

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben

— von der —

Allgemeinen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Wisconsin
und anderen Staaten.

Redigiert von der Fakultät des Ev.-Luth. Seminars
zu Chienerville, Wis.

Motto: „So ihr bleiben werdet an meiner Rede,
so seid ihr meine rechten Jünger, und
werdet die Wahrheit erkennen, und die
Wahrheit wird euch frei machen.“

Joh. 8, 31. 32

Preis per Jahrgang \$1.50.

Jahrgang 41.

1944.

Inhaltsverzeichnis zum 41. Jahrgang.

Abhandlungen	Seite
“My Kingdom is not of this World” John 18, 36 (Cont.). H. A. Koch	1
Der Antichrist. Das Papsttum, die Erfüllung der Weissagung 2 Thessal. 2, 1-12. W. Hoenecke	32
Study on 1 Corinthians 15. M.	81
Der Antichrist. Die Ansprüche der Bischöfe von Rom in bezug auf Alleinherrschaft über alle Reiche der Welt. W. Hoenecke	91
“My Kingdom is not of this World” John 18:36. H. A. Koch	110
Sermon from Hoenecke’s „Wenn ich nur dich habe.“ Translated by Prof. Werner Franzmann	123
Closing Address. M.	145
Der Antichrist. Das Papsttum, die Erfüllung der Weissagung 2 Thessal. 2, 1-12. W. Hoenecke.....	149
Study on 1 Corinthians 15. M.	176
Opening Address. P. Peters	209
Remarks on Eph. 4, 1-16. M.	217
What Is the Gift of the Holy Ghost According to Acts. A. Schaller	230
The Natural Knowledge of God in the Light of the Law and the Gospel. P. Peters	245
Kirchengegeschichtliche Notizen	
“What Christ?”	55
Presbyterian-Episcopalian Union Postponed	57
Religious Liberty in Russia	59
The Death of Dr. M. Reu on October 14, 1943	60
“Communion Service that Makes History”	62
A New Name for Open Questions?	64
“‘It Is To Weep!’”	66
“The Prophet” of the Lachish Letters	67
The Lutheran Academy for Scholarship	132
A Statement	133
An Overture for Lutheran Unity	135
Did Missouri Once Teach “Election in View of Faith”?	141
Is this the Way toward Unity?	197
Let the Record Speak	200

	Seite
Shall We Have Laws on Religion?	203
Missouri's Saginaw Convention on Union	263
Re-Thinking the Chaplaincy	267
Dr. Dau Called Home	269
Acceleration in Theological Education	270

Büchertisch

A. Besprechungen

The Cross Athwart the Sky	69
A Short Explanation of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism	70
Lutheran Confessional Theology	71
The Tragedy of Calvary	72
Cross Examined	73
Come Into My Heart	74
Courage in Christ, For Christ and Country, Victory Through Christ: Radio Messages	75
"The God of the Bible and Other Gods"	77
Our Bible	143
The Annotated Pocket New Testament, Authorized Version, With Notes by Theodore Graebner. Parts VIII and IX	143
The Power of the Keys	207
A Compend of Luther's Theology	207
The Primacy of Faith	208
A Dictionary of Bible Topics	272
From Science to Souls	273
Beginners' Hebrew Grammar	274
The Loves and Wars of Baal and Anat and Other Poems from Ugarit	274
The Chapel Hymnal	275
The Graduals for the Church Year	276
Our Church	276
Eighty Eventful Years	276

B. Kurze Anzeigen

Lutheran Annual 1944. — Amerikanischer Kalender für deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1944	71
Eleventh Bulletin of Distinctive Choral Music for the Choral Union. 1943-1944	73

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben von der Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Synode von
Wisconsin und anderen Staaten.

Jahrgang 41

Januar 1944

Nummer 1

"My Kingdom is not of this World"

John 18:36

Essay delivered by Rev. Dr. Hr. Koch at the 27th Convention of the Ev. Luth.
Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States in Watertown, Wis., August 4-11, 1943

(Continued from October Issue)

II

CHRIST RULES IN THE KINGDOM OF GRACE

We now come to the rule of Christ in His kingdom of grace. Christ says to Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world. Thou sayest I am a king. To this end was I born and for this cause came I into this world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice." Christ here informs us that His kingdom is not of this world, does not have its origin in this world and is different from all the kingdoms of this world. The kingdoms of this world are visible and are kingdoms of temporal power, Christ's kingdom is invisible and is a kingdom of grace. Into the earthly kingdoms of power men are born, it is through grace alone that one can become a subject of Christ's invisible kingdom. Christ calls it a kingdom of truth before Pilate. Grace and truth are correlated to one another in Christ's invisible kingdom. They are the chief characteristics of the kingdom. Grace and truth kindle faith in man's heart, and through faith and through grace one becomes a subject of Christ's kingdom of truth. Viewing Christ's kingdom in the light of the two terms, grace and truth, we shall see that the glory of God is the ultimate objective and the salvation of man is the ultimate purpose.

John tells us (1:17): "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." The antithesis is signifi-

cant. On the one hand the law, on the other, grace and truth. The law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. God gave the law through Moses. Moses was not the law as was Jesus the grace and the truth. Grace and truth are essential for the salvation of man. Grace is undeserved favor of God through Christ. Through grace we have forgiveness of all of our sins, are justified, clothed with the righteousness of Christ, and are also children of God our Father. We have received a full pardon for all of our sins. We need no longer say with Cain: "My punishment is greater than I can bear." (Gen. 4, 13.) We know that even though they are like crimson they shall become as white as snow. We can rejoice with David (Psalm 103): "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits, who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who healeth all thy diseases, who redeemeth thy life from destruction, who crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies." In Christ we have peace of heart, a quieted conscience, eternal life with all its heavenly gifts. We have not deserved or merited this salvation. It is ours through grace alone. Through grace alone we are subjects of Christ's kingdom. The word "grace" runs like a golden thread through the whole Bible from the first pages, relating the fall of man and the grace offered through the seed of the woman, to the very last pages of the Bible, where Christ consoles His faithful subjects with His coming to receive them into His kingdom of glory. This grace of God in Christ Jesus was revealed to the malefactor on the cross, who surely could show forth no good deeds to prove his merits.

This grace is universal and includes all, even Cain and Judas. It is not restricted to the elect as Calvinism claims. It is not a grace added to the merits of man as Rome teaches, not an irresistible grace as the Reformed Church teaches, but a universal grace, for God wants all men to be saved. It can be resisted, was resisted and rejected by the Jews and by Pilate and the majority of mankind at all times. This grace also can be lost as is seen in Judas and in so many who have fallen away from the church and have loved the present world, loved their own lives more than the life in Christ.

Through the means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments, we enter the kingdom of grace and are maintained in it. These

means of grace offer and create faith in our hearts. Their efficacy does not depend upon the good intentions of man to receive them, nor upon the person offering them. They are efficacious in themselves. It is only through these means that we become subjects of the kingdom of grace. The enthusiasts would have us believe that God has many ways besides the Word and the Sacraments to bring us to faith, yes, does not need such means. With Zwingli they believe and teach that the Holy Spirit requires no vehicle to enter in and work in the heart of man. God's Word, however, knows but of these means of grace.

What a consolation for us poor sinners to know that our salvation does not depend on our own merits, but solely on the grace of Christ, that nothing can separate us from the love of God, which is ours through Christ, that we are subjects of the only kingdom which can not and will not perish as the others must do and go the way of all flesh! This reliance on the grace of Christ gave the first Christians the strength to endure all tribulations and persecutions. This grace the great Reformer again brought to light out of the darkness of the Middle Ages. Those long forgotten truths and treasures which are ours through Christ, through the word, through faith alone, and through grace alone, were again taught and became the principles of the Reformation. Pure grace alone and nothing added on our part has made us subjects of Christ's kingdom of grace, of that kingdom which is not of this world. What a blessed lot is ours! Let us always walk and conduct ourselves as such children of grace!

Let us watch and pray that Satan does not raise doubt and unbelief in our hearts as to our being subjects of Christ's kingdom alone through grace, that all our preaching be nothing but the glorification of that grace of Christ alone as we find it in the preaching of Luther. Let us for our own persons always confess with Paul: "By the grace of God I am what I am and His grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain." (I Cor. 15:10.) May Christ's grace be sufficient for us in all weakness and tribulation! May we cling to the article of justification, the heart and soul of our Christian faith, as Paul also expressed it (Rom. 3:23f.): "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ."

Christ's kingdom also is a kingdom of truth. The world may say with Pilate: "What is truth?", may doubt, may even deny the truth of the Bible, it is nevertheless the truth. There is but one realm of truth, namely, the kingdom of truth in Christ. Satan's realm is nothing but a realm of falsehood and lies, he is the father of lies. In the realms of this world truth and falsehood are cleverly mixed by the devil, the *diabolos*, so as to deceive mankind. Christ's kingdom of truth is not of this world. Here on earth in the realm of Satan there is and can be no absolute truth. It is unobtainable through the best efforts of natural man. The power of human reasoning has been corrupted through sin, and the truth about salvation, the saving truth, is far beyond human reasoning. The scientist, who studies nature, may gain the knowledge of certain facts and truths, but the real truth, of which Christ speaks before Pilate, he will never gain through the study of nature. The divergencies in the findings of man in the fields of science, philosophy, arts, law and ethics, go to prove that *The Truth* is not given to natural man, but only to him who has become a subject of the kingdom of truth through the grace of Christ.

Is there a God? How differently have not the shrewdest minds tried to answer this question! Even though God gave into every man's heart the knowledge of Himself, and the works of creation reveal that there must be a God, still fools will continue to say there is no God. Those who do not deny His existence have either identified Him with nature or its forces, or have relegated Him into the background, as did the deists. Let us not forget that all men are without excuse, for God has shown Himself unto them in His creation. (Rom. 1:19.) But even where they do not deny the existence of God, they are nevertheless without the saving truth about God, which is alone revealed in Christ.

Mankind has developed all kinds of religions, the basis of all of these being the appeasement of the gods through the deeds and sacrifices of man. Man tries to satisfy God through his own deeds and merits. That is the basic falsehood of all man-made religion. The Bible reveals the truth that salvation is ours through no merits of ours whatever, but through the grace of Christ alone.

Christ brings the truth to mankind. It was held forth to

fallen man as a promise and revealed in the person of Christ. Christ says: "I am the truth. No man cometh unto the Father but by me." Jesus through the coming and the work of the Comforter creates faith in this truth in the heart of man. The disciples become convinced that in Him the Scriptures are fulfilled. They gradually discard their false conceptions regarding the Messianic Kingdom and learn to see Christ as the King of Truth who leads His disciples into all the truth.

We, His subjects, are privileged to be witnesses of this truth as revealed in Christ and in His Word of Truth. We are to bring nothing but the truth and the whole truth. If we cling to the true Gospel of Christ and do not permit it to be adulterated, then we have the most blessed task to perform for the whole human race.

As Christ bears witness unto the truth, let us do the same in our sermons, in our congregational and synodical work, in our lives! Let us ever see to it that Satan does not succeed in mixing his falsehood with the truth we are to proclaim. Let us heed the admonition of the King of Truth, "If ye continue in my word, then ye are my disciples indeed and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." (John 8, 31f.)

