Geneva: The World Council of churches, 1982), p. 11.
41. See Henry P. Hamann, "The Lord's Supper and the Holy Spirit," *Lutheran Theological Journal*, 16 (December, 1982), pp. 150–151.
42. Marxsen, *The Beginnings of Christology*, p. 104.
43. Skibbe writes, "The Agreed Statement (Church of South India) has now shifted the emphasis from the unanswerable questions to a new consideration of Christ's person. In doing this, it follows the lead taken by some 19th century theologians and Karl Barth. It stands closer to the understanding of the Lord's Supper found in the Gospel of John than to that expressed in the Synoptics. This shift is of greatest importance for the modern discussion of the Lord's Supper and for the development of the ecumenical movement" (p. 35). It should be noted, however, that this "shift" leads to a spiritualistic understanding of the Lord's Supper since John 6 is a discourse not about the Lord's Supper but about faith!
44. *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, p. 13.
45. Oscar Cullman, *Early Christian Worship*, pp. 14–24. Reformed theologians show their indebtedness to Cullmann on this point. See Ralph Martin, *The Worship of God* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982), pp. 145–170.
46. See Geoffrey Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 7–17, for an overall view of the eschatological background of the New Testament according to some

contemporary scholars.

47. Gordon Lathrop, "The Prayers of Jesus and the Great Prayer of the Church," p. 168.
48. Wainwright, p. 58.
49. Regin Prenter correctly maintains the "eschatological" dimension of the sacrament within the context of life in the world. See Regin Prenter, "Worship and Creation," *Studia Liturgica*, II (June, 1963), pp. 82–95.
50. In addition to the fine study by Hermann Sasse, *This Is My Body* (Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1977), see Werner Elert, *The Lord's Supper Today*, trans. by Martin Bertram and Rudolph F. Norden (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1973) for examples of careful study of the words of institution by Lutheran theologians.

The Reverend John T. Pless holds the S.T.M. degree from Concordia Theological Seminary and serves as pastor of University Lutheran Chapel, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Propitiation in the Language and Typology of the Old Testament

Douglas McC. L. Judisch

Derived ultimately from the Latin *pro* (which can be used to signify that someone acts "in favor of" or is "on the side of" someone else), "propitiation" refers to appeasing someone's wrath, even rendering someone favorable.[1] Synonyms are "conciliation" and "atonement" in its original sense.[2] Even without special revelation man can recognize the finger of a wrathful God in disease and death, fire and flood. Indeed, man's own conscience, recoiling from the fiery wrath aroused in a just God by human sin, often poses the same question as that ascribed to Satan by Milton:

> ...which way shall I fly
> Infinite wrath, and infinite despair?
> Which way I fly is hell; myself am hell;
> And in the lowest deep a lower deep
> Still threatening to devour me open wide,
> To which the hell I suffer seems a heaven.[3]

It is no wonder, then, that so much of the liturgical practice of the various religions of the world is designed to propitiate angry deities—so much so that Sir James Frazer in his classic *Golden Bough* enunciated this definition of religion: "By religion, then, I understand a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and of human life."[4]

Only through special revelation, however, can men appreciate either the extent of God's wrath or the means of its propitiation. Indeed, the proclamation of these truths was as pivotal to the prophets of the Old Testament as to the apostles of the New Testament. Already in Psalm 90, the oldest of the psalms, Moses laments (vv. 7–9, 11):

> For we have been consumed by Thine anger,
> And by Thy wrath we have been dismayed.
> Thou hast placed our iniquities before Thee,
> Our secret sins in the light of Thy presence.
> For all our days have declined in Thy fury;

We have finished our years like a sigh...
Who understands the power of Thine anger,
And Thy fury, according to the fear that is due Thee?[5]

The propitiation of this consuming wrath is likewise already a significant concept in the oldest books of Scripture, those of Moses, as we shall see.

I. Language

A. *The Etymology of* k p r

The Hebrew root to which one must pay special attention in discussing propitiation in the Old Testament is *k p r*.[6] In the nineteenth century the original meaning of the word was generally assumed to be "to cover" on the basis of the similar Arabic root *kaphara*, which means "cover" or "conceal;"[7] the *kapporeth* (or so-called mercy-seat) was said to receive its name from its role as the "cover" of the ark of the testimony.[8] The theological use of *k p r* supposedly involved the covering over of human sin by Old Testament ritual (until it could be dealt with in a more effective fashion by Christ, according to some scholars).[9] The concept of covering is still held by some recent authors,[10] but there is no consensus.[11] There is some evidence in its favor, *k s h* ("cover") sometimes appearing parallel to *k p r* in poetry (e.g., Ps. 32:1; 85:2).[12] Many contemporary scholars, however, connect *k p r* with the Syriac *kephar* (in the pa 'el *kappar*, "wipe, wipe away") and the Akkadian *kuppuru* ("wash away, erase").[13] Biblical confirmation of this identification is sought in the use of *k p r* in parallel with *m h h* ("blot out, wipe away"; e.g., Jer. 18:23).[14] Still others suggest by way of compromise that the original meaning of *k p r* was simply "rub," so that it could refer either to rubbing a substance off of something or rubbing a substance on something and so covering it.[15] There are also those who have sought to derive the Hebrew root from Egyptian origins, but these endeavors have met with little acceptance.[16] In such a situation it would be dangerous to base any theological freight on a supposed original meaning of *k p r*.[17]

B. *The Meaning of* k p r

The task which is, of course, much more important—indeed, essential—is the determination of the *usus loquendi* of *k p r* in Biblical Hebrew. Here, however, there is also some disagreement. Conservative scholars have traditionally maintained that

the common meaning of *k p r* is "to propitiate" someone or "to placate" wrath aroused by an offense.[18] There are also critical scholars who are impartial enough to concede this significance to the root.[19] This was the understanding of the men who produced the King James Version when they translated forms of *k p r* with "make atonement" in seventy of its ninety-nine occurrences in the Old Testament.[20] In 1611 "atone" was a relatively new word which had been composed by combining "at" and "one" and so referred to the creation of unity between parties who may previously have been at variance. [21] In other words, "make atonement" was a synonym of "propitiate" and "conciliate."[22]

Most critical exegetes, however, deny the meaning "propitiate" to *k p r* in those cases involving God and will allow as a translation at most "expiate," that is, "make amends" for an offense.[23] The quite unhidden presupposition which leads to this position is that the propitiation of God is foreign to Scripture. And the propitiation of God is alien for the simple reason that the wrath of God itself is pagan, according to such critics.[24] The more impartial critics previously mentioned generally find the concepts of divine wrath and its propitiation just as obnoxious as do their comrades, but they feel no tension in finding remnants of paganism in the Old Testament, as they would see them.[25]

The centrality of God's wrath to Old Testament theology we have already deduced from the oldest of the psalms, and there is no need here to multiply parallel passages.[26] It will be appropriate, however, to cite some evidence in favor of the traditional connection between *k p r* and propitiation—assuaging the wrath of someone, whether God or someone else. The word is used in Genesis 32:21 (MT, 20 EV) in the account of Jacob's return to Canaan and his imminent reunion with his brother Esau. At the time of Jacob's speedy departure from Canaan two decades previously, Esau had been enraged enough with his brother to be intent upon murdering him.[27] Now some twenty years later Jacob, in sending presents to Esau, whose vengeance he still feared greatly, had this idea in mind: "I will *appease* him with the present that goes before me. Then afterward I will see his face; perhaps he will accept me."[28] The first four words of this quotation represent *'akhapperah panaw*, literally, "I shall propitiate his face"; the last four words render *yissa' panai*, literally, "he will lift up my face." Both phrases find their basis in the usual connection between the expression of one's face and

his attitude toward someone else—wrath, friendliness, or whatever.[29]

Proverbs 16:14 is another verse worthy of attention here. Verses 10 to 16 speak about kings—their obligations and the proper conduct in relation to them. Verse 13 encourages the manner of speech in which kings (presumably good kings) delight. Verse 15 explicitly states the desirability of enjoying a king's "favor" or the "light of a king's face." Between these two verses comes a warning against the reverse situation and what to do if it should occur: "The wrath of a king is as messengers of death, but a wise man will *appease* it."[30] Here the feminine suffix of *yekhappe rennah* shows that *h a.math* ("wrath") is equivalent to the direct object of the verb.[31]

A third relevant passage is 2 Samuel 21:3. The concern there is that Saul and some other members of his family had unjustly put to death many of the Gibeonites to whom Israel had bound itself by a covenant of friendship.[32] This perfidious persecution had, of course, created enmity in the hearts of the Gibeonites against Israel; but the wrath of God too was evidently aroused, as is indicated by the famine of three years' duration which had befallen Israel. The implication is that the famine would continue until the just resentment of the Gibeonites was assuaged. It is in this context that David asks the Gibeonites, "What should I do for you? And how can I make atonement that you may bless the inheritance of the Lord?"[33] Thus, the purpose of the action denoted by *k p r* is to make someone bless someone else instead of nursing enmity toward him—in other words, propitiation. It is no wonder, then, that in the Septuagint *k p r* and its cognates are ordinarily translated with derivatives of *hileoos*, of which the basic meaning is "friendly" or "favorable."[34] Thus, the verb *k p r* itself is translated *exilaskomai* eighty-three times out of ninety-nine, three times as *hilaskomai*, and once as *hileoos gignomai*.[35]

II. Typology

Other indications of the propitiatory connotation of *k p r* appear in passages dealing with the sacrificial system. That evidence, however, we may allow to emerge incidentally as we proceed to discuss the contribution of typology to an understanding of the significance of propitiation in the Old Testament. By a "type" we mean, in accord with the traditional conception, a person or thing ordained by God to predict some other person or thing in some respect.[36] The most important

aspect of typology is surely the sacrificial system of the Old Testament.