Christ bears witness unto the truth, not a truth among many others of equal or similar value, not a truth later on to be superseded by another, but The Truth. Christ is no mere truth seeker. Lessing once said: "If God were to give me into one hand the truth and into the other the search after truth, I would in all humility request the search after the truth, for the truth would be for God alone." It sounds humble, but it is arrogant on the part of Lessing to speak thus, nevertheless. Christ the Truth tells the truth about us, about God, and about our salvation.

This truth is so beautifully expressed in Christ's words to Nicodemus: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3, 16.) This truth Christ furthermore stated by making the majestic claim: "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me." (John 14, 6.) Christ tells us that He Himself is the truth. From Satan, the great liar and mixer of truth and falsehood, the *diabolos*, or Devil, nothing but lies and deception can come. The

truth of Christ is found in His Word, and He wants His disciples to abide, to increase in it, and to be sanctified by it. Jesus prays for His disciples: "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." (John 17:17.) Christ is the only Truth, the only Savior. His Word is truth, showing the only way to salvation. Proud man can reject this truth as Pilate did with his words: "What is truth?", or be saved by it as was the case with the malefactor who recognized in Jesus the King of Truth, the true King of Kings. Christ's subjects obey this truth. For them it is the supreme authority in matters of doctrine and life.

This truth is for everyone, not only for a certain class of people like the wise, the philosophers. To the wise of this world it is hidden, and revealed to babes, not because Christ does not want the wise to be saved, but because the wise of this world consider the preaching of the cross foolishness, absurd and offensive to their advanced learning. Really wise men who were not proud of their wisdom, like Nicodemus, Paul, and Luther, were saved. This truth is also not for those who are seemingly better than others by nature. Before Jesus all are sinners and Jesus came into the world to save sinners and not the righteous.

Christ, however, did not only bring the Truth, is not only the King of the only realm of truth, He is, as He Himself says, the Truth personified (John 14:6). This we should like to emphasize. Christ is not merely truthful. Most men claim for themselves that they are truthful. Peter says of Christ: "Neither was guile found in his mouth" (I Peter 2:22). Christ does not only say the truth, when He speaks *ex cathedra*, officially, as is the arrogant and blasphemous claim of the Pope since 1870. He does not only bear witness unto the truth, He is The Amen, the faithful and true witness as He speaks of Himself in Revel. 3:14 and 19:11. There Christ presents Himself as "Faithful and True." Christ did not have to add to His words the words of the prophets of old: "Thus saith the Lord." He could say: "I say unto you." "Never spake a man like this man." (John 7:46.) "He taught as one having authority and not as the scribes." (Matth. 7:29.) Christ is the Source of all truth. He is the Truth come from heaven above as John informs us in his prologue to his gospel: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,

full of grace and truth." (John 1, 14.) Christ, the Truth, is true God, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, as we confess in the Nicene Creed. This Truth, Christ, was prophesied and preached in the Old Testament. It is the very essence of every true sermon of the New Testament. Paul knew nothing but Christ, and Him crucified. Christ alone can make the majestic claim: "I am the Truth," adding this one to the many majestic "I AMS." No other man has ever dared to make such a claim for himself. Christ did not only come into this world to remove the ignorance in the mind of man, to set a moral example as witness of and martyr of the truth, but to suffer and die for mankind and thereby give to sinridden humanity the only way to the Father, the only truth about God, themselves and their salvation. The Word of truth is nothing but a testimony of Him, who is the Truth. Christ says to His enemies, the Jews: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life and they are they which testify of me." (John 5:39.) If we continue in Christ's Word, then we shall know the Truth. Christ reveals Himself as the only true, real God and Savior. "He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent him." (John 5:23.) Luther says: "Outside of Christ there is nothing but idolatry and nothing but false imagination about God . . . He, who would know God and speculate about Him without peril (for his soul), let him look into the manger, begin at the bottom, first learn to know the son of the Virgin Mary, born at Bethlehem, lying in His mother's lap . . . or hanging on the cross, then he will learn who God is." Not by climbing the ladder of human reason with its vivid imagination and building castles in the air, nor the ladder of good works, will man come to God, but through Christ alone. That is the only truth. No man cometh to the Father but by Him, the Truth. (John 14:6.) Without Christ we come to the devil, the father of lies. Every other way leads astray. There are but two ways, two terminals, one to the Father through Christ, the other without Christ to the devil. The apostle Paul, who certainly had an opportunity to compare the seeming truths of Pharisaism and Greek wisdom with the gospel of truth, writes to the Ephesians (4:21): "The truth is in Jesus." John Arndt, whose book on True Christianity has been an inspiration to thousands of Chris-

tians despite its shortcomings, expresses it thus: "Without the Truth nothing is known. Therefore, look unto Me, the Truth in which you ought to believe. I am the infallible Truth . . . The royal way to immortal life is through My merit, the truth itself is My Word . . . If ye continue in this way, the truth will carry you on to eternal life."

Positively, Christ's kingdom is called a kingdom of grace and truth. Negatively, Christ says: "My kingdom is not of this world." With these words Christ wants to say that it does not have its origin in this world, is not earthbound, is not visible, but a spiritual kingdom in which He rules in the hearts of His believers in a spiritual body, a Church Militant here on earth. The kingdoms of this world are earthbound, the rulers are mortal. With all the treasures of this world they can not prolong their lives, and their nations perish and give way to others. Christ's kingdom is eternal, not earthbound, but including all things in heaven and on earth. Earthly kings are dependent on subjects, and without subjects they are without a throne or without a land, something like John Lackland, or in exile as so many of the past and present rulers. They may still retain the title, but they lack the might. Jesus as King is in a class all by Himself. He is king independent of His subjects. His earthly subjects have not given Him His power, but His Father in heaven. Pilate was correct in assuming that Jesus was no earthly king, but he was wrong in concluding that Jesus was no king at all because He had no visible kingdom. Pilate can rest assured that Christ's kingdom will be no threat to the Roman Empire. The greatest enemies of that empire lay within, in the corruption and vice of high and low. Rome gave to the world civil law, but declined and fell because of its lawlessness. Christ gave to the world the Gospel, that is His royal proclamation, and he who has and believes this Gospel has eternal life. The cross of Christ towers o'er the wrecks of time.

That Christ's kingdom is not of this world can be seen from the fact that it does not interfere with earthly kingdoms. It neither undermines nor overthrows any worldly kingdom or government. It is not revolutionary. Jesus had previously said: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." (Matth. 22:21.) Paul, the

servant of Christ, admonishes the Christians living in Rome under bloody Nero: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." (Rom, 13:1.) The Christians are not of this world, just as Christ's kingdom is not of this world, but they are in this world; they must not needs go out of this world, they obey their government in all things not forbidden by the Word of God, and they will rather suffer than revolt, if they can not obey their government. The kingdom of Christ is no mere abstraction, it is also in this world, but not of this world, does not have its origin in it.

If Christ's kingdom were of this world, His subjects would fight for Him. They would draw their swords and would not permit Him to be delivered into the hands of His enemies. Christ here indirectly asks Pilate: Have you seen or heard anything of an army or bodyguard which I have gathered or which is around Me to defend Me? Did you not say that My nation and the high priests have delivered Me unto you? Here I stand alone, I am your captive, given into your hands. The mighty Caesars had their powerful legions, their Praetorian bodyguards, Pilate had his own bodyguard, but not Jesus. He stands there all alone. Peter wanted to serve as a bodyguard. He drew his sword, but Jesus commands him to put it back into the sheath again. To this day Christ will have no earthly army or bodyguard, no crusaders or Swiss bodyguard, no Knights Templar or Salvation Army. Paul stood alone, Luther stood alone, the Protestants in Speyer stood alone. Christ's kingdom is not to be defended with earthly weapons, but with the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, alone. This Word of God is sharper than any two-edged sword, it penetrates the heart. The Gospel alone has the power to change a man's heart, not force or human persuasion, not the Law.

Jesus is born into this world as a King. He is King not only according to His divine nature. He assumes kingship at His incarnation. According to His human nature He is a lineal descendant of David. Christ came from heaven, was pre-existent. Christ does not merely have royal blood in His veins as other kings have. He can trace His ancestry back to heaven, to God Himself. God in the heavens is His Father. (Luke 3.)

Christ's kingdom is built and maintained by the Word and

the Sacraments alone, not by the sword, as we have already seen, but also not by the oratory of the preacher or the beautiful liturgy, vested choirs or organ recitals and concerts, not by societies and suppers as so many seem to think and would have us believe. It does not consist in eating or drinking. There is nothing external about it. It is no outward polity, nothing external. Many are of the opinion that such externals are the real means of grace, of increasing the congregation and building the church. One may build congregations for a time in such a way, but never the kingdom of Christ. Earthly kingdoms also use external means to increase their kingdom, not so Christ. The Word alone must do it and the Word alone can do it, for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth. Loehe, who founded Neuendettelsau, and who sent many a Lutheran missionary to our shores from Germany in the early days of our Lutheran Church, has very aptly put it this way: "The kingdoms of this world are built by force and the blood of many. Christ's kingdom is built by the blood of One and through the means of grace."

The Church of Christ is built and maintained by the Word and the Sacraments alone. This Word has as its sum and substance Christ, His Person and His Work. The Church of Christ is built on the one foundation, Christ: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (I Cor. 3:11.)

The Church's One Foundation
 Is Jesus Christ, Her Lord;
 She is His new creation
 By water and the Word.
 From heav'n He came and sought her
 To be His holy bride;
 With His own blood He bought her,
 And for her life He died.

The Church of Christ is built on the confession of Christ, the Son of the living God (Math. 16:18): "Unto this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Faith in Christ is created and maintained through the Word and the Sacraments. Thus alone is the Church of Christ ruled and built.

Christ is the only Head of this His church. The very same Father, who gave to the Son all power in heaven and on earth, also made Christ the Head of the church. God “hath put all *things* under his (Christ’s) feet, and gave him to be the head over all *things* to the church, which is his body (Ephes. 1:22–23). The church has no visible head, is not built on human persons as rocks as the Church of Rome claims. No one is to rule within the visible churches here on earth. Matth. 23:8: “But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, *even* Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no *man* your father upon the earth (as do the Romans with their “Holy Father” in the Vatican): for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters (this includes all Protestant church dignitaries, high and low, who want to lord it over others): for one is your Master, which is Christ.”

The church has no visible head, neither the Pope in Rome nor the Protestant consistories, neither the archbishops nor the presidents with their boards of directors or trustees, neither the bishops, nor the visitors. In the church there is but one office, the office of the keys entrusted to all Christians alike. They, who administer this office within the church, are servants of Christ and the Christians, by whom they are called. They are not to rule and lord it over others as is so often the case within visible churches to the great havoc of the church, but are to be servants of Christ and the church, not masters. The church is not built and maintained by the church politics of those who want to rule as visible heads over their respective churches, but by the preaching of the gospel alone. “Mass conversions” may be achieved and congregations may grow rapidly for a time through outward means and shrewd church political maneuvers, but the kingdom of Christ is not built thereby. The kingdom of Christ is built and maintained by the Word and the Sacraments alone. Let us ever bear this in mind in our church work and our missionary endeavors!

The church is not maintained either by papal decrees or bulls or by the laying down of the law to the rank and file of the church and the adoption of many legalistic rules and regulations. This kills real spiritual life and only hinders the real progress of the church.

The church is also not maintained by, and strengthened in the eyes of, those in authority, and elevated in the favor of the people who on one day can shout their Hosannas and on the next day their Crucify Him. The church is not maintained by favorable and shrewdly devised concordats or by the dexterous establishment of formal programs and the passing of grandiloquent resolutions, but by the Gospel of Christ Jesus alone, of which we should not be ashamed in any situation. The safety of a church does not depend on human manipulations, its existence is not maintained through outward means. If the church remains true to Christ, its only Head, and is being built by the Word and the Sacraments alone, not relying on any other support, then it need not fear for its maintenance, for Christ, the Head and only Ruler and Master of the church, has given it the assurance: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "If God be for us, who can be against us? He, that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? . . . Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? In all these things we are more than conquerors through him, that loved us." (Rom. 8:32f.) Let us, therefore, cling to Christ as the only real Head and Ruler of the church, His invisible kingdom, and let us all help build and maintain His church by the Word and the Sacraments alone. If we build on Christ, the only foundation, we shall build upon it gold, silver and precious stones; if not, it will be wood, hay and stubbles. Every man's and every visible church's works will be made manifest in that great day of judgment (I Cor. 3:12f). What shall be our verdict rendered by Christ Himself?

Since Christ's kingdom is not of this world, it does not only survive and thrive in a democracy or any similar form of government as many seem to think. Christ rules in the hearts of His believers, whether they belong to a democratic form of government or a monarchy, a republican or a totalitarian or dictatorial form of government. Christ has His subjects under all possible forms of government. Christ does not interfere with the earthly forms of government, nor does He prescribe any as do so many of His would-be disciples in our days, the advocates of a social gospel.

The kingdom of Christ is and remains a spiritual one, an

article of faith, an offense to natural man. One can write eulogies about Christ and Christianity and extol Him as the greatest personality mankind has ever produced, one can write inscriptions as Pilate did about Christ's kingship, but only the believer recognizes His Kingship. With Pilate many may say: “Behold, the man,” but only believers will pray with the malefactor, “Remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom.” Christ's kingdom is a spiritual one either to be accepted or rejected. It suffers no indifference or neutrality. It will either be the only truth or a stumbling block and offense to the self-righteous, foolishness to the wise of this world. In reality there are only two kingdoms, the kingdom of the truth and the kingdom of falsehood, which lies under the rule of the father of lies. The one great struggle at the bottom of all the earthly struggles lying on the surface and going on till the end of days is the struggle between Christ and Satan for the souls of men. Satan feels secure in his rule over the unbelievers. They are his willing followers. He is ever anew trying to break into the ranks of Christ's faithful followers and to tear souls away from their Savior. Through the means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments, souls are continually being freed from the bondage of Satan. Everything else in this world is of secondary importance, be it ever so important in the eyes of the world. The average worldly mind clings to the ephemeral happenings of his day and considers them decisive. It reveals a limited horizon. We might call it a frog's perspective, which only sees things in its own pond. The Christian views everything in the light of the Word of God, of eternity, and thus obtains through Christ's majestic claim, “My kingdom is not of this world,” the true perspective and world view. He is no longer a truthseeker, but has the Truth in Christ. What a comfort for us Christians to have such a sure foundation, to have the truth in Christ and to have Christ ruling in our hearts and governing our lives as the Truth!

We have seen that Christ's kingdom is a kingdom of grace and truth, that it is different from all the kingdoms of this world, that it is built not by earthly means, but by the means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments. Wherever the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Crucified and Risen Lord of all, is preached, there Christ exercises His kingdom of grace. This kingdom will terminate

at the end of the world and find its consummation in the kingdom of glory. Till judgment day Christ will protect His kingdom through His almighty power. Even the very gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

After having examined at first Christ's own interpretation of His kingdom of grace, as a kingdom of truth and not being of this world, in the words spoken before Pilate, let us also look at other passages which in like manner bring out the true nature and purpose of Christ's kingdom, and clarify and complete the picture for us.

By metonymy the church on earth has been called and is called the kingdom of grace. It is a metonymy in which we name the cause (grace) to indicate the effect (the church). Much of our information regarding the kingdom of grace we obtain from passages speaking of the Church. Strictly, the church is the object of Christ's rule.

Christ's kingdom is a spiritual one. This is not only borne out by Christ's words before Pilate, but by many other related passages. Rom. 14:7 we read: "The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" (nothing tangible or visible). He who has this righteousness of Christ and is at peace with God enjoys the kingdom and is a subject of the kingdom of Christ. In I Cor. 4:20 we find: "The kingdom of God is not in word but in power." It does not consist in mere words, lip service, but in the power of the Holy Spirit operating through the Word.

Christ very clearly points out the spiritual nature of His kingdom in Luke 17:20f., when the Pharisees demand of Him to tell them when His kingdom would come and He answers, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say Lo here! or, Lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you," literally in your midst, not in the hearts of the Pharisees, even though Christ also wanted to win them and rule in their hearts. Luther in his sermon against the "Heavenly Prophets" explains this passage: "The kingdom of God does not consist in external things, localities, persons, words, but . . . is within you. Whence it does not follow that Christ is nowhere, but that He is everywhere and fills all things." In another sermon (St. L. XI, 1928) Luther says: "The kingdom of God,

by which He rules over all believers and as a faithful king shields, rebukes, rewards, leads them . . . is not worldly or temporal, but spiritual, is not eating and drinking or any external thing, but righteousness, satisfaction and consolation of the human heart and conscience. . . . It destroys the kingdom of sin and is really nothing but a cancellation and forgiveness of sin. God rules in the heart by bringing peace, quiet, comfort through His word, just as sin produces the opposite, namely, disturbance, anxiety and trouble. Herein God gives evidence of His glory and grace in this life, in that He takes away and forgives the sin of men: That is the kingdom of grace." Thus we see that the kingdom of Christ is nothing else but His rule in the hearts of the Christians through the forgiveness of sins and finds its consummation in the kingdom of glory. This kingdom is a spiritual one, giving spiritual gifts.

This kingdom also is invisible. Christ says, "It is not of this world." Faith and the working of the Spirit can not be seen. The kingdom is within us, in our hearts, consisting in the rule of Christ in our heart, not visible here or there. The Pope, the Antichrist, teaches the very opposite. He makes the church a visible organization, an outward polity. Cardinal Bellarmin claimed, "The Church is as visible as the Republic of Venice and the Kingdom of Gaul." Both have become rather invisible at present. The cardinal must be wrong. Neo-Lutherans of our days contaminate the doctrine of the church by saying the church has an invisible and a visible side. They claim that the Word and the Sacraments make the church visible. They wrongly consider the notes or signs of the church as belonging to the essence of the church. The church is created and lives through the means of grace, but they are not the church itself or a part of it, just as little as air and food are a part of man, although man can not live without them.

The words of Christ are so clear that one should think that misinterpretations would be impossible, but the devil, the father of lies, has seen to it that Christ's words have been grossly misunderstood and misinterpreted. We shall not be able to discuss all possible misinterpretations within the scope of this essay. We shall limit ourselves to two of them. In the one case church and state are intermingled, in the other case it is the false hope and

idea that visible kingdom of Christ can and will be erected here on earth. Satan not only tries to destroy Christ's kingdom and rule in the hearts of His subjects, but he also deftly mixes truth and falsehood so as to deceive the believers and cause havoc within Christendom. Discerning the fundamental importance of Christ's claim he seeks to change these words around so as to mean, "My Kingdom is of this world," just as he changed God's Word for Adam and Eve and brought about their fall. He performed his masterpiece of deception in the Church of Rome in this respect and all of the Protestant copies are but exhibitions of dilettantism compared with this one. The original fraud is revealed in Rome, the others are mere copies of the same deception and misinterpretation of Christ's words.

The Church of Rome, pretending to be the only correct interpreter of Christ's words, simply turns Jesus' words around and makes Him a liar as though Christ had said, "My church is of this world." Satan did that too. The Pope teaches that the Church and Kingdom of Christ are as visible as the republic of Venice and the Kingdom of Gaul, that the Pope is the Vicegerent of Christ here on earth and that the state is the maid (ancilla) of the church, that the Pope has two swords in his hand, the temporal and the spiritual one, that he is the absolute ruler over church and state. Emperors had to submit to his authority, were excommunicated if they disobeyed.

His own troubled conscience and the terrible perversion of Christ's words and claims in the Papacy brought Luther ever deeper into the study of Scriptures, and there he found the truth and again brought it to light. It is Luther who taught anew what Christ had so clearly stated, the separation of church and state. It was Luther who pointed to Scripture with its teaching that Christ's kingdom is a spiritual one, that the church in this world is not to rule over the state, and also not the state over the church, but that the two are divinely ordained, each having distinct functions and fields of duty. The church is to use only the sword of the Spirit as its weapon, the state the iron sword. The state is to protect the life and the bodies of the citizens and preserve law and order, the church is to preach the Gospel and provide for the soul. The church lies within the state, but is to be governed by the Word of God, the state according to reason; the Christians are to obey

the state in all things not forbidden by the Word of God. Church and state both are responsible to God, whether they know it and accept it or not. Ignorance of the law excuses no one also in this respect. Both are ordained by God, are God's representatives here on earth, and both receive their authority from God. The church receives its authority from Christ. To Me is given all power, Christ says, and then He commands, Go ye and preach the Gospel . . . teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you. That the worldly governments receive their power from God is brought out by the conversation between Christ and Pilate. Pilate says to Christ (John 19): "Speakest thou not unto me, knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee and have power to release thee?" To which assumption Christ replied: "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above." In the last analysis governments do not obtain their authority by a social contract as Rousseau believed or directly by the vote of the people, but from God in the heavens. In Romans 13 Paul tells us that there is no power but of God.

Even though both domains are separated from one another, this does not mean that they must oppose one another. On the contrary, they are to serve one another. Christians are not to leave the world as the Pope teaches in order to live a higher Christian life, but are to live in the world and to obey their government, pay taxes, serve in war and peace. They are citizens of two worlds. The Christians are to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. The state is to serve the church by preserving law and order, securing peace and justice for all alike, safeguarding the freedom of religious worship and not to interfere in purely religious matters, should treat all religious denominations that do not strive to overthrow the government alike. The state is to have no favorites as is so very often the case with Rome, where governments vie with one another to win its favor or at least not to offend the worldly ruler in the Vatican. The Pope by accepting worldly ambassadors clearly reveals that his kingdom is of this world, the kingdom of the Antichrist in league with Satan, the greatest adversary of Christ.