A. *The Sacrificial System in General*

1. THE PROPITIATORY NATURE OF SACRIFICE

In regard to this system, then, it is first of all necessary to postulate that the sacrifices of the Old Testament in which blood was shed assuaged the wrath of God—by virtue of the future self-sacrifice of the Messiah which they symbolized and the results of which they mediated. This truth is implicit in the favorable manner in which God looked upon Abel and his slain sheep (Gen. 4:4),[37] and it becomes explicit already in Genesis 8 in the record of Noah's post-diluvian sacrifice of at least one representative of every clean kind of animal.[38] Verse 21 states that the Lord smelled the *reah-hannihoah*. The King James Version translates this construct chain as "a sweet savour," the Revised Standard Version as "the pleasing odor," and the New American Standard Bible as "the soothing aroma." The noun *nihoah* is derived from the verbal root *nuah*, "rest," and so is defined as "a quieting, a soothing, a tranquilizing" and occurs only, as here, in conjunction with *reah*.[39] Literally, then, the phrase means "the smell of pacification." Taking the olfactory reference, of course, as an anthropomorphism, the idea is clearly that Noah's sacrifices assuaged God's wrath. Indeed, the result was that God promised never to destroy every living thing at one swoop again despite His knowledge that all the waters of the worldwide flood had been insufficient to wash away the innate sinfulness of men.[40]

The construct chain "smell of pacification" is used thirty-nine times in the Old Testament to describe the effect of sacrifices upon the true God; the other three times it refers to the effect which idolaters desire their sacrifices to have upon their false gods (Ezek. 6:13; 16:19; 20:28). In those cases where *k p r* is conjoined with the phrase, the propitiatory nature of the sacrifice is underlined. The first chapter of Leviticus, for example, lays down rules concerning the offering of the *'olah*, usually called in English the "burnt offering."[41] In verse 4 *k p r* is used to designate the goal of this sacrifice: "And he shall lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, that it may be accepted for him to make atonement on his behalf."[42] In verse 9, however, *reah nihoah* serves the same purpose: "And the priest shall offer up in smoke all of it on the altar for a burnt offering, an offer-

ing by fire of a soothing aroma to the Lord."[43] Leviticus 4 stipulates the manner of offering the *hatta'th*,[44] usually known in English as the "sin offering." Forms of *k p r* are used several times (vv. 20, 26, 31, 35). Verse 26 tells us, for example, that, by burning the fat of the sacrificial goat, "the priest shall make atonement for him" who has brought the goat "in regard to his sin, and he shall be forgiven." Concerning the sin offering verse 31 declares that "the priest shall offer it up in smoke on the altar for a soothing aroma to the Lord. Thus the priest shall make atonement for him" who has brought the animal "and he shall be forgiven." Here the propitiatory nature of the sacrifice is attested in triplicate by the addition of that final clause, "and he shall be forgiven," using the verb *s l h* (of which God is always the explicit or implicit agent).[45]

The other sacrifices in which blood was shed likewise assuaged the wrath of God. Leviticus 5 sets down the regulations governing the *'asham*, usually denominated the "guilt offering" in English.[46] Verse 16 uses both *k p r* and *s l h* to state the goal of this kind of sacrifice: "The priest shall then make atonement for him" who has brought the victim "with the ram of the guilt offering and it shall be forgiven him." Numbers 5:18 compounds the effect of *k p r* by using both the verb and the noun *kippurim* derived from it, referring to the sacrificial victim as "the ram of atonement by which atonement is made."[47] As far as the *shelamim*, usually called "peace offerings," are concerned, the account of David's sinful census of Israel in 2 Samuel 24 is instructive.[48] The last verse of the chapter includes peace offerings along with burnt offerings as bringing to an end the calamitous pestilence—and evidently its wellspring, the "anger of the Lord" which "burned against Israel" (24:1): "Thus the Lord was moved by entreaty for the land, and the plague was held back from Israel" (2 Sam. 24:25b).

Numbers 28 and 29 codify the legislation requiring the people of Israel as a whole to offer certain sacrifices in the morning and evening, on the sabbath, and on the various holy days of the year. In these chapters clauses containing *k p r* or the phrase "smell of pacification," used interchangeably, become a virtual refrain, so as to stress the propitiatory nature of all these daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly sacrifices. The Feast of Weeks, for example, requires "a burnt offering for a soothing aroma to the Lord, two young bulls, one ram, seven male lambs one year old" (28:27), and "one male goat to make atonement for you"

(28:30).[49] Indeed, the Lord commands concerning all these sacrifices: "You shall be careful to present My offering, My food for My offerings by fire, of a soothing aroma to Me, at their appointed time" (Num. 28:2).

The most comprehensive statement, however, occurs in Leviticus 17 in the midst of regulations concerning the treatment of blood. In verse 11 God lays down a definitive principle which applies to all the Old Testament sacrifices in which the blood of animals was shed: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood by reason of the life that makes atonement." In Psalm 40, to be sure, the Messiah Himself asserts: "Sacrifice and meal offering Thou hast not desired. . . Burnt offering and sin offering Thou hast not required" (v. 7 MT; 6 EV).[50] The Epistle to the Hebrews, moreover, adduces this very passage in connection with the statement that "it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins" (v. 4). The point of Psalm 40 and Hebrews 10, however, is not to deny the propitiatory role of the blood spilt upon the altar of God in Old Testament times, but rather to remind Israelites that it stilled the wrath of God, not in and of itself, but only by virtue of the blood of the promised Messiah which it symbolized and the effects of which it mediated.[51] In Article XXIV of the Apology, therefore, Melanchthon contends that the sanguinary sacrifices of the Old Testament did not intrinisically merit the forgiveness of sins but that they may be called propitiatory for two reasons. In the first place, some of them reconciled individual sinners to the visible church.[52] Secondly and more importantly, they symbolized the coming self-sacrifice of the Messiah, which would intrinsically propitiate a wrathful God.[53] Indeed, as Article VII of the Formula of Concord (Solid Declaration) teaches, these sacrifices actually conveyed to the people of the Old Testament era the very propitiation which they symbolized.[54]

2. THE PROPITIATORY SCOPE OF SACRIFICE

It is quite plain, then, that the Old Testament sacrifices in which blood was shed assuaged the wrath of God by virtue of the self-sacrifice of the Messiah which they symbolized. An inquiry, therefore, into the extent of this propitiation would be of value. John Calvin, after all, acknowledged that the propitiation of God was accomplished by a Messianic self-sacrifice

which had been symbolized by the sanguinary sacrifices of the Old Testament.[55] Thus, in commenting on the clause, "and He is the propitiation for our sins," in the First Epistle of John (2:2),[56] Calvin observes that "no one is fit to be a high priest without a sacrifice. Hence, under the Law, no priest entered the sanctuary without blood; and a sacrifice, as a usual seal, was wont, according to God's appointment, to accompany prayers. By this symbol it was God's design to shew, that whoever obtains favour for us, must be furnished with a sacrifice; for when God is offended, in order to pacify Him a satisfaction is required."[57] Yet when the Apostle John proceeds to proclaim that Christ is the propitiation not only for our sins, "but also for the sins of the whole world," Calvin still restricts this propitiation to the elect: "For the design of John was no other than to make this benefit common to the whole Church. Then under the word *all* or *whole*, he does not include the reprobate, but designates those who should believe as well as those who were then scattered through various parts of the world."[58]

In actuality, however, not only the self-sacrifice of Christ itself, but even the general Old Testament sacrifices—since they symbolized it and mediated its effects—did provide a comprehensive propitiation. There were, of course, circumstances in which individuals could or had to offer sacrifices which were designed to affect those particular individuals.[59] Much more frequent, however, were the general or national sacrifices, and these, in the first instance, assuaged the wrath of God with respect to all Israelites—whether elect or not, whether believers or unbelievers. Leviticus 4, for example, makes provision for the sacrifice of a sin offering if "the whole congregation of Israel" should "commit error" and so "become guilty" (v. 13). By means of the sin offering "the priest shall make atonement for them, and they shall be forgiven" (v. 20); here forms of both *k p r* and *s l h* speak of the effect upon the whole people.[60]

Leviticus 9 describes the first day of Aaron's new ministry as high priest, his week-long consecration having come to an end. On this occasion Moses directs Aaron to sacrifice two sets of sin offering and burnt offering. The point of the first set is to propitiate God with respect to the high priest himself. The purpose of the second set, on the other hand, is to placate the divine wrath aroused by the sins of the rest of the "sons of Israel" (v. 3). Moses tells Aaron in verse 7: "Then make the offering for the people, that you may make atonement for them, just as the Lord has commanded." Aaron fulfilled this directive when "he

presented the people's offering, and took the goat of the sin offering which was for the people, and slaughtered it and offered it for sin. . . . Then he slaughtered the ox and the ram, the sacrifice of peace offerings which was for the people; and Aaron's sons handed the blood to him and he sprinkled it around on the altar" (vv. 15, 18).[61]

We have already seen how Numbers 28 and 29 emphasize the propitiatory power of the various sacrifices offered every morning and evening, every week on the sabbath, every month on the first day, and every year on the holy days. These regular sacrifices were the real heart of the sacrificial system, much more important than any others. The point which we have to stress at this juncture is that these sacrifices were offered on behalf of the "sons of Israel" in general (v. 3). Numbers 28, for example, speaks of the burnt offering (two bulls, one ram, and seven male lambs) and the sin offering (one male goat) required on the Passover. When verse 22 asserts that these sacrifices serve "to make atonement for *you*," all Israelites are embraced by the propitiation accomplished.[62] This comprehensiveness is likewise apparent when the same formula is applied to the burnt offering (two young bulls, one ram, seven male lambs, and one male goat) necessary to the Feast of Weeks (28:30) and similar burnt and sin offerings necessary to the Feast of Trumpets (29:5).[63]4 It comes as no surprise, therefore, when the Chronicler connects the whole nation with the propitiation of God effected through the sacrificial system in general: "Aaron and his sons offered on the altar of burnt offering and on the altar of incense, for all the work of the most holy place, and to make atonement for Israel, according to all that Moses the servant of God had commanded" (1 Chron. 6:49).

B. *The Day of Atonement*

Of all the occasions of general sacrifice, however, the one in which the concept of propitiation is enunciated most emphatically is the Day of Atonement. The tenth day of the seventh month of the year (Tishri) was the only day of fasting laid upon the ancient Israelites, and it was the only time during the course of the year that anyone went past the veil into the holy of holies in the tabernacle or temple.[64] The name of the day itself is evidence of the propitiatory emphasis, being a translation of the term *yom-hakkippurim*, which occurs in Leviticus 23: "On exactly the tenth day of this seventh month is the day

of atonement; it shall be a holy convocation for you, and you shall humble your souls and present an offering by fire to the Lord. Neither shall you do any work on this same day, for it is a day of atonement, to make atonement on your behalf before the Lord your God" (vv. 27–28). Leviticus 25:9 applies to the day the same terminology, employing again *kippurim*, a noun (derived, of course, from *k p r*) which occurs only as an abstract plural in the Old Testament; whereas in modern Hebrew the singular is used in the name "Yom Kippur."[65] Since the word "atonement" has shifted its meaning since the reign of King James VI, a better translation than "Day of Atonement" would be "Day of Propitiation."[66]

The observance of the Day of Propitiation, then, is prescribed in most detail in Leviticus 16, which abounds in forms of the verb *k p r* and occurrences of the derivative noun *kapporeth*.[67] This object was a slab of gold which lay atop the ark of the testimony in the holy of holies. The length was two and a half cubits and the width a cubit and a half.[68] Atop it, in turn, were two golden cherubim whose outstretched wings met above it. It symbolized the throne of God, who sometimes manifested His presence there visibly or audibly,[69] although on the Day of Propitiation it was enveloped in a cloud of incense which filled the holy of holies (vv. 12–13). For on the Day of Propitiation the high priest twice entered the most holy place with the blood of a sacrificial victim and sprinkled it once on the plate of gold and seven times in front of it (vv. 14–15). In English the *kapporeth* is usually called the "mercy-seat," a paraphrastic rendition which William Tyndale based upon Luther's *Gnadenstuhle*.[70] The idea is presumably that God's wrath was changed to grace or (somewhat less aptly) mercy by virtue of the blood sprinkled upon His symbolic seat.[71] The *kapporeth* had been translated more literally by John Wycliffe as the "propiciatorie."[72] The rendition in the first English Bible was, of course, based upon the *propitiatorium* of the Vulgate.[73] The Latin term, in turn, may have been suggested or at least influenced by the *hilasteerion* of the Septuagint, a noun derived, of course, from the same Greek stem as the words which, as previously noted, were used to translate forms of *k p r*.[74] This Greek word, moreover, is aptly applied to Christ by the Apostle Paul in Romans 3:25.[75] We have already observed that nineteenth-century scholars generally explained *kapporeth* as meaning merely "lid" or "cover"—in accord with the theory that the original meaning of *k p r* was "to cover."[76] Modern Hebraists, however,

regardless of their etymologies of *k p r*, concede that the denotation of *kapporeth* derives from the theological significance of the verb. Thus, Brown, Driver, and Briggs give "propitiatory" as the definition,[77] and the margin of the New American Standard Bible gives the same word as the literal counterpart to "mercy-seat."[78] Since we are unaccustomed, however, to using "propitiatory" as a noun, "place of propitiation" may be more appropriate.