Church and state are to serve one another but not to compel one another to services not lying within their jurisdiction. The

church is not to call upon the state as a mere executioner of its will as Rome did in the Inquisition, as did Zwingli and Calvin, the state is not to tell the church what to preach, *e. g.* civic righteousness. Civic righteousness lies within the scope of the state and not of the church. The state is to uphold civic righteousness by means of its executive and legal authority, the church is to preach the Gospel, justification and sanctification, but not to condescend to the preaching of civic righteousness. That would be an intermingling of the two functions and contrary to God's Word. Individual Christians may and should strive for the furtherance of civic righteousness in their communities, but the duty of the church lies on a different plane. The church's sole function is to preach the Gospel for the salvation of man. Civic righteousness is the domain of the state and not of the church. Romans 13 we read: "For rulers are not a terror to good works but to evil. For he (the ruler) is the minister of God to thee for good . . . But if thou do that which is evil be afraid, for he (not the church, but the ruler) beareth the sword not in vain, for he (not the church, but the ruler) is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." That the maintenance of morality, civic righteousness, is the duty of the state and not of the church is also clearly expressed in The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Art IV (Triglotta page 127) Par. 22: "Now we think concerning the *righteousness of reason* thus, namely, that God requires it and that because of God's commandment, the honorable works which the Decalogue commands must necessarily be performed according to the passage Gal. 3:24: 'The Law was our schoolmaster,' likewise Tim. 1:9: 'The Law is made for the ungodly.' For God wishes those who are carnal to be *restrained by civil discipline and to maintain this He has given laws, letters, doctrine, magistrates, penalties. And this righteousness of reason by its own strength can to a certain extent work*, although it is often overcome by natural weakness and by the devil impelling it to manifest crimes. Now, although we cheerfully assign this *righteousness of reason* the praises that are due it (for this corrupt nature has no greater good, and Aristotle says aright: 'Neither the evening star nor the morning star is more beautiful than righteousness, and God also honors it with bodily rewards'), yet it ought not be praised with reproach to

to Christ.” When is civic righteousness praised with reproach to Christ? Whenever any spiritual value is attached to it. The church has to deal with spiritual values and things. Hence it is not the duty of the church to preach and maintain civic righteousness but the duty of the state. If the church does it, the false impression is created as though this righteousness alone, or also, could bring salvation. It, however, only brings bodily rewards, material blessings. Hence the state should not ask the church to preach it. The church is to preach the Gospel and to cultivate among its members a life of sanctification as a fruit of the Spirit. It is, therefore, an intermingling of the functions of state and church if the state asks the church or individual preachers to preach civic righteousness. If ministers of the church perform such functions as are the clear duty of the state, they lower themselves to the same level with those who preach a social gospel, who also try to make this world a better place to live in. This again is the duty of the state, pure and simple, and not of the church. The church also preaches the Law, but in a spiritual sense and way so as to bring about a knowledge of sin and to serve as a curb for the Old Adam and as a rule for the Christian. As a result civic righteousness is fostered, since Christians are in this world.

We should also like to add another classic passage found in the Augsburg Confession Art. 28: “The power of the keys or the power of the bishops, according to the Gospel, is a power or commandment of God to preach the Gospel, to remit and retain sins and to administer Sacraments. For with this commandment Christ sends forth His Apostles, John 20, 21sq. . . . This power is exercised only by teaching or preaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments, according to their calling, either to many or to individuals. For thereby are granted, not bodily, but eternal things, as *eternal righteousness,** the Holy Ghost, eternal life . . . These things can not come but by the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments, as Paul says in Rom. 1:16 . . . Therefore, since *the power of the Church grants eternal things, and is exercised only by the ministry of the World,** it does not interfere with civil government . . . For civil government deals with other things than does the Gospel . . . *The civil rulers defend not minds, but bodies and bodily things* against manifest injuries, and *restrain*

* Italics ours.

*men with the sword and bodily punishments in order to preserve civil justice and peace. Therefore, the power of the Church and the civil power must not be confounded.** The power of the church has its own commission, to teach the Gospel and to administer the Sacraments. Let it not break into the office of another; let it not transfer the kingdoms of this world; let it not abrogate the laws of civil rulers; . . . let it not prescribe to civil rulers concerning the form of the Commonwealth. As Christ says: 'My kingdom is not of this world,' also Luke 12:14: 'Who made me a judge or divider over you?' Paul also says in Phil. 3:20: 'Our citizenship is in heaven.' . . . After this manner our teachers discriminate between the duties of both these powers and command that both be honored and acknowledged as gifts and blessings of God. If bishops have any power of the sword, that power they have not as bishops, but by human law, having received it of kings and emperors for the civil administration of what is theirs. This, however, is another office than the ministry of the Gospel."

It has been claimed that we here have a case of a bishop serving in a double capacity as bishop and as a servant of the state. To understand the words of the Confession it must be remembered that in Luther's days some bishops also ruled over lands, not only over their diocese. Such bishops are meant here. The Confession implies that a Christian living under such a bishop would have to obey him, but only as a citizen and only in civil matters. It must, furthermore, be borne in mind that in the Augsburg Confession the Lutherans were to bring a confession in which they would show in how far they could give in to the Roman Church with a clear conscience so as to bring about a reunion. Furthermore, the bishops mentioned here are Roman bishops, for a little later we read that these bishops demand celibacy. Hence they must be Roman and not Lutheran bishops, who would not have demanded celibacy after Luther had already married in 1525. This passage can, therefore, not be adduced as a proof for the privilege of a pastor as being able to serve in a civic function at the same time.

It has also been claimed that Luther himself confused church

* Italics ours.

and state by asking princes to provide for the church. Did he not ask the Elector of Saxony to conduct a visitation? Yes, he did, but he expressly added that he asked this of the elector as a duty of love, which is the common duty of all Christians and is demanded of them, which he did not owe in accordance with the rights and duties of civil government.

It has, furthermore, been claimed that in the Old Testament church and state were united. However, we are no longer living in the Old, but in the New Testament. With Christ the two are separated. Even in the Old Testament we find the duties of priest and king mostly separated. Was not Saul reprimanded by Samuel for bringing a sacrifice which it was not his duty to perform? See II Chron. 26:9ff: When Uzziah had fortified the city of Jerusalem against the enemy, he went into the temple to bring a burnt offering, and Azariah went into the temple and said to the king: "It *appertaineth* not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests the sons of Aaron . . . Go out of the sanctuary; for thou hast trespassed." Then Uzziah became angry. While he had the censer in his hand, leprosy rose up in his forehead and Uzziah was a leper to the day of his death.

Moses did not serve as high priest, but his brother Aaron. In Christ alone all three offices are united. It is a sacrilege of the Church of Rome to assume that this three-fold office also belongs to the Pope, who pretends to be the Vicegerent of Christ. At his coronation the Pope receives a three-fold crown placed upon his head with the words: "Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns and know that thou art Father of Princes and Kings, Ruler of the World, and Vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ." This tiara is not worn upon purely spiritual occasions; the Pope then wears the mitre of a bishop. It is worn at secular functions. This is a clear proof that the Papacy is a worldly kingdom. There is no justification whatever for the Pope to wear the tiara. According to Scriptures church and state have entirely different functions and must not be confused.

That the Church of Rome annuls the clear words of Christ we have already seen. This is a plain intermingling of church and state. It is also an intermingling of the two domains, where state churches are upheld as is the case in most of the European countries. Churches need not be surprised then if the state selects

the teachers of the future ministers, prescribes the exact curriculum of theology and what the pastors are to preach and which subjects they are not to preach about. If the state pays the salaries, it has a right to make certain demands, and it is only too natural then to infringe on the rights and duties of the church and to overstep its own boundaries and authority. Therefore, such acceptance of salaries from the state brings with it implications and is clearly an intermingling of church and state.* Neither the Church of Rome, that wants to rule the state, nor the State Church, in which the state dictates to the church, are biblical. Both are in direct contrast and opposition to Christ's clear words, "My kingdom is not of this world."

Luther strove to bring about a real separation of church and state. Conditions, however, prevailed at his time which he could not brush aside at once, but he always strove toward the realization of that goal. In his writings he always expresses the principle of strict separation of church and state as a biblical and the only justifiable one, that must be the duty of both the church and the state to work for and bring about its realization. Luther based his claim on Christ's clear words, "My kingdom is not of this world." In our country we still have the rare privilege of having the separation of church and state guaranteed in the Bill of Rights affixed to our Constitution. We Lutherans ought to cherish this priceless treasure and fervently pray that it be not taken away from us because of our contempt of the Word of God or ingratitude. Here in our United States the Lutheran Church had and has till now the unique opportunity of developing freely, unhampered by government restrictions. This is a special gift of God to our Lutheran Church. We are in grave danger of losing this priceless treasure. Already the signs are increasing of an intermingling of these two domains, of the state asking certain duties and functions of the church and its pastors, of the church in wanting to take over certain duties and functions which are clearly within the jurisdiction of the state. Will we Lutherans prove worthy of our Lutheran heritage and cling to Scriptures as did Luther with his, "Thus saith the Lord?" "Thus it is written."

* This is also maintained and implied by F. Pieper in his Dogmatics (Vol. 3, p. 480 and Note 1520 on same page).

"The Word they still shall let remain." "One little word of Scriptures makes the whole world too narrow for me." Will we retain this precious heritage entrusted to us or will we also lose it by default? It is the characteristic of the Reformed Church to give way to sectarian denominationalism. It is the grave danger of the Lutheran Church to be undermined by liberalism and to suffer final disintegration. Let us be on our guard and not forfeit this treasure of Scriptures and also the right safeguarded by our Constitution for a pottage of lentils consisting of earthly gains and public recognition! Let us neither be guided by expediency nor any other motive, but by the Word of God alone!

In this connection we should like to call attention to a prophetic warning of the great Reformer from a sermon held in 1538 (St. L. VII 1789-91): "Till the end of the world *the two kingdoms** are not to be confused as was done in the days of the Old Testament by the Jewish people, but *should remain separate if we want to retain the true Gospel and the true faith** . . . We are to rule the church with the Word or with the sword of the mouth and the rod of the mouth. On the other hand, the civil government has another sword, a sword for the fist and a wooden rod, wherewith the body is struck . . . The preacher's rod also strikes the consciences . . . They all grab for the sword, the Anabaptists, Muenzer, the Pope and all of the bishops have desired to dominate and to rule, but not within their calling. This is the abominable devil. On the other hand, the civil government, the princes, the kings and the nobles in the provinces, also the judges in the villages want to wield the sword of the mouth and teach the preachers what and how they are to preach and to preside over their churches. But you tell them: You fool . . . mind your calling, do not preach, let your preachers do that . . . This all the devil does and does not rest till he have mixed these two swords thoroughly. This is nothing new that the devil brews everything together. You, however, know that the emperor or civil government shall carry an iron sword and a wooden rod, but we preachers have the rod and the sword of the mouth . . . I admonish you who are one day to become the teachers of consciences and the Christian Churches that you adhere to this difference. For if it is mingled nothing comes of it. For as soon as the prince says: Hear, you preacher, you are to teach for me in such and such a

* Italics ours.

way, do not scold and punish in such a manner, it has then been confused. On the other hand, if a preacher declares: Hear, you government or judge, you are to pronounce judgment as I want it, this is also wrong. You will see that the devil will again mix . . . But the bishops now want to have both swords in their fists and rule over kings and princes and confuse, which is altogether wrong and unjust. Therefore, since the Pope will not harm us and will hardly take the Gospel away from us, for he is too severely beaten, but our junkers, those of the nobility and the princes, also the evil judges, they will do it, who now strut about with power, want to force the people because of the Sacrament to do as they desire . . . For you must obey the government, therefore, you must do as we wish you to do. Then the worldly and spiritual kingdom is "ein Kuchen," that is, one cake. This the Pope has also done; he has carried the sword of the mouth into the civil government; thereby the Word of God has been extinguished. Now the leaf is being turned. Now they make out of the office of the fist a spiritual office, and the civil rulers want to exercise the spiritual government and rule the pulpit and the church that I should preach what the prince likes to hear. *Then let the devil step into my place and preach,** for they take the sword of the spirit and the mouth and make scourges and whips out of them and *drive out of the church not the buyers and sellers, but the conscientious teachers and preachers.***

Brethren, let us be honest. Is that not the exact danger confronting the true Lutheran Church in our days? With but very few changes we could apply these prophetic words of Luther to our present day conditions. Have we not experienced within the church the bitter truth of Luther's prophetic words regarding the Gospel as a passing shower, which does not return to the place where it has been? Is not this also a prophetic warning to us of the true Lutheran Church to be on our guard lest this priceless treasure of strict separation of church and state, which has always been a jewel in the crown of the true Lutheran Church, be taken from us too? Let us all, preachers, teachers, and laity alike see to it that the clear words of Christ and the Scriptural teaching of our Lutheran Church suffer no harm also in this respect. In our days, the doctrine of the separation of church and state is again in the crucible. Let us retain the pure gold of Christ's words and

* Italics ours.