The sprinkling of sacrificial blood, moreover, on and before the "place of propitiation" on the Day of Propitiation placated God with respect to all Israelites. First of all, to be sure, the high priest was to sacrifice a bull and to sprinkle its blood in the holy of holies to assuage the wrath of God against himself and his family (Lev. 16:6, 11, 14). The priest proceeded, however, to slaughter a goat and sprinkle its blood in the most holy place. Leviticus 16:15 describes this goat as a "sin offering for the people," and its blood ensured the presence of a gracious God in the tabernacle despite "the impurities of the sons of Israel" and "their transgressions, in regard to all their sins" (v. 16). By this means the high priest "made atonement for himself and for his household and for all the assembly of Israel" (v. 17). The comprehensiveness of the propitiation achieved in this way was confirmed when a second goat was symbolically laden with "all the iniquities of the sons of Israel and all their transgressions in regard to all their sins" and was then sent into the wilderness bearing "all their iniquities" (vv. 10, 21-22).[79] The point was underscored when the priest would then bathe and "come forth and offer his burnt offering and the burnt offering for the people, and make atonement for himself and for the people" (v. 24). Thus, God is addressing all Israelites and even includes the aliens who reside among them (v. 29) when He makes this promise: "It is on this day that atonement shall be made for you to cleanse you; you shall be clean from all your sins before the Lord" (v. 30).[80] Verse 33 declares once again that the Day of Propitiation would placate God with respect to "all the people of the assembly"; and verse 34, that it would "make atonement for the sons of Israel for all their sins once every year."

C. *The Appropriation of Propitiation*

A consideration of various aspects of the sacrificial system leads us, then, to the conclusion that the general sacrifices of the

Old Testament did provide a comprehensive propitiation. They assuaged the wrath of God with respect to all Israelites by symbolizing the future self-sacrifice of the Messiah and mediating the propitiation of God which He was thereby to accomplish on behalf of all men of all nations. From this awesome truth it does not at all follow that all Israelites actually benefited from the propitiation accomplished for all. Eternal life with God came only through faith in the Messianic propitiation for the sins of the whole world symbolized and mediated by the sacrifices of the Old Testament.[81] Indeed, the wrath of God revived against those who continued to rely, not on the work of the Messiah to placate God, but rather upon their own works. To offer up divinely ordained sacrifices without faith in the Messiah's mission symbolized by them was, moreover, a form of works-righteousness which provoked the anger of God even more than the ignorant unbelief of the heathen. In Isaiah 1, for example, God equating the wickedness of Judah with that of Sodom and Gomorrah, excoriates the Jews for their careful but faithless observance of His cultic commandments (vv. 11-14):

> What are your multiplied sacrifices to Me?...
> I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams,
> And the fat of fed cattle.
> And I take no pleasure in the blood of bulls, lambs, or goats.
> When you come to appear before Me,
> Who requires of you this trampling of My courts?
> Bring your worthless offerings no longer,
> Their incense is an abomination to Me.
> New moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies—
> I cannot endure iniquity and the solemn assembly.
> I hate your new moon festivals and your appointed feasts,
> They have become a burden to Me.
> I am weary of bearing them.[82]

In Article IV of the Apology Melanchthon explains that similar passages in Psalm 50 and Jeremiah 7 condemn, not the divinely ordained sacrifices themselves, but rather "the wicked belief of those who did away with faith in the notion that through these *works* they placated the wrath of God," those who offered "sacrifices with the notion that on account of them they had a gracious God, so to say, *ex opere operato*."[83]

Conclusion

Several lessons, then, may be learned from a study of the concept of propitiation in the language and typology of the Old Testament: (1) The wrath of God and His propitiation are pivotal elements in the theology of the Old Testament. (2) The concept of divine propitiation lies at the heart of the elaborate sacrificial system of the Old Testament. (3) The sanguinary sacrifices had propitiatory power, but only because they symbolized the propitiating self-sacrifice of the Messiah and mediated its effects. (4) The Messiah, who would be both God and man, was to propitiate God for all sins on behalf of all sinners by means of His sinless life and vicarious death. (5) Only those people of the Old Testament era enjoy eternal life with God who trusted in the propitiation of God which the Messiah was to accomplish.

Footnotes

1. "Propitiation," *Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. James Augustus Henry Murray (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933), VIII, p. 1476. In his translation of 1388 John Wycliffe used the phrase "the tyme of propiciacioun" in Leviticus 25:9.
2. Ibid. The original sense of "atonement" will be discussed later.
3. John Milton, *Paradise Lost and Other Poems*, ed. Maurice Kelley (Roslyn, New York: Walter J. Black, 1943), p. 167. Satan makes this statement in his first discourse in Book IV of *Paradise Lost* as he nears Eden in his expedition to involve Adam and Eve in his rebellion against God.
4. James George Frazer, *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951), pp. 57–58. An example of this phenomenon is furnished by the propitiatory goal of ancient Celtic sacrifice as described by T. G. E. Powell, *The Celts* (new edition; London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), pp. 180–181.
5. The superscription (v. 1 MT) ascribes the psalm to Moses; there is no textual reason to doubt its authenticity. The translation used here and elsewhere in this study, except where indicated, is *The New American Standard Bible* (Carol Stream, Illinois: Creation House, 1973), hereafter cited as NASB.
6. The root with which we are dealing here is usually distinguished from another root with identical radicals which has to do with "pitch" ("II. *k p r*," BDB, p. 498) and a third root with identical radicals which is the

assumed root of words meaning "young lion," "village," and "henna" or some other plant ("III. *k p r*," BDB, pp. 498–499). Brown, Driver, and Briggs, indeed, distinguish a fourth root with the same radicals as the assumed root of *k e por*, meaning (1) a bowl of gold or silver used in the temple and (2) hoarfrost ("IV. *k p r*," BDB, p. 499). Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), here abbreviated BDB. Caution in the assignment of words with identical radicals to different roots has rightly been urged by Roger Nicole (" 'Hilaskesthai' Revisited," *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 49 [1977], pp. 173–177) but not in such a way as to affect the meanings of the words under consideration here.

7. William Gesenius, "*k p r*," *Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*, tr. and ed. Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (1846; rep. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978), p. 411.
8. Ibid., "*kapporeth*," p. 412.
9. Cf. R. Laird Harris, "*kaphar*," *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), I, p. 452.
10. Ludwig Koehler, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951), p. 452. On the basis of Koehler, indeed, J. Barton Payne (*The Theology of the Older Testament* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962], p. 249) continued to describe this etymology as the one "generally accepted."
11. R. Laird Harris, for example, states: "There is, however, very little evidence for this view. This connection of the Arabic word is weak and the Hebrew root is not used to mean 'cover'" (*op. cit.*, pp. 452–453).
12. BDB, "I. [*k s h*]," pp. 491–492, which lists Job 31:33; Proverbs 17:9; 28:13; and Psalm 32:5 as places where the word refers to covering transgressions or, in the final case, iniquity.
13. W. Robertson Smith (*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church: A Course of Lectures on Biblical Criticism*, second ed. [London: Adam and Charles Black, 1892], p. 381) is cited by BDB (p. 497) as taking this line of thought but is actually non-directive. He will only go as far as to say of the conjunction of *k p r* or *h l h* with "face" that, although not decisive, "on the whole it seems easiest to take this to mean 'to wipe clean the face' blackened by displeasure, as the Arabs say 'whiten the face.'" The term *kuppuru* comes to have already in the expiation ritual of Babylon the significance of "set aside" or "cancel," according to W. Schrank, *Babylonische Suehneriten (Leipziger semitistische Studien*, III:1, 1908), p. 86, cited by J. Herrmann, p. 302).
14. BDB, "I. *m h h*," p. 562, which lists as places where the word refers to blotting out transgressions so that they may be "no more remembered

by God against [the] sinner" Psalm 51:3; Isaiah 43:5; and 44:22.

15. Milgrom, citing B. Landberger (*The Date Palm and Its By-Products according to the Cuneiform Sources* [Archiv fuer Orientforschung, Beiheft 17, 1967], pp. 30–34), claims that both "wipe" and "cover" are attested as usages of the Akkadian word in medical-magical texts where "the step between 'rubbing off' and 'rubbing on' is so short we cannot distinguish between cleaning and treatment." J. Milgrom, "Atonement in the OT," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia, Supplementary Volume* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976), p. 78.

16. M. Goerg ("Eine neue Deutung fuer Kapporet," *Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977), pp. 115–118) sees an Egyptian term meaning "sole" or "bottom of the foot" as the source of the Hebrew noun *kapporeth*, which he defines as the place on which the feet of the enthroned Lord rested. Y. M. Grintz, on the other hand (*Leshonenu* 39 [1974–75], pp. 163–168), proposes a derivation of *kapporeth* from an Egyptian root meaning "roof" and uses this proposal to support an "early date" of the so-called P source of the Pentateuch. Goerg, however, has characterized the Grintz theory as philologically and historically impossible in his "Nachtrag zu Kapporet" (*Biblische Notizen*, 5 [1978], p. 12).

17. Thus, J. Herrmann ("*hilaskomai, hilasmos*: A. Expiation and Forms of Expiation in the Old Testament," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel, tr. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, III [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965], p. 302) accepts the judgment of W. Robertson Smith (*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*): "The question of the etymological meaning of the Hebrew root *k p r* is obscure." Likewise Bernd Janowski ("Suehne als Heilsgeschehen. Studien zur Suehnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 106 (1981), pp. 779–780, a summary of a dissertation written in Tuebingen) concludes from an investigation of the etymological relation of *k p r* to the Akkadian *kapparu* and the Arabic *kafara* that no conclusion is possible.

18. E.g., Payne, pp. 249–250: "The meaning of 'atone' in the Old Testament is therefore to 'propitiate (placate),' and not simply to 'expiate (make reparation)'; for expiation specifies neither the why nor the how of atonement. Propitiation, by contrast, necessarily connotes the idea of an offended person (Person), against whose wrath the propitiatory covering is sought for protection."

19. E.g., Adrien Schenker ("*koper* et expiation," *Biblica*, 63 [1982], pp. 32–36), arguing from the use of the noun in Exodus 21:28–32 and the use of the verb elsewhere, concludes that *kopher* means a placation or

means of placation.

20. In two more cases the King James Version used "atonement be made" to translate forms of *k p r* (in the one case a pual rather than the usual piel). Employing close synonyms of the original sense of "atone," the KJV used "appease" once, "pacify" once, "be pacified" once, "make reconciliation" four times, and "reconcile" three times. More distant synonyms employed by the KJV were "forgive," occurring twice; "be forgiven," once (nithpael); "pardon," once; "be merciful," twice; "purge," twice; "purge away," twice; "be purged," five times (once in the hithpael, otherwise in the pual); "be cleansed," once (pual); "put off," once; "be disannulled," once (pual). The KJV makes use of the word "atonement" to translate a word other than *k p r* or *kippurim* (which is so rendered nine times) on only one occasion—in the New Testament, namely, *katallagee* in Romans 5:11, a word which it otherwise renders "reconciliation" or "reconciling." The term "propitiation" does not occur in the Old Testament of the KJV, figuring in only three New Testament passages as the counterpart to *hilasmos* (1 John 2:2; 4:10) or *hilasteerion* (Rom. 3:25).

21. "Atone," *Oxford English Dictionary*, I, p. 539: "From the frequent phrases 'set at one' or 'at onement,' the combined *atonement* began to take the place of *onement* early in the 16th c., and *atone* to supplant *one* vb. about 1550. *Atone* was not admitted into the Bible in 1611, though *atonement* had been in since Tindale."

22. "Atonement," ibid., pp. 539–540, which observes again that the noun was apparently in use before the verb by virtue of development from the earlier substantive "onement."

23. The most influential statement of this position is the famous essay, "Hilaskesthai: Its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms in the Septuagint," written by the late "doyen of British New Testament scholarship," C. H. Dodd (originally published in 1931 in the *Journal of Theological Studies* [32; pp. 352–360] and reprinted in C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935, pp. 82–95]). The influence of this essay was such that already in 1939 Vincent Taylor could assert that Dodd had "conclusively proved" the non-classical (i.e., non-propitiatory) sense of *hilaskesthai* and its relatives in the Septuagint ("Great Texts Reconsidered: Romans 3, 25f.," *Expository Times*, 50 [1938–39], p. 296). The supposed non-classical use of these words in the Septuagint was assumed, of course, to arise from the force of the original Hebrew words which Greek vocables were being used to translate. Thus, Dodd was describing his own concept too of *k p r* when he contended that those who produced the Septuagint did not understand *k p r* "as conveying the sense of propitiating the Deity" (p. 359).

24. C. H. Dodd, for example, in his essay so widely acclaimed in the critical world was again speaking not simply of ancient Jewish thought, but also of his own when he concluded (p. 359): "Hellenistic Judaism, as represented by the LXX, does not regard the cultus as a means of pacifying the Deity...." His comments on Romans show that an aversion to the doctrine of divine wrath lies behind the aversion to the doctrine of propitiation (*The Epistle to the Romans* [New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932], pp. 21–22). Indeed, Norman H. Young ("C. H. Dodd, 'Hilaskesthai' and His Critics," *The Evangelical Quarterly,* 48 [1976], p. 78) uses the adjective "grotesque" to express his disgust: "If one advocates 'propitiation,' the word must be radically applied in the first instance to the removal of pollution and only secondarily to the cessation of wrath. The initiative of God in this action must be jealously preserved and all intimations of the grotesque notion of God propitiating himself, or his justice, banished." Perhaps the ultimate potential of the higher-critical method of interpretation is realized, by Henri Clavier ("Note sur un Mot-Clef du Johannisme... *Hilasmos*," *Novum Testamentum*, 10 [October 1968], pp. 287–304) when he eschews the idea of propitiating God while still preserving the propitiatory denotation of the Greek vocables concerned and so proposes that, in the Johannine literature at least, it is God who propitiates man.
25. Johannes Herrmann (p. 305) sees in 1 Samuel 26:19, for instance, "the firm statement that when God is unfriendly the savour of sacrifice will propitiate Him. The element of expiation seems to be lacking here, since this isolated primitive statement provides no motive for the wrath of the deity." Herrmann adds that Genesis 8:20–22 and 2 Samuel 24:25 are to be understood along the same lines.
26. Leon Morris (*The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, third edition [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965], pp. 149–150) estimates the occurrence of more than 580 references in the Old Testament to the wrath of God aroused by sin and requiring punishment to satisfy His justice.
27. According to the author's chronology, Jacob set off to Haran-Padanaram in the year 1929 B.C. (Gen. 28) and returned to Palestine in 1909 B.C. (Gen. 31).
28. This is the one passage where the KJV (followed here by the NASB) uses "appease" to translate *k p r*.
29. BDB, "[*panah*], pl. *panim*," pp. 815–816.
30. This is the one occasion on which the KJV uses the word "pacify" to translate *k p r*.
31. BDB, "*hemah*," pp. 404–405.
32. This covenant, derived from the days of Joshua, had involved an Israelite oath sworn by the name of "the Lord God of Israel," and the

princes of Israel had, consequently, scrupled to harm the Gibeonites "lest wrath," clearly the wrath of God, "be upon us for the oath which we swore to them" (Josh. 9:20–21).

33. This is one of only four passages outside the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers in which the KJV uses "atonement" to translate *k p r* (the others being 2 Sam. 21:3; 1 Chron. 6:49; 29:24; Neh. 10:33). It is the only occasion aside from Leviticus 16:23 on which the KJV uses the phrase "make *the* atonement" (although the passive formulation "the atonement was made" occurs in Exodus 29:33), thus diverging from the usual usage of the word with the indefinite article (the anarthous construction, "make atonement," occurring five times).

34. Friedrich Buechsel, "hileoos," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III, p. 300. Therefore George Smeaton (*The Apostles' Doctrine of the Atonement* [Edinburgh, 1870], p. 455) could assert of *hilasmos*: "The uniform acceptation of the word in classical Greek, when applied to the Deity, is the means of appeasing God, or of averting His anger; and not a single instance to the contrary occurs in the whole Greek literature." Moulton and Milligan ascribe the same uniform propitiatory denotation to the word group in Hellenistic Greek as do Liddell and Scott in respect to the classical language [Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. Henry Stuart Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940; supplement, 1968), p. 828]. Even Dodd admits that outside of the Septuagint and New Testament *hilaskomai* and *exilaskomai* "have regularly the meaning 'placate', 'propitiate'" (p. 352). He produces two instances in the rest of Greek literature, to be sure, in which he sees an expiatory (and non - propitiatory) significance of *exilaskomai*, but they are quite unconvincing. Dodd's main thesis that the word group refers in the Septuagint and the New Testament to expiation rather than propitiation has, of course, carried much more weight in the scholarly world, but it too has been satisfactorily parried by the thrusts from various angles of Nicole, Hill, and, above all, Morris: Roger R. Nicole, "C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 17 (1954–1955), pp. 117–157; "'Hilaskesthai' Revisited," *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 49 (1977), pp. 173–177. David Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), which deals with "The Interpretation of *hilaskesthai* and Related Words in the Septuagint and in the New Testament," pp. 23–48. Morris took up the guantlet thrown down by Dodd in "The Use of *Hilaskesthai* etc. in Biblical Greek," *The Expository Times*, 62 (1950–1951), pp. 227–233, and continued his counteroffensive in "The Wrath of God," *The Expository Times*, 63 (1951–1952), pp. 142–145, and successive editions of *The Apostolic Preaching of the*

Cross (first published in 1955). The third edition (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965) also incorporates material previously published in "The Meaning of *hilasteerion* in Romans iii.25," *New Testament Studies*, 2 (1955–1956), pp. 33–43. Morris responds to Dodd in various ways in chapters five and six, pp. 144–213.

35. Johannes Herrmann, p. 302. The other translations are *hagiazoo* (twice), *katharizoo* (twice), *ekkatharizoo, perikatharizoo, katharos gignomai, aphieemi, athooooo, aphaireoo, apokathairoo,* and *apaleiphoo.*

36. Raymond Surburg, *The Principles of Biblical Interpretation* (Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press), p. 401.

37. Thus, Chytraeus began his treatise on sacrifice with a summary of the plan by which "God's Son would take on human nature and become a sacrificial victim, thus placating the utterly just wrath of God and restoring righteousness and eternal salvation to the human race" (p. 33) and this affirmation (p. 34): "And in order that man might be admonished and instructed concerning the sacrifice of Christ, God instituted animal sacrifices immediately after His first creatures had been drawn back to Him."

38. The distinction between "clean" and "unclean" animals in Genesis 8:20—indeed, already in the Lord's instructions to Noah in 7:2 and in Noah's observance of them in 7:8—clearly assumes not only the prior institution of sacrifice by God, but also his provision of a considerable quantity of sacrificial legislation (although not necessitating, of course, anything nearly so detailed as the later Mosaic Code).

39. BDB, "*nihoah,*" p. 629. Cf. the verbal root and its other derivative, including the name "Noah" (Gen. 5:29), pp. 628–629.

40. The *ki* clause—echoing 6:5 and serving as one of our traditional proof-texts of universal depravity and original sin—provides, of course, the reason why it would seem appropriate to exterminate mankind and so underlines the propitiatory power of sacrifice in deflecting the thunderbolt of divine wrath from so conducive a target.

41. BDB, "*'olah,*" p. 750.

42. The Hebrew word rendered "that it may be accepted" is a form of the verb *r tz h*, which will merit more attention in a future study. Suffice it to say at this point that its presence intensifies the spirit of propitiation which *k p r* would conjure even on its own.