Luther's doctrine! Let us not cast it out as dross, let us not mix it with the baser metals of expediency in critical times!

That the Church of Rome does not believe in separation of church and state is known to all of us. Zwingli and Calvin, the leaders of the Reformed Church, too, intermingled and confused the two powers. Like Savonarola, Zwingli wanted the state to govern the church. It was Zwingli who inaugurated the state church. Calvin on the other hand wanted the church to govern the state. He wanted to revive the Old Testament theocracy and wanted to use the Bible as a code of laws. Calvin became the absolute dictator in the city of Geneva in Switzerland. He was responsible for the imprisonment and execution of Servetus, who denied the Trinity, and thus sullied the shield of the Reformed Church and, for that, of the whole Christian Church. Neither the Church of Rome nor the Reformed Churches believe in strict separation of church and state. The Reformed Church has claimed that it brought about the separation of church and state through the creation of free churches. Through the free church, however, it sought to gain control over the state by legislation, by molding public life and opinion, and solving social problems. The reformed denominations have always sought to dominate public life and opinion within the state and have the state enact laws inspired and desired by the church. The true Lutheran Church alone has fought for and upheld this clear teaching of Holy Writ. If we continue in Christ's words and teaching also with regard to the separation of church and state, then we shall be His disciples indeed and shall know the truth and the truth shall make us free. Let us contend for and uphold this freedom which is ours through the King of Truth! It is our Magna Charta of true Christian liberty. May the words of Christ: "My kingdom is not of this world," ever ring in our ears, rule our hearts, govern our consciences, and dictate our actions! Then all will be well. Otherwise we shall be weighed and found wanting and the pure Gospel will be taken away from us.

Within the liberal Protestant denominations another attempt has been made and is still being made to change Christ's word: "My kingdom is not of this world." They too, with Rome, would like to have Christ say: "My Kingdom is and will be of this world." They are dissatisfied with the old Gospel. It seems

to speak only of heaven and the life beyond. They, however, would like to establish Christ's Kingdom here on earth. Since the old Gospel is sorely outmoded in their opinion, they have invented a new Gospel, the so-called social Gospel. They are primarily interested in making this world a better place to live in. They think that it is the most important duty of the church to improve the social and economic and if possible also the political conditions in this world. They maintain that they have abolished slavery, they want to blot out poverty, unemployment, wars, in short bring about a paradise here on earth. To achieve this they want to use Christ's moral teachings, especially those in the Sermon on the Mount, as a moral code for human society. They are convinced that the leaven of their social Gospel will finally leaven the whole lump of human society and then the Christians will no longer be looked upon as evildoers, as such as are responsible for all of the evils of our times, but will be hailed as the benefactors, the philanthropists of mankind. Finally all mankind will accept Christ's moral teachings and the better world will be established. Paradise here on earth will be regained.

One is at a loss at times just where to place these social gospelites, if we may be privileged to coin such a word. Are they mere liberals who no longer believe in the deity of Christ and, therefore, are no longer interested in the old Gospel with its spiritual message and merely accept the moral teachings of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount as did Tolstoi, or are they to be viewed as chiliasts, and is their improved world merely to be an antechamber for the so-called millennium, in which Christ will come to reign with His faithful followers? We are inclined to view most of them as ultra-liberals who have discarded Christ as Son of God and Savior and merely see in Him a new teacher of morals, a founder of a new man-made religion. The social gospelites do not expect Christ to return as do the millennialists, for He is to most of them not the Son of God, but a mere man as dead as Mohammed, Buddha, or Confucius. They are convinced that it is their duty to perform the task which Christ could not and did not complete because of adverse conditions in His days. They want to be the social reformers of our days, want to prove that Christianity is not a failure. They hope to create a new world order by establishing a visible kingdom of Christ here on earth

with Christ's Golden Rule and His moral teachings in the Sermon on the Mount. The Social Gospel is their creed. The old Gospel is sorely outmoded in their opinion and does not solve the social problems of this world. "Let us make this world a better place to live in," is their slogan.

The social gospelites have set out to remedy all kind of social evils of our times. They would like to solve the social and economic problems of mankind. Since they claim to do this as representatives of the Christian Church and describe the new world order of freedom and equality for all as their program which is to be carried out, they are also mingling the duties of the church with those of the state, are trying to establish a visible kingdom of Christ here on earth. But the church is to preach the Gospel, justification and sanctification, the state is to provide for the social and economic well-being of all citizens, to establish and maintain law and order. Christ did not come into this world to establish a visible kingdom, to solve the political, social and economic problems of this world. He is no political and social reformer, He came to save sinners. Where sinners believed in Him He helped and healed them. He refused to be made a bread king. His prime purpose of coming to this earth was to save sinners and establish His Kingdom in the hearts of His believers. The miracles were merely performed to call the attention of the people to His message, His person and His work, the salvation of mankind.

The social gospelites endeavor to solve the social and economic problems without removing the cause. The cause of all ills and social evils and problems lies in the original sin of man. Because of the sin of man the soil is cursed, pains, temporal and eternal death are his fate. Quack doctors try to remove the effects with a little salve or medicine, but fail to go to the root of the evil. They and their patients are primarily interested in immediate results. A good physician goes to the root of the evil, even resorts to operations to remove the cause. Man can not solve the social problems, because he can not remove sin. With all the salves and medicines he would apply he can not really heal, for he can not eradicate sin. This Christ, the great Physician, alone can do and did do it by His own sacrificial death on the cross. This world can never be changed into a paradise again. It will remain to the

end of days a vale of tears because of the sin of man. It is a vain endeavor to remove effects without removing the cause. The advocates of the social gospel fail to recognize the cause in the sin of man and their absolute inability to change matters. They have dethroned Christ as their King and woefully misunderstand the purpose of His coming into this world.

The Gospel of Christ does not deal with conditions here on earth, but with individuals, and through the individuals it does change conditions in the families and communities. Through the Gospel love is kindled toward all men. The Gospel changes the man who accepts it, and he becomes a salt of the earth and a light of the world. Not the church, but the individual members are to try to remedy the ills in this world as best they can, well knowing that a full cure can not be effected because of the original depravity of man. Like good gardeners, they will keep on removing the weeds fully aware that new weeds will continue to grow. The golden age of mankind here on earth lay in the past. This world will see no other, no visible kingdom of Christ.

It is impossible for us to even mention all the representatives of the new social gospel. Only some of the most characteristic ones we shall refer to briefly. Their line of thought, their goals are almost identical. One of the most outstanding exponents of the social gospel is the missionary to India, Stanley Jones, who in his book, "*Christ's Alternative to Communism*," lets the world choose between the new world order of communism and the visible kingdom of Christ here on earth. He and the others are convinced it can be done and that they have understood Christ's words and purpose correctly. It is a mystery to us how they can ignore and misinterpret Christ's word: "My kingdom is not of this world," so completely. The Archbishop of Canterbury develops similar ideas in his book: "*Christianity and the Social Order*." The Federal Council of Churches is especially concerned about the peace conferences. At the Treaty of Versailles they were not asked to take part. The politicians handled it all alone. Now they want to get in their proposals in time and also see to it that they are not ignored, but carried out. They wish to avoid the criticism that the church has failed to secure a just peace. The Federal Council of Churches has set up six pillars for a lasting and just peace. It is to be expected that these pillars will also

break down under the heavy weight of faulty and false assumptions and expectations.

Since the last World War not only the liberal Protestant world conferences but also the Lutheran World Conventions have been engaging themselves with social problems. Frederick Nolde in his book: "*Christian Action*," has harped the same string and interested himself in the future peace which can not be properly brought about without the aid and co-operation of the churches.

The latest pet child and idea on the plane of the social gospel among the liberal Lutheran church bodies of our country is the slogan: Co-operation in externals. This is a grave danger for our true Lutheran Church. Let us be on our guard lest the evil foe ensnare us here with a new vision of this "harmless" kingdom here on earth, in which we could co-operate with other church bodies for the betterment and improvement of general conditions.

It would seem to us as though Dr. Reu of Wartburg Seminary of the former Iowa Synod had joined the ranks of the social gospelites in his lecture: The Church and the Social Problem, delivered at the meeting of the Lutheran World Convention in Paris in 1935. "The Church must help create a better social order." Agreeing with Althaus in his Ethics Dr. Reu states: "The Church must send out of her midst into the social order people with an awakened conscience . . . She does that *not only* when she fulfills her duty on election day and votes only for those who stand for social justice and the service of the individual to society, *she does it also* when she makes men Christians, who in their positions through word and deed foster social justice." In the last part Dr. Reu has actually stated the duty of the Church. The Church is to send out Christians who are to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. The Church, however, has no duty to send people to the polls and tell them to vote for certain men who stand for certain goals. The Roman Catholic priest and the Reformed sectarian preacher do not hesitate to tell their people for whom to vote. We of the true Lutheran Church know and maintain that the Church is to preach sin and grace and leave it to the individual to decide political matters according to the dictates of his own conscience, which must alone and will then also in most cases be guided by the Word of God. Dr. Reu closes his address with the following words: "In the measure that the

church ceases to strive to establish a Godpleasing social order in her own midst, she refuses to do what will help most to solve the social question. She loses the right to *offer her co-operation to the world in the solution of the social question.*" Dr. Reu seems to forget that it is not the duty of the church even to try to solve the social question and co-operate with the state in this respect. That is a personal duty of the individual Christian to be a salt and a light in his community. The Church must cling to its own command and duty to preach sin and grace, law and Gospel for the salvation of sinners and the building of the Kingdom of Christ alone.

It is to be deeply deplored that so many of the churches have not kept and still can not keep their fingers out of purely secular matters and forget their real spiritual duties. Why must it ever and again be necessary for governmental representatives and men of letters to remind the churches of their real duty? If the busybodies among the churches, who have to be dabbling in all affairs, pastors and the laity, would be mindful of their real duty of spreading the Gospel, they would find no time for such ultimately fruitless endeavors, which must finally fail, because they ignore the clear words of Christ, "My kingdom is not of this world."

When one thinks of the would-be leaders of the churches, who like to meddle with political, social and economic affairs one is so vividly reminded of a very appropriate saying of the deceased President Coolidge: "The pastors should preach less socialism and more Gospel, then they would render the best service."

In his book: "*Christianity and the Social Order*," the Archbishop of Canterbury tells of an attempt of the English government, coal mine owners, and miners to settle a strike. No agreement could be reached for a long time. Because of the sad results for the families the bishops of England agreed to intervene in an endeavor to settle the strike. The former Prime Minister Baldwin became enraged at this attempt of the bishops to meddle with the affairs of the government in purely secular matters. He asked the bishops how they would like it and what they would say if he would ask the Iron and Steel Federation to revise the Athanasian Creed. The Prime Minister surely knew more about the separate functions of church and state than did the venerable bishops.

For a time they minded their own business, but now the Archbishop is again on the scene with his new social world order.

It would, furthermore, seem to us that the Unitarian Nathanael Hawthorne had a better insight into human nature and its basic depravity than do most of the social gospelites, who do not reckon with original sin as the basic evil that frustrates all attempts of ever solving the social problem. They also forget that social problems lie within the sphere of the state and not of the church.

Hawthorne in one of his short stories, "Earth's Holocaust,"* tells of an attempt of men to destroy all the objects of luxury and temptation by making a huge pile of them and burning them. As the flames consumed the huge pile the manufacturers and owners of these objects stood around and were saddened to think that now there would be no further market for their products (most likely as dismayed as the silversmiths in Ephesus were at the preaching of Paul, when they thought there would be no further market for their statuettes of Diana). Hawthorne lets the devil tell these downcast men, who see their whole trade and pleasures of life spoiled, "Be not downcast, my dear Sirs, there is one thing these wisecracks have forgotten." "What is that?" they all shouted. Satan replied, "The human heart. Unless they hit upon some method of purifying that foul cavern, the world will be the same as before."

We have examined the words of Christ and other related Bible passages and have learned that Christ's Kingdom, which is not of this world, is a kingdom of grace and truth, a spiritual, not a visible kingdom. We have, furthermore, examined the most flagrant misinterpretations of Christ's words in the fields of the intermingling of church and state and the social gospel. We can but hope and pray that our true Lutheran Church remains firm in its retention of the clear words of Jesus and will ever heed the admonition of the King of truth: "If ye continue in my Word, then ye are my disciples indeed and shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Let us diligently study our Bibles, pastors, teachers, and laity alike, let us courageously defend the truth of the Bible in these trying days of ours, let us rather sacrifice everything than give up the truth. Let us not become

* Taken from: Mosses from an old Manse.

guilty of mixing truth and falsehood. Let us cling to the great truth expressed in Christ's claim before Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world." As Christ prayed for His disciples, let us continue with this prayer: "Sanctify us in Thy Truth, for Thy Word is Truth."

(To be concluded)

Der Antichrist

Das Papsttum, die Erfüllung der Weissagung 2 Thessal. 2, 1–12.

In dem Aufsatz, der diesem vorausgeht, ist gezeigt worden, daß selbst in unserer lutherischen Kirche die Meinungen in bezug auf die Erfüllung jener paulinischen Weissagung 2. Thess. 2, 1–12 im Papsttum geteilt sind, indem z. B. Rohnert, dazu viele Theologen der American Lutheran Church, wohl dem Papsttum Antichristliches nachweisen wollen, aber dennoch glauben, daß jene Weissagung Pauli noch ihrer Erfüllung harre und erst in dem Auftreten einer Einzelperson vor dem Jüngsten Tage ihre Erfüllung finden werde. Dem gegenüber ist gezeigt worden, daß Luther, unsere Bekenntnisschriften, die Dogmatiker des 17. Jahrhunderts, auch spätere Theologen wie Philippi und die Väter unserer Synodalkonferenz in ihren Aussprüchen in bezug auf die Erfüllung jener Weissagungen in ungemein entschiedener und unmißverständlicher Weise wie mit einem Munde sie im Papsttum erblicken und fest glauben, daß sie sich darin nicht irren.

Angeichts dieses Zwiespalts erhebt sich die Frage: **Wer hat recht?** Die Beantwortung dieser Frage soll in dem vorliegenden und den folgenden Aufsätzen gegeben werden und zwar so, daß sie dem Urteil Luthers, unserer Bekenntnisschriften usw. ohne Einschränkung zustimmen.

Es sei, ehe dies weiter ausgeführt wird, noch einmal auf das im vorigen Aufsatz Ausgeführte hingewiesen, daß nämlich die einzige Weise, um zur Erkenntnis der Erfüllung jener Weissagung Pauli in einer bestimmten historischen Erscheinung zu gelangen, die ist, daß man diese Weissagung als Maßstab anlegt. Anders kann niemand zur Gewißheit gelangen. Findet sich dabei, daß eine

gewisse historische Erscheinung sich in jeder Beziehung mit Pauli Weissagung deckt, dann haben wir mit absoluter Gewißheit in jener die Erfüllung dieser vor uns. Indem dieser Prozeß nun Schritt für Schritt, wie Pauli Weissagung sie uns vorlegt, am Papsttum geübt wird, wird offenbar werden, daß jedes Stück dessen, das Paulus in 2 Theß. 2, 1–12 vorausgesagt hat, im Papsttum seine Vollendung gefunden hat und daß darum das Papsttum der von Paulus geweissagte Antichrist ist, kein anderer, erst recht nicht eine Einzelperson vor dem Weltende.

Auf ein weiteres sei noch einmal hingewiesen, was bereits in der Auslegung von 2 Theß. 2, 1–12 besonders stark betont wurde, daß es sich in dieser Weissagung um den „Menschen der Sünde“ handelt. Paulus sagt uns selbst, worauf es ihm dabei ankommt und wie er das will verstanden haben, indem er sagt: „Er widerstrebt allem, setzt sich über alles, das göttlich ist und sitzt im Tempel Gottes als ein Gott.“ Demnach ist der „Mensch der Sünde“ der, in dem dem Wesen der Sünde im Menschen gemäß diese Sünde zu einem einzigartigen, vulkanischen Ausbruch kommt, so daß er mit unerfättlicher Sucht, mit allen ihm zu Gebote stehenden Mitteln die arge Lust seines verderbten Herzens zu befriedigen sucht, mit List und Gewalt dafür kämpft und nicht ruht, bis er alles, selbst Gott, unter sich hat und in der ganzen Welt der eine Herrscher ist, vor dem Himmel und Erde sich beugen müssen. Damit ist der Kern der Weissagung Pauli gegeben. Nur die historische Erscheinung, auf die genau dieser Kern paßt, ist der von Paulus vorausgesagte Antichrist. Und das ist gerade das Hervorstechende im Papsttum. Es wird gezeigt werden, wie das Papsttum, dessen Anfänge in der ersten nachapostolischen Zeit liegen, von da an immer größere Kreise in nie gesättigter Lust auf alle mögliche Weise unter seine Botmäßigkeit zu bringen gesucht hat, zuerst den Presbyter und andere Diener der Kirche, dann ganze Provinzen, dann die ganze Kirche als Bischof von Rom, dann alle Fürsten, Könige und Kaiser, und zuletzt Gott, indem er sich für den Gott auf Erden, der alle Gewalt über Himmel, Hölle und Erde in sich vereine, der allein könne selig machen, der dazu ein anderes Gesetz und ein anderes Evangelium als die von Gott gegebenen erfand und, nicht zu vergessen, dadurch eben der greulichste Seelen- und Gewissenverderber wurde, erklärte. Ja, da haben wir den „Menschen der Sünde“ vor uns. Und wie dieser Kern der Weissagung Pauli im Papsttum in solch kraffen Farben hervorsticht,

so zeigt sich an demselben ohne Ausnahme auch alles andere, das Paulus in seiner Weissagung in Verbindung mit diesem Kern über den „Menschen der Sünde“ uns sagt.

Indem wir nun das eben kurz Vorausgeschickte an Hand von 2 Theff. 2, 1–12 genauer ausführen, fangen wir, Pauli Worten folgend, an

mit dem Abfall der nachapostolischen Kirche, der Apostasia.

Schon während seiner Lebzeiten hatte Paulus da und dort mit Irrlehren, wie in den Gemeinden Korinth und Galatien, kämpfen müssen. Bei seinem Abschied von den Ältesten der Gemeinde zu Ephesus prophezeite er weit schlimmere Zeiten für die Kirche: „Ich weiß, daß nach meinem Abschied greuliche Wölfe kommen, die der Herde nicht schonen, die die Herde an sich locken werden.“ Wir wissen auch aus der Offenbarung Johannis, daß es mit jenen sieben kleinasiatischen Gemeinden nicht mehr so rein stand, wie es mit ihnen hätte stehen sollen. Doch alles dies ist noch nicht der allgemeine, umfassende Abfall, der sich aber bald darauf nach und nach verbreitete. Die apostolische Zeit mit ihrer Hochschätzung des Evangeliums hat nicht lange bestanden.

Dieser Abfall setzte zuerst ein, pröton; nach ihm erst wurde der sich schon zu Pauli Zeiten regende „Mensch der Sünde“ offenbar. Er war von Gott geschickt als Gericht über die abgefallene Kirche.

Vergegenwärtigen wir uns noch einmal kurz das Wesen dieses Abfalls, wie Paulus ihn B. 10 beschreibt. Man hatte die Schriften der Apostel und wachte sorgfältig über dieselben. Man sammelte sie; schon um das Jahr 125 waren die vier Evangelien und die dreizehn Briefe Pauli als Sammlung vorhanden. Aber hierin offenbarte sich der Abfall seinem Wesen nach, daß man nicht mehr die herrliche Wahrheit, das Evangelium, aufnahm zu seiner Rettung. Der eine Zweck des Evangeliums ist die Seligmachung durch den Glauben. Als solches wurde es nicht mehr geschätzt, verehrt und gebraucht. Ja, man verstand das Evangelium in seinem Wesen nicht mehr, wie sich das zeigt in den Schriften der ältesten, nachapostolischen Kirchenlehrer.

Die eine Ursache war die Werkgerechtigkeit. Man begnügte sich dabei nicht mehr mit dem Gesetz Gottes, sondern erjann Menschenwerke, denen man einen besonderen Schein von Heiligkeit anheftete und ihnen einen hohen Grad von Heiligkeit und Verdienstlichkeit

zuschrieb. Die Folge davon mußte die sein, daß man das Evangelium von der Rechtfertigung allein durch den Glauben nicht mehr verstand und auch nicht mehr schätzte, wiewohl man dasselbe in den apostolischen Schriften hatte und bewahrte.

Prof. Koehler in seiner Kirchengeschichte, § 23, b, schildert die innerkirchlichen Zustände der nachapostolischen Zeit so: „Mit all diesem ging Hand in Hand eine **innere Verbildung**. Schon zu Pauli Zeit war unter den Heidenchristen ungeistliche Sattheit eingerissen. . . . Es fing nun das **natürliche gesetzliche Wesen** an, auf zweierlei Weise sich unter den christlichen Formen auszubreiten.