43. The "it" refers to "the young bull," as the NASB translates it, in verse 5 (literally, "the son of the herd").

44. BDB, "*hatta'th,*" p. 308.

45. BDB, "*s l h,*" p. 699.

46. BDB, "*#'asham,*" p. 79.

47. BDB, "*kippurim,*" p. 498; it is found only in the plural, being allotted to the abstract category.

48. BDB, "*shelem*," p. 1023.
49. The Feast of Weeks (later called Pentecost) was the second of the three annual pilgrimage feasts, marking the completion of the wheat harvest (therefore called also the Feast of Harvest or the Feast of First-Fruits).
50. The identity of the speaker is established by verse 8 (MT; 7EV) and confirmed by Hebrews 10:5,10.
51. Psalm 40 describes the ultimate sacrifice—the sufferings (vv. 15-16, 18a MT), according to the human nature which He was to assume (v. 8 MT and, by necessary implication, vv. 7, 9, etc.), of Him to whom God was to impute all the sins of humanity (v. 13 MT)—in fulfilment of prophecy (v. 8 MT)—in order to save mankind from the consequences of those sins (vv. 10-11, 17 MT). This ultimate sacrifice was to make animal sacrifice obsolete (v. 7 MT). Hebrews 10, therefore, argues that there was no longer any purpose to the sacrifice of animals, since the One who was to come had now, in fact, fulfilled all the prophecies of Psalm 40—in short, "we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (v.9).
52. Apology of the Augsburg Confession, XXIV:21,24. *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, fifth edition (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 355-356.
53. Ibid.
54. VII:50. *Bekenntnisschriften*, p. 988. Similarly, Chytraeus maintains that "the Levitical sacrifices were also sacraments for the pious, that is, they were symbols of belief in Christ, or signs and testimonies to awaken and encourage faith in God's promised forgiveness of sins, freely given because of Christ's future death on their behalf." David Chytraeus, *On Sacrifice: A Reformation Treatise in Biblical Theology*, trans. and ed. John Warwick Montgomery (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962), p. 60, where he cites the example of Samuel before the Battle of Mizpah (1 Sam. 7:7-12).
55. Calvin did not, of course, admit the sacramental role of the Old Testament sacrifices, since he did not accept the existence of sacraments, in the Lutheran sense of the word, in either testament. His definition of a sacrament does not make it a medium through which God conveys to men the forgiveness of sins: "Now, I think it will be a simple and appropriate definition, if we say that it is an outward sign, by which the Lord seals in our consciences the promise of his good-will towards us, to support the weakness of our faith." John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, tr. John Allen, 2 vols.,(Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education), II, p. 555.
56. On this passage see Douglas McC. L. Judisch, "I John 1:1-22," *CTQ* 46 (1982), pp. 44-46, where I observe that "the death of Christ has satisfied, with respect to all sinners who have ever lived, the wrath of

God aroused by sin'' (p. 45).

57. John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles*, trans. and ed. John Owen (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948), p. 171.

58. Ibid., p. 173. Similarly, Payne calls both the ultimate sacrificial death of Christ and the sacrifices connected with the effectuation of the Sinaitic testament (from which blood was sprinkled on the assembled Israelites) ''a limited atonement, designed only for God's elect church'' (p. 251). He explains his phraseology thus (p. 252, note 21): ''The qualification 'limited' must not be understood as in any way minimizing, the *potential* efficacy of the atonement. But it does signify that the *actual* propitiation of God's wrath only occurs in reference to the elect. 'Limited' atonement is simply 'definite' atonement. There is no real atonement, unless it is efficacious; and therefore, since salvation is not universal, it is clear that God did not ordain the atonement of the sins of the non-elect.'' (The italics derive from Payne himself.)

59. The burnt offering, for example, was requisite to the purification of women (Lev. 12:6–8), removal of ceremonial uncleanness, (Lev. 15:14–15, 30), cleansing of former lepers (Lev. 14:19), and restitution for breaking the Nazirite vow (Num. 6:11, 14).

60. See note 45 above.

61. The altar clearly served, as the ''altars'' in our churches still serve (Charles McClean, ed., *The Conduct of the Services* [St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1975], p. 7), as the symbol of the presence of God, whose presence with sinners, however, could be a blessing to them, rather than a curse, only by virtue of the death of His Son, symbolized by the sacrifices burnt upon the altar and the blood sprinkled on it, as here in Leviticus 9 (Heb. 13:10).

62. The form rendered ''for you'' by the NASB is the preposition *'al* with a second person plural termination.

63. The Feast of Trumpets, at the beginning of Tishri (September–October), became Rosh Hashanah, the beginning of the civil year, signalled by the blowing of the shofar, or ram's horn (cf. Lev. 23:23–25).

64. This veil clearly symbolized the separation created by sin between fallen mankind and a God of absolute holiness, a separation which could be removed only by the death of God the Son (Heb. 9:8; Matt. 27:51 and parallels).

65. BDB, ''*kippurim*,'' p. 498.

66. The current usage of ''atonement'' centers in ''expiation, reparation for wrong or injury'' (although it may still serve as a synonym of ''reconciliation'' or ''propitiation''). H. W. and F. G. Fowler, eds., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, fifth edition (Oxford:

Clarendon Press, 1964), p. 73.

67. The verb occurs sixteen times and the noun six times in Leviticus 16.
68. BDB, "*kapporeth*," p. 498.
69. E.g., Leviticus 1:1; Numbers 1:1; and especially Numbers 7:89 (cf. Ex. 34:33–35).
70. "Mercyseat," *Oxford English Dictionary*, VII, p. 352.
71. The Synodical Catechism defines "merciful" as "full of pity," while it invests "grace" with richer apparel as the "love and favor of God toward undeserving man." *A Short Explanation of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism: A Handbook of Christian Doctrine* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1943), pp. 48, 216.
72. "Mercyseat," *loc. cit.*
73. Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, eds., *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879), p. 1471.
74. Liddell, Scott, and Jones, pp. 827–828, who classify *hileos* and *hileoos* (originally an Attic form) as variants of *hilaos*, the more common form in classical Greek.
75. Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, fourth edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), p. 376. Arndt and Gingrich give the definition "that which expiates or propitiates, *concr.* a means of expiation, gift to procure expiation" for the word in Romans 3:25, although some argue for "place of propitiation" (cf. T. W. Manson, "*Hilasteerion*," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 46 [1945], pp. 1–10). Arndt and Gingrich give "mercy-seat" as the meaning of *hilasteerion* in Hebrews 9:5.
76. See note 8.
77. See note 67.
78. E.g., Exodus 25:17–22. NASB, p. 117.
79. Although the NASB text of verse 22 translates *lamedh* as "in regard to," the margin gives "in addition to" as an alternative.
80. The Massoretic Text actually has an active form of *k p r*; i.e., "he shall make atonement," the subject of the verb presumably being the Lord, who is named in the following and parallel clause.
81. Thus, Chytraeus correctly maintains that "... the sacrifices were principally representations or types of the sacrifice and benefits of Christ which are set forth in the New Testament." For the sacrifice of animals was designed "to bring to mind the future sacrifice of Christ, which alone was a *lutron* or ransom for the sins of the human race." David Chytraeus, pp. 58–59.
82. The point appears from the last two words of verse 13 (in English the last five words). It is not the cultus itself ("the solemn assembly") but its conjunction with unbelief ("iniquity") which the Lord finds

unbearable— indeed, hates (cf. " *'awen*," BDB, p. 20).

83. Apology IV: 207. "Apology of the Augsburg Confession," tr. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 135.

Theological Observer

HOW TO GIVE UP THE CONFESSIONS WITHOUT SEEMING TO

Bishop David Preus' article "Fellowship with other Christians," in *The Lutheran Standard* (20 January 1984), the official organ of the ALC, marks a major mile-stone in the history of Lutheranism in America. At least three lines of comment suggest themselves.

[1] *Scuttling the Minneapolis Theses*

Bishop Preus proposes changing what he calls "ALC policy regarding altar and pulpit fellowship." Specifically, he claims that the "results of bilateral dialogs with Reformed, Roman Catholic, and Episcopal Christians indicate that the ALC should, if those bodies agree, enter into altar and pulpit fellowship with them."

The enormous significance of this suggestion lies in the fact that the ALC's chief spokesman here publicly calls for the scuttling of his church's official position. That position was embodied in the *Minneapolis Theses* (1925), which served as the doctrinal foundation for both the (old) American Lutheran Church (1930) and the American Lutheran Conference (1930). Section III, on "Church Fellowship," in the *Minneapolis Theses* is so excellent, that is must be quoted in full:

> 1. These synods agree that true Christians are found in every denomination which has so much of divine truth revealed in Holy Scripture that children of God can be born in it; that according to the Word of God and our confessions, church fellowship, that is, mutual recognition, altar and pulpit fellowship, and eventually cooperation in the strictly essential work of the church, presupposes unanimity in the pure doctrine of the Gospel and of the confession of the same in word and deed. Where the establishment and maintenance of church fellowship ignores present doctrinal differences or declares them a matter of indifference, there is unionism, pretense of union which does not exist.
> 2. They agree that the rule, "Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran pastors only, and Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only," is not only in full accord with, but necessarily implied in, the teachings of the divine Word and the confessions of the evangelical Lutheran Church. This rule, implying the rejection of all unionism and syncretism must be observed as setting forth a principle elementary to sound and conservative Lutheranism.

The "new" ALC's Articles of Union (1958) reaffirmed the *Minneapolis Theses* of 1925, and also the *United Testimony of Faith and Life* of 1952. The *United Testimony* also specifically affirms that "Article III, Church Fellowship, *Minneapolis Theses*,...furnishes the correct principles on fellowship for our Churches." But, adds the *United Testimony*, "in the application of these principles, situations calling for exceptions will arise." This may seem to relativize the *Minneapolis Theses* to some extent. Nevertheless it is clear that what Presiding Bishop Preus is calling for is not simply more exceptions, but an abolition of the principles themselves.

It is interesting to note Fred W. Meuser's judgement that the *Minneapolis Theses*, on the one hand opposed "the suspicious and isolationist spirit of the Synodical Conference," but, on the other hand, "bore witness that on the issues of inspiration of the Scriptures, the Lutheran Confessions, fellowship with other churches, and attitude toward secret religious societies the U.L.C.A. was seriously deficient" (*The Formation of the American Lutheran Church*, 1958, pp. 247–248). Yet the *Minneapolis Theses* had, on the question of fellowship, taken their stand squarely on the "Galesburg Rule" (1875) formulated by the great Charles Porterfield Krauth for the General Council, a predecessor of the U.L.C.A. (now L.C.A.). This means that whatever differences existed in application, the traditional Lutheran fellowship principles were not a "Missourian" peculiarity, but were held in common by all the antecedent bodies of the ALC and by the General Council and the Augustana Synod components of the LCA. In abandoning this common Lutheran ground, today's merging bodies are deliberately taking their stand far below the level even of the old, confessionally flabby General Synod!

[2] *Churches or "Other Christians"?*

That tell-tale word "policy" in the very first sentence already suggests that the whole matter of church fellowship lies in the plane not of basic doctrine, but of practical action, hence "policy." This is probably inevitable if one thinks of fellowship as having to do with individuals rather than with churches as such. And that is clearly the case in this article. The very heading proclaims that the issue is perceived to be one of fellowship with "other Christians," rather than with churches. Churches are mentioned, to be sure, but the over-riding category is that of "Christians," that is, individuals. That notion, in turn, is no doubt heavily colored in terms of actual people one has met, or, in Bishop Preus' own words, "personal enrichment through shared experiences with non-Lutheran Christians" and "deepening fellowship experiences." If fellowship is seen only or mainly under the aspect of individuals, perhaps of persons near and dear, and if churches are seen basically as aggregates of such individuals, then charity will of course dictate a "policy" of broad inclusiveness.