1. Die Amtsformen waren in der vorigen Zeit flüchtig gewesen, d. h. sie entstanden je nach Bedürfnis und man verband damit nur die Idee des Dienstes. Jetzt setzen sie sich fest als ein Recht, und es bildete sich eine **Autoritäts- und Amtslehre**. Um 100 hatte man noch den Presbyterismus, da der Bischof als Primus an der Spitze des Presbyterkollegiums stand. Der Bischof erschien als der feste Punkt, um den die durch den Tod der Apostel führerlos gewordenen Gemeinden sich sammelten. Daraus wurde zuerst in Kleinasien und Syrien, um 160 in Rom, der monarchische Episkopat. 2. Damit stand unmittelbar in Verbindung eine **Werklehre**, die einerseits sich nicht an den natürlichen Werken des Berufs genügen ließ, sondern **Entsagung** (Askeze, Fasten, Enthaltung von Fleisch, Wein und Ehe) forderte und andererseits dieser dann Verdienst beimaß. Die paulinische Auffassung von Gesetz und Evangelium war verloren, man redete vom neuen Gesetz und unterschied zwischen göttlichen Geboten und evangelischen Ratschlägen.“

Angeichts dieses inneren Verfalls in der Kirche verstehen wir auch die Christenverfolgungen, die unter Nero einsetzten, unter Diokletian und Galerius, vom Jahre 303 an, besonders wüteten, bis unter Konstantin dem Großen das Christentum zur Staatsreligion erhoben wurde. Das waren Gottes Gerichte, ob sie doch zur Wahrheit umkehren möchten, ehe das schwerste Gericht, der „Mensch der Sünde“ über sie komme. Petrus: „Es ist Zeit, daß das Gericht anfangen am Hause Gottes.“

Eine Schilderung anderer Art als die aus Prof. Koehlers Kirchengeschichte eben zitierte findet sich im „Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte“ von Dr. Heinr. Schmid, ordentl. Professor der Theologie an der Universität Erlangen, Erlangen 1880. Es sei vorausgeschickt, daß Prof. Schmid die Zustände in den Gemeinden nach-

apostolischer Zeit von einer anderen Seite schildert als Prof. Koehler, von der Seite der Verweltlichung und der inneren Zerspaltung. Beide Schilderungen schließen einander nicht aus. Prof. Koehler hebt die Seite ernstlichen Strebens seitens einer Anzahl in den Gemeinden hervor, nur daß dieses Streben sich in einer ganz dem Evangelium widersprechenden Weise kund tat, nämlich in der Befolgung menschlicher Gebote aus Verdienstlichkeit. Prof. Schmid führt dies allerdings auch an; er hebt aber die Verweltlichung vieler in den Gemeinden besonders hervor und gibt dies als Grund an, weshalb die Ernsten dem um das Jahr 150 eindringenden Montanismus zum großen Teil zusielen. Beide Gegensätze werden immer vortreten sein.

Dr. Schmid sagt: „Der Montanismus fand nicht geringen Anklang; der Grund davon lag in den Zuständen, welche er in der Kirche der Gegenwart vorfand; diese trieben ihn in einen leicht erklärlichen Gegensatz. Wer sich die Stimmungen und Erwartungen der ersten Christen vergegenwärtigte, der konnte sich in diese Zeit schwer finden; denn die frühere Begeisterung hatte vielfach einer befremdlichen Kälte Platz gemacht. Man vermisse den früheren Ernst und die frühere Lebensstrenge, es war viel weltförmiges Wesen eingedrungen, die außerordentlichen Geistesgaben waren verschwunden, die Wiederkunft des Herrn dachte man sich nicht so nahe mehr und die Kirche richtete sich auf eine längere Existenz auf Erden ein. . . . Solche Wahrnehmungen wurden um diese Zeit auch von Lehrern der Kirche gemacht und beklagt.“

In diese Zeit fällt auch die Unterscheidung von Episkopos und Presbyteros, über die im nächsten Abschnitt die Rede sein wird. Ebenso ereigneten sich allerlei Kirchenspaltungen, nicht, wie Dr. Schmid schreibt, auf Grund einer Differenz in der Lehre, sondern in der Kirchenzucht und Kirchenverfassung. Kirchenspaltungen entstanden, wie in Karthago und Rom. Bei der Kirchenzucht handelte es sich besonders um das strenge Verfahren bei der Wiederaufnahme solcher, die in den Verfolgungen Christum verleugnet hatten, der Papst. Aufrichtige Buße genügte nicht; womit doch Christus in bezug auf Petrus zufrieden gewesen war. Eine Anzahl wollte diese Gefallenen überhaupt nicht wieder aufnehmen. Das verursachte Spaltungen, so auch die Steigerung der Episkopalgewalt. Dazu drangen allerlei Irrtümer in die Gemeinden ein: Montanismus, Ebionitismus, Gnostizismus, Manichäismus und Monarchianismus.

Dieses von den Gemeinden der nachapostolischen Zeit gegebene Bild zeigt klar, daß der Abfall eingetreten war. Seine Wurzel hatte alles, das er umfaßte, in dem **einen**, schweren Schritt, daß sie die Liebe der Wahrheit nicht mehr schätzten zu ihrer Seligkeit. Diejem Abfall folgte auf dem Fuße das Offenbarwerden, öffentliche Auftreten des „Menschen der Sünde“, der sich schon zu Pauli Zeiten heimlich geregt hatte.

Im öffentlichen Auftreten des „Menschen der Sünde“ haben wir den sichtbaren Anfang des Papsttums vor uns.

Das öffentliche Auftreten des „Menschen der Sünde“ kam mit der Unterscheidung von Episkopos und Presbyteros, wobei der Episkopos in seiner Bedeutung und Stellung in der Kirche weit über die Kirche und ihre anderen Diener gestellt wurde. Hier zeigt sich der Geist der Autorität und Herrschsucht, der das Wesen des Papsttums ist und dasselbe die Jahrhunderte hindurch, auch heute noch, gekennzeichnet hat. Hier, in der Heraushebung des Episkopos haben wir den Anfang. Die späteren Jahrhunderte zeigen uns, wie das, was hier anfing, wuchs, indem das Papsttum immer weitere Kreise unter seine Botmäßigkeit zu bringen suchte, bis es seine Klimax erreichte in dem Gottseinwollen und an sich alles riß, das Gottes ist. Ja, das ist der „Mensch der Sünde“, der, wie ja offenbar ist, tief und konsequent erschöpfende Ausbruch der Sünde im Menschen. Hier wirkt sie sich aus und erhebt sich zur vollen Höhe der in ihr liegenden greulichen Bosheit.

Episkopos und Presbyteros, diese Bezeichnungen stammen allerdings aus der Apostelzeit. Doch hatten die Apostel bei diesen Benennungen in keiner Weise an ein **Ueber oder Unter gedacht**. Im Gegenteil, diese Benennungen waren ihnen Namen für **eine und dieselbe Person**. Rohnert sagt in seiner Dogmatik: „Daß mit beiden Worten dasselbe Amt bezeichnet wird, also die Presbyter mit den Bischöfen **identisch** sind.“ So werden sie auch Hirten und Lehrer genannt. Diese verschiedenen Bezeichnungen waren weiter nichts als ein Hervorheben verschiedener Seiten des Gemeindedienstes derselben Person.

In der Apostelgeschichte, 20, 17–29, werden die Ältesten von Ephesus, die Paulus nach Miletus kommen ließ, von ihm auch Bischöfe genannt, weil sie auf die Gemeinde, Herde, acht haben sollen. Zugleich sollen sie die Herde weiden und bewachen, also Hirten sein.

Genau dasselbe bezeugt Paulus in seinem Brief an Titus, Kap. 1. Er schreibt V. 5, er habe Titum deshalb in Kreta gelassen, damit er die Gemeinden von Stadt zu Stadt mit Aeltesten besetze, mit solchen, die untadelig, eines Weibes Mann sind, gläubige Kinder haben, nicht berüchtigt, daß sie Schwelger und ungehorsam sind, V. 6. Dann fährt Paulus V. 7 fort: **Denn ein Bischof muß untadelig sein.** Bezeichnend ist auch 1 Tim. 3, 2ff. Hier gibt Paulus dem Timotheus Instruktion, wie beschaffen ein zu berufender Bischof und Diakon sein sollen. Presbyter sind nicht genannt. Warum nicht? Eben darum, weil der Episkopos und Presbyteros dieselbe Person ist.

Hätten die Apostel in irgendeiner Weise in ihren Gemeinden ein Episkopalssystem, wie wir es bei den Römischen und Episkopalen vorfinden, stiften wollen, dann hätten sie schlechterdings wider den Geist und Instruktion Jesu Christi gehandelt. Christi Geist war die Liebe und aus der Liebe das Dienen: „Des Menschen Sohn ist nicht kommen, daß er ihm dienen lasse, sondern daß er diene und gebe sein Leben zu einer Erlösung für viele“; Matth. 20, 28. Seine Instruktion: „Ihr wisset, daß die weltlichen Fürsten herrschen und die Oberherren haben Gewalt. So soll es nicht sein unter euch, sondern so jemand will unter euch gewaltig sein, der sei euer Diener“; Matth. 20, 25, 26.

Die **U**o**s**t**r**e**n**n**u**g des Episkopos vom Presbyteros, die bis dahin in einer Person vereinigt gewesen waren, das **S**o**n**d**e**r**s**t**e**l**e**n und die **E**r**h**e**b**u**n**g des Bischofs über den Presbyter, alle anderen Diener der Kirche und die Kirche selbst kam bald nach der Zeit der Apostel schon gegen Ende des ersten Jahrhunderts. Ueber die Anfänge dieser Scheidung sagt Dr. G. Schmid in seiner Kirchengeschichte folgendes: „Soweit wir die Sache verfolgen können, hat es sich mit der Verbreitung des Episkopats so verhalten. Wir finden ihn in unserem Zeitabschnitt am frühesten in den judenchristlichen Gemeinden und da ist ihm besonders von den Clementinen das Wort geredet. Bei den heidenchristlichen Gemeinden finden wir ihn zuerst zu Anfang des zweiten Jahrhunderts zu Antiochien, Ephesus und Smyrna. Aus dem Brief des Polycarp an die Gemeinde zu Philippi ersehen wir aber, daß dort noch einige Jahrzehnte später kein Unterschied zwischen Bischof und Presbyter war.“

Mit ein Hauptbegründer des Stellens der Bischöfe an die Spitze der Kirche war Ignatius von Antiochien, der um das Jahr

115 in der Verfolgung unter dem Kaiser Trajan in Rom den Märtyrertod erlitt. Dasselbe taten Tertullian und ganz besonders Cyprian, Bischof von Karthago.

Zu welchem Maße diese bereits den Bischof emporstellten, zeigt folgendes: **Ignatius** sagte, der Bischof, präsidiere an Stelle Gottes, die Presbyter an Stelle der Apostel. „Er will, daß man dem Bischof untertan sei, wie Christus es dem Vater war. Er macht die Beziehung zu Christo abhängig von der Beziehung zum Bischof. Nach den **Clementinen**, Schriften aus allererster Zeit nach den Aposteln, ist der Bischof für die Gemeinde der Stellvertreter Gottes und Christi. Die Kirche wird mit einem Schiff verglichen. Der Herr ist Gott, der Lenker Christus, der Vorruderer der Bischof, und dieser vertritt sichtbar die Stelle Christi; es sündigt also gegen Christus, wer gegen den Bischof sündigt. Nur der kann selig werden, der sich an den Bischof hält.“ **Tertullian** vergleicht den Bischof mit dem jüdischen Hohenprieester. **Cyprian** unterscheidet die Bischofswürde auf das bestimmteste von der des Presbyters und Diakonen. Vom Bischof sagt er: Gott hat ihn gemacht, vom Presbyter, die Kirche mache ihn, vom Diakon, der Bischof mache ihn. Die Bischöfe nennt er die Nachfolger der Apostel und nimmt für sie die Rechte der Apostel in Anspruch. Niemand soll darum die Bischöfe richten dürfen. Er sagt auch vom Bischof weiter: Er repräsentiert Christum, er leitet und regiert nicht nur an dessen Stelle, sondern er richtet auch. Im Laufe der Zeit, schreibt Dr. Schmid, stellten sich zwei Vorstellungen heraus, welche bleibend mit dem Episkopat verbunden werden. Die eine ist die, daß die Bischöfe die Inhaber der Schlüsselgewalt und die Vermittler des Heils seien. Die andere ist die, daß die Bischöfe als die Nachfolger der Apostel die Vermittler und Bewahrer der echten Tradition seien.