This person-centered approach is by no means unusual. It is in fact the prevailing view of things, which we take in with the very air we breathe. Contemporary culture, disseminated by the mass media, knows nothing beyond the immediacies of individual human existence, understood largely in biological terms. Knowing no history, democratic mass culture cannot sustain the mental effort to think trans-personally, in terms of great historical movements or long-term strategic relationships. It is easier to gush about individual people and their hopes and fears, to assume that everyone in the world is basically "just like the folks next door," and to project Madison Avenue fantasy worlds, in which peace and survival depend not so much on tough-minded strategic realism as on the magic of personal feelings and relations. (Hence the cosmic significance, on silly celluloid, of CIA–KGB love affairs!) We have here that "preoccupation with the self and its experiences, promoted by and promoting the subjectivist analysis of moral, aesthetic, metaphysical and theological judgements" which C.E.M. Joad has so well placed among the "stigmata of decadence." Given this sort of cultural mood or climate, churches are soon following suit. The Missouri Synod's own CTCR produced in the early sixties a rather wobbly sort of "Theology of Fellowship." Henry P. Hamann wrote of it in the Australian sister church's

official critique:

> The tendency throughout — and it is intentional — is not to speak of churches, but to speak of individuals. For with them, in accordance with the subjective *proton pseudos* at the basis of the whole presentation, we can — at least so it is held — distinguish those who are plainly not of Christ...and those who are true Christians....
>
> Surely one must see that the true counterpart in our day to the false teachers of the New Testament age are the heterodox church-bodies themselves.

Now, the great confessions of our church also know and speak of Christian individuals — but how differently! The church, as a seven-year-old child praying the Creed knows, is "holy believers and sheep who hear the voice of their Shepherd" (SA,III:XII). The holy believers and sheep, whom only God knows as such, are accessible to us only indirectly, through the voice of their Shepherd, in the purely proclaimed Gospel and the rightly administered Sacraments. Even the much maligned Formula of Concord is at pains to aim its doctrinal condemnations at *false systems, not their victims as such, viz.*, "those persons who err ingenuously and who do not blaspheme the truth of the divine Word, and far less do we mean entire churches...." (Preface) But the presence of captive Israel in Babylon is not allowed to soften or blunt faithful resistance to the latter. The Formula does not hesitate to say that the Augsburg Confession "distinguishes our reformed churches from the papacy and from other condemned sects and heresies" (FC SD, Rule and Norm, 5)!

Here lies the theological greatness of Luther's "ecclesiology of the cross" (just the point of Augsburg Confession VII!). This understanding of the church is broad enough to include every single child of God and narrow enough to exclude every denial of the uniquely saving Gospel and Sacraments. The whole church is bound up with the whole Gospel—one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism! This ecumenical perspective is truly evangelical because it pays attention only to the saving gift of God, not to the impressive vanities of "religious man." It therefore liberates one from being "blown here and there by every wind of teaching and by the cunning and craftiness of men in their deceitful scheming" (Eph. 4:14 NIV). This is precisely where Luther and the modern ecumenical movement part company. Both confess one single universal church — but where Luther walks humbly, by faith, the ecumenical movement insists on sight. For him the starting point is the Gospel, the *known*, which alone determines the value of the *unknown* in the "ecumenical equation," the church. The ecumenical movement does the opposite. Its starting point, or the known, is the visible, institutional church organization, or rather the aggregate of such organizations. The Gospel is the unknown, the "X," which must be calculated from the institutional givens — that is, where at least two or three hundred million are gathered together. This is "theology of glory" with a vengeance!

For Luther the church is part and parcel of the Christ mystery and, as such, totally inaccessible to all human wisdom. Humbly "hidden under the cross" in this age (Ap,VII-VIII,18), the church is to be found and grasped only in the holy Gospel and Sacraments of Christ, but there fully. Uplifting encounters

with "other Christians" are no substitute for the one holy church known and recognised by faith alone, in her pure marks alone. Based on, and limited by, these marks, church fellowship does not depend on our subjective guesses about just how far afield "other Christians" might still be found.

[3] *Confession versus Church Politics*

Contrary to the Gospel as understood in the Book of Concord, the ALC's Presiding Bishop Preus urges full church fellowship with both the Roman and the Reformed churches. He cites in support the results of "bilateral dialogs." How vacuous these results are is clear from Bishop Preus' own admission that "debate with the Reformed churches as to the mode of Christ's real presence in the sacrament can continue without separation at altar and pulpit." But of course it is totally false to suggest that the Lutheran and Reformed churches agree on Christ's real presence but differ only about the "mode." No Zwinglian or Calvinist has ever denied that Christ, the Person, is "really present" in His divine nature, not only in the Sacrament, but at any meal at all, and indeed everywhere. What the Reformed churches have denied, and continue to deny, is that the Savior distributes His real body and blood under the consecrated bread and wine, so that all communicants receive these, and not simply "by faith," but bodily, with the mouth. That, and not a vague, Calvinistic "real presence of Christ," is the clear and unanimous sacramental teaching of our Confessions, from the Catechisms and the Augsburg Confession to the Smalcald Articles and the Formula of Concord. Current diplomatic compromises and evasions about the Sacrament of the Altar are meant to allow just the sort of positions which "cannot be tolerated in the church of God, much less be excused and defended," according to the Formula of Concord (SD, Rule and Norm, 9).

As for the Roman-Lutheran dialogue in the U.S.A., the lengthy justification document is impressive in some ways, but finally signals an impasse at best or a Lutheran surrender at worst. For while the Roman Catholic party retreats not one inch from the Council of Trent, the Lutherans, with some assistance from the Lutheran World Federation, are torn between the Bible and their Confessions on the one hand, and historical criticism on the other. In the end the Lutherans yield to the traditional Roman confusion between justification and internal renewal or transformation (par. 156-5)! Yet this is the very article by which the church either stands or falls, and of which our church confesses with Luther in the Smalcald Articles: "Nothing in this article can be given up or compromised, even if heaven and earth and things temporal should be destroyed" (SA, II,I,5). And now full church fellowship is urged on the basis of what is admittedly "not fully equivalent to the Reformation teaching on justification" (par. 157).

Bishop Preus is of course aware that all is not well: "We continue to have significant theological and organizational differences with such bodies." But he thinks that the difficulty can be met:

> Hence, it is important that Lutherans and others maintain their ex-

istence within their confessional bodies. The differences are significant enough that confessional identities should be acknowledged, but the differences are not significant enough to keep us from expressing our unity at the altar and in the pulpit.

This proposal, however, really makes matters worse. It amounts to the Lutheran World Federation's notion of "Reconciled Diversity," which expressly combines "genuine church fellowship" with "the legitimacy of the confessional differences and therefore the need to preserve them" (LWF 1977 *Proceedings*, p.174). The LWF has here radicalized the approach of the Prussian Union (Lutheran and Reformed) of the last century: each church can keep its confession, but the differences are no longer regarded as church-divisive. The Church of the Augsburg Confession is downgraded to one school of thought among others, within a broad communion in which many confessions have equal rights.

To think that one can preserve "confessional identities" while granting church fellowship to contrary confessions is pure illusion. If the confessions are not allowed to define the boundaries of church fellowship, then they have been set aside as confessions. To yield the theological substance of church fellowship while withholding organizational trifles is sectarian. It preserves nothing more than "bureaucratic identities." So called "confessions" which are not confessed in pulpits and at altars are play confessions. To rely instead on some sort of institutional, organizational pressure, is to put church politics in the place of theology. And this stands Augsburg Confession VII precisely on its head: the one thing needful, agreement in the pure Gospel and Sacraments ("in the doctrine and in all its articles," FC SD X,31) is given up to promiscuous altar and pulpit fellowship, while the "human traditions" which are "not necessary" are, in the form of bureaucratic structures, relied on to project pseudo-confessional "identities."

How do Lutheran churches respond today to such public abandonment of their confessions? It remains to be seen. One can agree, in one sense, with Presiding Bishop Preus: "These matters must be discussed and debated in the church. Bring out your best biblical thinking. Do not be intimidated by anyone who sounds like [sic] he or she has all the answers." But those who have in Confirmation confessed the Faith of the Small Catechism, and especially those who have, in Ordination, sworn a solemn oath to teach in accordance with the Book of Concord, should have *some* answers.

K.E.Marquart

Book Reviews

JAMES—THE APOSTLE OF FAITH.
By David P. Scaer. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, 1983. 158 pages.

It is no secret that the Epistle of James has had bumpy sailing in Lutheran waters. From Luther's comment about the "straw" epistle to the relative silence of this apostolic voice in today's pulpits and pews, there is reason to pause and question the record. Has James, *the* pivotal spokesman at the apostolic council in Acts 15, been properly heard by later generations? Or, has the course of church history, due to its own theological agenda, wrongly relegated his message to a secondary or tertiary place and thereby precluded a fair hearing?

James—The Apostle of Faith challenges certain exegetical and ecclesiastical commonplaces concerning the position and performance of this "brother of the Lord" (Gal. 1:19) in the apostolic era: "James must be recognized as a theologian, no less capable than any other apostle, including Paul. Let it be said here: James is an apostle of faith; he is not the moralist he is often portrayed as being " (p. 15).

This thesis that James must be viewed as a theologian is advanced by David P. Scaer in a convincing and cogent manner. First, Scaer's study is closely textual. Time after time the reader is led back to the text and appeal is made to its vocabulary and claims. The nuanced discussion of "blessed" (makarios) with its rich Old Testament associations (p. 69) is typical. Such careful exposition, with its obvious sensitivity to the Hellenistic/Hebraic milieu of first century Palestine, is moreover, rendered in an elegant prose which will be a pleasure to both pastor and layman.

A second strength of Scaer's work is his willingness to face difficulties squarely and fashion his solutions within the limitations of the available data, i.e., one will not find that sort of simplistic sentence which both traditional and critical scholarship so often frame to fill in historical holes. For example, the question of the date of the Epistle of James vis-a-vis the other New Testament documents is given fitting prominence. Scaer joins those scholars (e.g., Franzmann) who view this letter as the earliest (antedating even I Thessalonians) document of the inchoate church (pp. 23-38). This reading of the historical evidence opens a window to those first Christian synagogues where James would have taught that the Torah had come in the Christ. Scaer's exposition of James 2:23-24, where the apostle "introduces Gn 15:6 into the ear-

ly church's discussion on justification," is a sterling example of *textual* insights that a less sensitive reading would never render. This reviewer had never tied James' use of Abraham to his use of Job, but "the apostle of faith" places them at strategic turns in his theological treatise. (cf. pp. 93–94).

It should also be stated that Scaer is thoroughly conversant with the scholarly literature on James. While they remain anonymous for the most part (and hence the scholarly "tome" style is avoided), Scaer's conversation partners represent the full spectrum of modern day scholarship. Indeed, one work which is mentioned in the bibliography (pp. 152–154) could provide a particularly suitable companion volume namely Richard N. Langenecker's *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (SM, 1970).

A final stimulus to purchase this slender volume is the section on "Luther, the Lutherans, and James " (pp. 138ff). Here too, one finds a fine balance in the evaluation of the exegetical moves that the Reformer and his colleagues made in their use of James. Concordia Publishing House is to be commended for attractively and accurately printing this work, but even more so, for its commitment to the thorough and suggestive scholarship which is here exhibited.

Dean O. Wenthe

THE THIRD REFORMATION? Charismatic Movements and the Lutheran Tradition. Carter Lindberg. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1983. 345 pages. Cloth, $24.95.

It is Prof. Lindberg's (Boston University) stated purpose to attempt "a historical-theological analysis of the present charismatic renewal in light of prior renewal movements" (p.10), the prior movements being the "spiritualists" of Luther's time and the pietists of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. It is a balanced, thorough-going treatment. Lindberg acknowledges frankly that he has no charismatic leanings; he succeeds in presenting a carefully measured and objective review, one which takes account of the concern that Lutheran bodies have regularly shown towards the charismatic threat, viz., over division of the body corporate and the undercutting, whether admitted or not, of the means of grace. This inevitably involves also the center point of Luther's teaching on justification as an act of God *extra nos*, a thing accomplished objectively and unconditionally even before faith enters in through Christ (pp.39, 45). It was precisely the internalizing of the sinner's justification by the "spiritualists" (so Lindberg), or "fantastic spirits" as Luther preferred to call them, which turned the theology of the cross into a "theology of glory," at which point they then differed little from the Romanists with their mystical pietism or monasticism. Lindberg traces nicely the whole story from Karlstadt (p.55ff.), through Thomas Muentzer (p.75ff.), to Melchior Hoffmann (p.88ff.), Sebastian Frank (p.95ff.), and Casper von Schwenckfeld (p.101ff.), illustrating the inevitable clash which en-

sued with the central article on justification. This is an extremely valuable theological analysis, weakened only by Lindberg's quirk (one shared with many modern Luther scholars) which traces the *usus triplex*, third use of the Law, only to Melanchthon and not to Luther (p. 129). Pietism's (Arndt, Francke, Arnold) intention, to try to recover primitive Christianity by inward wrestlings and renewal, ends finally, as Lindberg correctly shows, with the displacement of justification. Protestation by Charismatics of Lutheran orientation (Larry Christenson, *et al*) to the contrary, the same judgment must rest upon the so-called "Third Reformation." This carefully documented section alone makes the cost of the book seem less prohibitive; Lindberg traces the history of the movement in a convincing manner and then also adds the theological assessment for which especially the Lutheran reader will be looking. Included is an exceptionally fine bibliography, plus an index. Certainly it is a significant production from every point of view.

E.F. Klug

MARTIN LUTHER. Abridged Edition.
Peter Manns. Translated by Michael Shaw.
New York: Crossroad, 1983. 120 pages. $14.95.

The University of Mainz professor and Romanist priest, Peter Manns, is recognized as one of the ablest Luther scholars of our times. He follows in the Lortz (his teacher) tradition which, while it softens the judgment or assessment of and against Luther, still leaves him stand, not as a "father of the church," but as an heretic. However, this being said, let the reader prepare himself for one of the most insightful biographies to have appeared on the Reformer's life during the recent jubilee period. Like Lortz, Manns is perfectly ready to acknowledge "that the Reformation had become historically inevitable" (p.11), but in the same breath he lets stand the verdict that Luther was responsible for disintegrating the unity of Christ's "church," an obvious identifying of Rome with the *una sancta* on Manns' part. Manns is at his best when he describes Luther's odyssey from student at Erfurt to monk in the Augustinian order of the same city. Indeed, the reader will gain an inside view of what Luther's life was like in the monastic system, told by one who knows the institution from the inside himself. However, it is not true that Luther supported monasticism as a way of life (p.98) up till 1525 (cf. *The Judgment of Martin Luther on Monastic Vows*, 1521); nor is there really any good reason for assuming that the *Theses* were not posted (p.53); nor can one claim really "that Luther's theological concerns do not compellingly account for the direction of the Reformation" (p.51); nor can Manns sustain his rejection of Luther's heroic words at Worms, implying that they are so much hagiography on the part of his followers (p.82); and, above all, there is no credible, nor creditable, ground for believing Manns that Luther was the one mixed up on the relationship of works (or love) to faith, or of the proper place for *gratia infusa* in theology (p.49). There are these and other strictures, but the book dare

not be ignored; fresh ground is turned at a number of places. Too, it is beautifully illustrated, with many pictures in full color. Here and there the English translation falters, sometimes merely in awkward structure, occasionally in meaning. With unrepentant consistency the publishers persist on the spelling "unrepentence." It is good reading nonetheless.

E.F. Klug

HOW TO TEACH ORIGINS.
John N. Moore. Milford, Michigan: Mott Media, 1983. 382 pages.

The name of John N. Moore is familiar to those who have paid some attention to the creation-evolution confrontation in recent years. Professor of biology at Michigan State University, Dr. Moore, now retired, maintained his professional standing in the science arena while contending for fiat creation of the universe by God, thus accepting the Scriptural account as factual in explaining the origin of the universe, of life on the earth, and of humankind. A lifetime of teaching stands behind this text which is intended to aid the Bible-believing teacher of science, whatever his area, to cope with the tensions and problems involved in presenting an alternate view on the multifaceted subject of first origins. Not least is Moore's concern to show that the American Civil Liberties Union has no legal leg to stand on when challenging the right to teach creation as an alternative view (p.37ff.). The philosophical roots and impact of evolutionary thinking are traced in the first chapter, "What Is Science?" along with the necessary definition of terms (a glossary of terms is also appended at the end of the book). Science is not at its best, Moore shows convincingly, when it tries to reach back to origins, trying to explain things where it actually has no empirical handle (pp.49,55,59,146). The great names in science, like Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Linnaeus, Mendel, and a host of others, most of whom were devout men of God, knew and respected the limitations imposed on them by their research, refraining from speculative "guessing" on that which they had no way of reaching. Such proper restraint is hardly the posture of the famed Leakey family (Louis, Mary and their son Richard) who boldly pontificate that the hominid fossils discovered in the Olduvai Gorge point to this area of Africa as the cradle of humankind. The more likely facts are that the cradle, as formerly believed, is still the plains of Babylon region, and that what the Leakeys are looking at are ape fossils (pp.187-220 *passim*). But this reviewer has resolved to keep up his *National Geographic* subscription nonetheless, leaky though the above claims are. There is no way of quibbling with the fundamental principle or law that Moore finds running through the whole of the flora and fauna system of life: "An artificial breeder of plants or animals always concludes all breeding practices with the same recognizable kind of organism which was used to start the selective breeding" (p.225). The charts, suggested projects, review questions, glossaries, appendices, bibliography, index, etc., are all designed to be of max-

imum assistance to the teacher of science who is personally committed to the Biblical teaching that all of life as we know it stems from God's creative hand. The book can be of help, of course, also to the general reader, student or teacher, who has a concern over the creation-evolution controversy.

E.F. Klug

CHRISTIAN YOGIC MEDITATION.
Swami Amaldas. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc.
Paper, $3.95.

This volume—CHRISTIAN YOGIC MEDITATION—is one of a series of books on prayer and "Christian" meditation. This volume can be left on the shelf untouched. It is boldly syncretistic, attempting to combine Christianity and Hinduism. Some examples from the book should suffice to illustrate how it ignores the historic Christian faith. First of all, there is no Gospel at all in the book. The atonement is avoided and ignored. Any reference to it is of no importance, because the atonement is merely a reference point, not the center of the Bible.

Secondly, the main thrust of the book is to call the Christian into a Cosmic Christ Consciousness; we feel ourselves become Christ by expanding the hidden powers within us (page 16):

> My senses and intellect could not grasp what I experienced, but gradually I could see the hidden power within me was growing. . .After many years of yogic meditation and study of the Bible and Hindu Scriptures with the help of my Guru and other spiritual teachers, I now understand at least something of what I experienced. "My body became bigger and bigger" that is a process of going from one lever to another—from my individual consciousness to the Cosmic Consciousness. . .My body is Jesus Christ's body and my blood is Jesus Christ's blood. . .I passed from Cosmic Consciousness to Cosmic Christ Consciousness.

What we have is pure pantheism. Here is no means of grace, no conversion from unbelief to faith in the Savior. Here is no Holy Spirit acting on the heart of the sinner. Here is the individual striving to reach God, and doing so! He becomes Christ Consciousness, the drop of individual water blending with the ocean of eternity and so on.

Thirdly, syncretism is clearly taught (page 20):

> Different people have different experiences of God. If you repeat the name Krishna, you will enter Krishna Consciousness and experience God the way that Krishna did. If you repeat the Name of Christ, you will enter into Christ Consciousness and experience God in the way that Christ did. Calling Christ by Name means accepting Him as our Lord and Master and allowing ourselves to be awakened by his power.

There is no doubt that the Christian Gospel has lost out in this volume. The Trinity now shares His throne with any and all other gods. The Christian church needs to discover once again the value of Christian meditation, an art not employed with great frequency in the church today; this volume is no answer.

George Kraus

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY: An Introduction.
William C. Placher. Philadelphia: Westminister, 1983. Paper. 324 pages.

Any work going from the history of Israel to Martin Luther King in 324 pages is necessarily going to be abbreviated. As Placher teaches at Wabash College, his text seems directed to college seniors to give them a baptism into the critical study of religion—and that it does. It seems patterned after the schema of von Harnack with the simple teaching of Jesus evolving into a more complex Christology of the Fourth Gospel. Special attention is given to the American scene which, in relation to the course of the centuries, it certainly does not deserve. A final chapter looks forward to the new possibilities associated with liberation theology. No new ground here is ploughed.

David P. Scaer

CONCORDIA SELF-STUDY COMMENTARY: An Authoritative In-Home Resource for Students of the Bible.
Walter H. Roehrs and Martin H. Franzmann. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1979.

It is with some sense of shame that the present review of the *Concordia Self-Study Commentary* is offered at this time, since this fine volume has been published since 1979. For any who may still be unacquainted with this work, however, let me now recommend it most highly. Its *authors* (the commentators) are former professors at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Martin Franzmann for the New Testament and the minor prophets, and Walter Roehrs for the majority of the Old Testament. Both men write clearly. More important, both write with great *theological* insight, reminding the reader of the great depth and richness of true *Biblical* theology. This volume is billed as a "home resource" and "tailored for lay use," but do not be deceived—any pastor or professor will benefit greatly!

The format of the volume is simple. For each Biblical book a brief introduction discusses matters of authorship, date, purpose, etc. These sections are concise, giving the reader a reasonable exposure to modern thinking, but, in the end, holding forth a solid, Lutheran viewpoint. Consider, e.g., Roehrs on the authorship of *Isaiah* (OT p. 444):

> Today a majority of Biblical scholars deny large segments of the book to the prophet named in the superscription. Chs. 40–66 are attributed to writers living at least two centuries later. Chs. 1–39 do not fare much better. Large and smaller sections are declared spurious, notably chs. 27–29 and 32–35....
>
> All proponents of the decimation of the ancient document admit that their case rests entirely on internal evidence.... Only a multiple authorship, they contend, can explain the lack of uniformity they find in three areas: literary style and vocabulary, theological concepts, and the historical standpoint of the writers.

There is no external, objective evidence in ancient literature, religious or profane, to validate this theory.

Also, consider Franzmann on the purpose of *Hebrews* (NT p. 233):

> The Letter to the Hebrews is surely a part of the story of how the Word of the Lord grew and prevailed. Here if anywhere in the New Testament we are made conscious of the fact that God's speaking is a mighty onward movement, an impetus of revelation designed to carry man with it from glory to glory. And here it is impressed on us that if man resists that impetus, he does so at his own deadly peril; we are warned that stagnation and retrogression invite the destroying judgment of God. But the letter is itself also the proof that God does not abandon the weak and sickly stragglers of His flock; He sends forth His word and heals them.

The introductions are followed by commentary. The commentary is not a strict verse by verse style, but, rather, a combination method: first an integral part or unity is explained in overview; then selected *key* verses are explained in detail. The *unit* explanations are especially valuable in helping to maintain the overall picture. See, e.g., Roehrs on Isaish 24:1–23 (OT p. 460):

> In chs. 24–27 "the vision of Isaiah" (1:1 first note) becomes broader in scope. The focus of chs. 1–12 is on the chosen people. Chs. 13–23 deal with individual nations that played a part in Israel's history. Now the whole world of nations comes into view. However, the seer's eyes are opened not only to take in a wider scene of action but also to peer deeply into the future—to the very end of time. What every "day of the Lord" (2:11 note) was to effect—whether judgement or deliverence—will reach a decisive climax *on that day*...when all nations will cease to be because heaven and earth will pass away.

Also, see Franzman on Matthew 5:1–7:29 (NT p.18):

> The Sermon on the Mount is the record of how Jesus molds the will of His disciple, leading the disciple to live a life wholly drawn from God the King as He is revealed in these last days in His Son, a life which is therefore wholly lived for God the King. The gift of the Kingdom and the claim of the Kingdom (the call to repentance) are to shape the disciple's whole existence.

The explanations of the selected verses are outstanding, too, maintaining, as they do, the overall picture (Roehrs, especially, cross–references nicely; see the quote on Isaiah 24 above). They also emphasize the tight unity of the Old and New Testaments. See, e.g., Psalm 2:7:

> "My son." Declared God's adopted son when elevated to "the throne of the kingdom of the Lord" (1 Ch 28:4–7), David foreshadowed that "Son who was descended from David according to the flesh and designated Son of God according to the Christ our Lord" (Ro 1:3–4...). His dominion extends beyond "the ends of the earth (8) because to Him "all authority in heaven and on earth has been given" (Mt 28:18).

The explanations also offer a balanced approach:

> (1 Cor.) 15:29 "Baptized on behalf of the dead." Since baptism on behalf of the dead is not explained or even mentioned elsewhere in the NT, one can only conjecture what Paul is referring to here. Many conjectures have been made, none really satisfactory. One that meets the conditions of Paul's argument is this:....
> (Just to whet your appetite; you will have to read the solution yourself!)

If you are still not convinced, read Roehrs' Introduction to the *Song of Solomon*, in which he deals comprehensively and effectively with the questions of the meaning and purpose of the book. By itself it is "worth the price of admission."

James W. Voelz

THE WORD BECOMING FLESH.
By Horace D. Hummel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1979. 679 pages. Cloth, $17.95.

Most readers of this journal would acknowledge that the rich resources of the Old Testament are not always being fully drawn upon in the proclamation and teaching of the church. The *de jure* confession of the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament as the authoritative Word of God is often joined to a *de facto* constriction of that corpus to those texts which are explicitly expounded in the New Testament. The relative silence of such books as Ecclesiastes or Chronicles in the church is often the result of a pastor's puzzlement over how properly to appropriate those texts in the New Testament context. As one surveys the early church fathers and their diverse exposition of the Old Testament it is clear that this is a perpetual challenge and task rather than a distinctly modern problem.

The pastor or student who has pondered the question of how he might render the full spectrum of Old Testament texts into useable currency for his own and his congregation's pilgrimage will be greatly stimulated by Horace Hummel's *The Word Becoming Flesh*. As stated in the "introduction to introduction," the aim of this volume is broader than the standard review of date, authorship and historical setting. It seeks to, and constantly does, bridge the chasm between introduction and theology. Hummel rightly critiques "the tendency to divorce exegesis, homiletics, and theology from specifically isagogical issues" and hence leave the text "not very preachable " (p.12).

Thus, as Hummel surveys the major critical and traditional postures on introductory questions, he continually points the reader to the larger theological assumptions which attend and even determine one's answers. He scores the "historical critical method" for its dependence on "human reason and philosophy" (p.13, p.58, pp.260ff, p.463, *passim*). The opposite tendency to disregard the historical setting is also shown to be inadequate (p.29, pp.59-61).

A particular strength of Hummel's work is its distillation of a vast secondary literature. The discussions of the documentary hypothesis (pp.32–57) and the work of Herman Gunkel (pp.421ff) are representative of the many concise summaries. Since most seminarians, regrettably, find it hard to read the primary sources, this volume will serve as a fine outline of the major issues.

While there are many suggestive statements in a work of this scope, this review can only focus on one, namely, the manner in which typology is deployed as an important hermeneutical category.

Hummel writes:

> Sometimes typology has been urged in opposition to prophecy-fulfillment. Let it be clear that there is no such hidden agenda here. The meaning proclaimed at the fulfillment is no more read into a genuine prophecy than a genuine antitype finds only superficial parallels in some precedent. In fact, we would argue that typology and porphecy-fulfillment are two sides of the same coin, ultimately two ways of saying the same thing. (p. 17)

A specific application of this principle is offered in conjunction with the discussion of the Messianic psalms:

> The royal psalms are to be read in the light of especially 2 Sam 7, Nathan's pivotal Messianic prophecy of perpetuity to the Davidic dynasty, specializing and extending to it the same covenant which was the fundament of Israel's entire existence. If with some critics we do not dismiss the grandiose language of these psalms as merely the traditional, fulsome bombast of ancient Near Eastern 'court style'; it soom becomes apparent that their primary subject is not any empirical king, but the office of kingship under the promise. But 'office' is an abstraction; the terms of the promise were partly 'fulfilled,' that is exemplified and objectified again and again in Israel's kings..., but the very incompleteness of that application always reminded that the partial fulfillment was also a prophecy and type of Another who would fully and finally incarnate and establish its terms in an external kingdom. Nor is this something 'read in'; the Old Tstament context alone sufficies to defend the viewpoint that the ultimate, eschatological and messianic import was part of the speaker's original vista and intent. (p. 439)

The juxtaposition of these two quotes suggests that this is an opportune moment to discuss the proper uses and possible abuses of what has been termed "typology," a notoriously slippery term, as Hummel indicates. (pp.16ff).

That Hummel is clearly not introducing something new to Lutheran circles can be seen from Robert Preus' description of the interpretation of Old Testament in *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism I* (1970), p. 328:

> With its emphasis on types in the Old Testament (Melchizedek, Adam, the stairs of Jacob, the sacrifices, the crossing of the Red Sea, the manna, the fiery serpent, etc.) and on direct predictive prophecy where the prophetic words themselves point directly to Christ, classical Lutheranism shows that in a sense it regarded the entire Old Testament as typological, as a foreshadowing and a blueprint, as it were, for the work of Christ and the coming of His Kingdom.

Indeed, this reviewer has found it striking that one of the first hermeneutics

used at Concordia Seminary, D.C.G. Hofmann's *Institutiones Theologiae Exgeticae* (St. Louis, 1876) spends some thirty pages describing the *"De sensu S. Scripturae mystico."* This mystical sense is divided by Hofmann into three categories: *allegoricum, parabolicum, ad typicum* (pp.33ff). In each case proper guidelines are offered and examples given. Under the category of *genuine types*, Hofmann writes:

> Innati typi, qui soli hoc nomen biblicum merentur, variis modis dividi et ossunt et solent; ego vero putarem, salvis aliorum sententiis satis commodam et aptam esse divisionem in typos 1)personarum, 2)legum et institutorum atque 3)factorum historicorum. Ad typos personales, si ita loqui fas est, pertinuit persona summi sacerdotis, maxime Aaronis, Mechisedechi, primogenitorum etc. Ad legales vel, si mavis, caerimoniales referendus est totus cultus Dei Leviticus, cum omnibus iis, quae ejusdem partes constituerunt, ut erant sacrificia, tabernaculum cum suo apparatu, templum, sacerdotium, sacramenta, festa, anni jubilaei, sabbata, neomenia, impuritas juxta legem Mosaicam contracta, caerimoniae aliae. Ad historicos denique pertineret eductio populi Israelitici ex Aegypto, reditus ejusdem populi ex captivitate Babylonica, fletus Rahelis etc.

The earlier essay by Walter R. Roehrs' on "The Typological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *A Project in Biblical Hermeneutics* (CTCR, 1969, pp.39–53) and the same author's *Self-Study Commentary* (CPH, 1979) have also made significant contributions on the possible uses of typology.

Questions which might profitably be explored in the investigation of typology as a hermeneutical category are: [1] To what extent is the exegesis of the church fathers (e.g., Augustine) similar or dissimilar? [2] At what point must concern be expressed vis-a-vis *sensus literalis unus est*? Did the ancients of Antioch propose a unity which was rich in its view? "The ability to see these two objects *per modum unius* is due to a divine revelation, usually in the form of a supernatural exaltation. The soul of the prophet is withdrawn from the material world in ecstacy, and by divine charism contemplates the future. This does not mean he loses sight of the contemporary historical panorama, but rather that by a divine light he penetrates to a further horizon than formerly seen. The great feat of the inspired author again returning from this ecstasy is to find a suitable formula to include both the contemporary meaning of events and their future fulfillment" (P. Ternant, 'La Theoria, d'Antioche dans le cadre des sens del' Ecriture,' *Biblica* 34 (1953), p.139). [3] How are we to view the sort of typology which the Confessions apply to Numbers 28:4ff in *Apology* 24:36? [4] How is the paradigm of the *Word Becoming Flesh* similar to and different from those offered by Goppelt, *et alii*?

Dean O. Wenthe