Sehen wir das Gesagte genauer an, was finden wir? Der Bischof ist weit herausgehoben über die ganze Kirche, Gemeinden und ihre Diener. Ihm wird eine einzigartige Sonderstellung in der Kirche zuerkannt. Die Vorrechte der Gemeinde und ihrer Diener sind ihnen genommen und auf den Bischof übertragen. Die Gemeinde ist unmündig und gänzlich abhängig vom Bischof gemacht. Im Bischof allein kann die Gemeinde Heil und Seligkeit finden; er ist der Besitzer, Hüter und Austerler der Wahrheit. Zwei Stücke treten hier klar heraus: des Bischofsamtes überragende Stellung in der Kirche, dessen schier unbeschränkte Gewalt. Hier haben wir, was Paulus als nach ihm kommend prophezeit hat, den „Menschen der

Sünde". Denn was ist dies anders als die Selbsterhöhung, die in der angeborenen Sünde des Menschen ihre Wurzel und Kraft hat? Hier sehen wir schon erfüllt, was Paulus in 2 Thessal. 2 über den „Menschen der Sünde“ sagt: Der sich allem widersetzt, über alles sich setzt und im Tempel Gottes sitzt als ein Gott. Hier ist der „Mensch der Sünde“ in die Öffentlichkeit getreten.

Hier haben wir vor uns die Anfänge des Papsttums. Was sich hier offenbarte, Bischof mit uneingeschränkter Macht, ist das Wesentliche im ganzen Papsttum. Es dauerte nicht lange nach den ersten Anfängen, daß das, was schon am Ende des ersten Jahrhunderts sich in der Kirche entwickelte, auf den Bischof von Rom konzentriert wurde, daß dieser mit immer mehr gesteigerter Herrschsucht alles unter seine Gewalt zu bringen suchte, bis er alle anderen Bischöfe, die Metropolen, Synoden, Konzilien, Reiche der Welt und Gott unter seine Botmäßigkeit gebracht hatte.

Dr. R. Hagenbach, Prof. der Theologie in Basel, Schweiz, der hier öfter zitiert werden wird, schreibt in seinen „Vorträgen über die Kirchengeschichte im Mittelalter vom 7. bis 12. Jahrhundert“, 1860: „Man kann wohl sagen, daß Nikolaus II. und Hildebrand, Gregor VII., daselbe gestrebt und gewollt haben, **unbedingte Herrschsucht** des römischen Stuhles; sie haben das **Papstideal** aufs höchste gespannt und zu erstreben gesucht.“

Zu 2 Thess. 2, 1–12 sagt Dr. Hagenbach: „Wir finden allerdings schon zu des Apostel Paulus Zeiten Bischöfe, aber die Bischöfe waren eins und dasselbe mit den Ältesten, welche der Gemeinde vorstanden, und ihnen zur Seite finden wir die Diakonen, denen zunächst die Armenpflege oblag. Aber bald ragten dann **über** den Presbyter die Bischöfe hervor und aus diesen erhoben sich wieder die Erzbischöfe, Metropolen, unter welchen dann wiederum schon im 4. Jahrhundert die großen Kirchenhäupter von Jerusalem, Antiochien, Alexandrien und Konstantinopel und Rom hervorragten. Wie aber aufwärts die Stufen sich zuspitzten nach der Pyramide des Papsttums, so spitzte sich das Papsttum im Mittelalter zur Monarchie aus.“

Somit ist klar gezeigt, daß das von Paulus geweissagte Erscheinen des „Menschen der Sünde“ nach dem Abfall der Kirche im Papsttum seine Erfüllung hat. Das Papsttum ist nicht erst später entstanden; seine Anfänge liegen in der ersten nachapostolischen Zeit. Das ist der „Mensch der Sünde“, der da sollte offenbar werden. Was hier in die Erscheinung trat, ist dem Papsttum all die Jahr-

hunderte hindurch eigen gewesen. Was hier an die Öffentlichkeit trat, hat sich im Papsttum in gerader, engverbundener Linie Schritt für Schritt **von da aus** weiter entwickelt, bis es durch Luther den Todesstoß erhielt, sich aber trotzdem bis auf diesen Tag in seinem Wesen treu geblieben ist.

Dies alles ist wichtig. Da der „Mensch der Sünde“ schon zu Pauli Lebzeiten heimlich sich regte und bald nach seinem Abscheiden in die Öffentlichkeit treten sollte, kann das Papsttum nur dann dieser „Mensch der Sünde“ sein, wenn seine Anfänge in die Zeit nach Pauli Tod zurückreichen. Das eben tun sie.

Es sind ihrer viele.

Dieser Gedanke mag hier schon angeschlossen werden. Die Weisagung Pauli 2 Thessal. 2, 1–12 fordert die **Annahme** einer großen Menge von Menschen der Sünde. Der „Mensch der Sünde“ kann hier **nur** als eine Gesamtbezeichnung für viele Personen gleicher Art, als ein Kollektivum, gefaßt werden; denn Paulus sagt von dem „Menschen der Sünde“, daß er sich bereits zu seiner Zeit heimlich rege, nach ihm offenbar werde und daß der Herr sein ein Ende mache in der Erscheinung seiner Zukunft. Hiermit sagt Paulus für den „Menschen der Sünde“ eine Lebensdauer von solcher Länge aus, daß keine Einzelperson, sondern nur eine **Menge von Personen** gleicher Art sie ausleben kann. Demnach ist der „Mensch der Sünde“ als eine Sukzession von Personen derselben Art, Menschen der Sünde wie der erste, zu fassen.

Wie ist auch dies im Papsttum erfüllt! Von dem ersten öffentlichen Auftreten des ersten Bischofs voller Autoritäts- und Herrschaft hat sich diese Art in ununterbrochener Reihenfolge in der Kirche Roms fortgepflanzt bis auf diesen Tag und wird erst ihr Ende erreichen am Jüngsten Tage; lauter Menschen gleichartig in ihrem unerfättlichen Streben nach schrankenloser Macht mit ihrer Spitze im Papst.

Seine volle Erfüllung findet auch im Papsttum der Antikeimenos, der Widerstreber, der Gegner.

Allgemein gefaßt ist der Antikeimenos der Gegner, der gegen oder wider einen oder viele aufsteht. Er ist nicht Verteidiger, sondern Angreifer. Seine Gegnerschaft hat einen Zweck und Ziel, nämlich das zu nehmen, das des andern ist, sei es, das Eigene dafür

zu setzen oder, das des andern ist, selbst zu besitzen. Es mag sich dabei um das Urteil, die Pläne, den Besitz, die Autorität, Jurisdiktion, Ansehen usw. des andern handeln.

Indem Paulus den Antikeimenos von dem „Menschen der Sünde“ aussagt und diesen damit als einen Widersacher, Gegner, kennzeichnet, so ist augenblicklich klar, in welcher Richtung in bezug auf Absicht, Zweck und Ziel seine Gegnerschaft sich bewegt, wogegen er aufsteht und wonach er trachtet. Als der „Mensch der Sünde“ hat er bei seiner Gegnerschaft nur ein Ziel im Auge, nämlich zu herrschen, alle Autorität, die andere haben, ihnen zu nehmen und für sich allein zu besitzen, an Macht und Ansehen der Größte unter allen zu sein.

Indem der „Mensch der Sünde“ als Bischof, wie er bereits beschrieben worden ist, inmitten der Kirche auftritt, wird sich naturgemäß sein Herrschgelüste zuerst auf das Mächtigliegende, die Kirche, erstrecken, nämlich so, daß er die gesamte Kirche, ihre Beamten, ihre Diener, ihre Versammlungen usw. unter seine Botmäßigkeit zu bringen sucht, sodann das, das außerhalb der Kirche liegt, die Reiche der Welt. Endlich strebt er auch, seine Herrschaft auf das auszustrecken, das über der Erde ist, nämlich Gott und alles Göttliche.

Die beiden Begriffe, antikeimenos und hueperairomenos, Gegner und der sich über alles setzt, hängen eng zusammen, indem der zweite Begriff Zweck und Ziel des ersteren als etwas Erreichtes bezeichnet. Das in der Sünde im Menschen Liegende, Haß wider alles, das noch nicht unterworfen ist, und die Herrschsucht sind hier die wirkenden Ursachen.

Wie hat sich doch dies alles erfüllt in der Geschichte der Bischöfe, unter denen schon früh der Bischof von Rom an die Spitze aller trat! Die Geschichte der Bischöfe von Rom, der Päpste, zeigt klar ihre Gegnerschaft, wie sie oben ausgeführt wurde, und zugleich ihre Erfolge hierin.

Daß die in dieser Arbeit als Kern jener Thessalonicher Weisagung Pauli fort und fort betonte unerfüllliche Herrschsucht, die ja in Vers 4 so stark zum Ausdruck kommt, voll und ganz im Papsttum ihre Erfüllung gefunden hat, das sollen die Aussprüche folgender Männer bezeugen, die das Papsttum genau kannten, weil sie zur katholischen Kirche gehört haben.

Döllinger, Prof. in München, verfeindete sich mit der katholischen Kirche wegen des vom Vatikanischen Konzil, 1869–1870, angenommenen Dogmas von der Unfallibilität des Papstes.

Pius IX. exkommunizierte ihn im Jahre 1870. Döllinger ist bis zu seinem Tode 1890 nicht wieder in die katholische Kirche zurückgekehrt. In seinen letzten Jahren war er ein eifriger Leser der Schriften Luthers. Wie hoch er ihn und sein Werk schätzte, zeigen folgende Worte aus einer von ihm im Jahre 1882 gehaltenen Rede: „Ich bete die Wege der Vorsehung an, in deren allwaltender Hand die deutsche Nation ein Werkzeug, ein Gefäß im Hause Gottes, und kein unedles geworden ist.“

Die folgenden Zitate beziehen sich auf den Ultramontanismus innerhalb der katholischen Kirche. Damit bezeichnet man jene Richtung, die die absolute Herrschaft des Papstes über Kirche, Welt und alles Göttliche zu erstreben sucht. Diese Richtung ist in der römischen Kirche die herrschende und hat heute ihre vornehmste Stütze im Jesuitenorden. Sie ist aber in ihrem Wesen so alt wie eben der „Mensch der Sünde“, als er offenbar wurde. Daß diese Richtung auch heute in der Kirche Roms die herrschende ist, beweist zur Genüge das Vatikanische Konzil.

Döllinger im Jahre 1865: „Der Ultramontanismus ist eine im Schoße der großen kirchlichen Gemeinschaft sich geltend machende, von einer größeren oder geringeren Anzahl von Personen vertretene Anschauung. Diese läßt sich in einen einzigen kurzen und klaren Satz zusammenfassen. Der Satz lautet: Der Papst ist die höchste, unfehlbare und darum auch einzige Autorität in allem, was Religion, Kirche, Sitte, Moral betrifft; jedem seiner Aussprüche über diese Gegenstände gebührt unbedingte innerliche wie äußerliche Unterwerfung.“ Dies sagte Döllinger schon fünf Jahre vor Annahme der Definition der Unfehlbarkeit 1870 im Vatikanischen Konzil.

Graf Høensbroech. Dieser war ein Mitglied des Jesuitenordens gewesen, trat aber von demselben aus. Im Jahre 1893 veröffentlichte er in den „Preußischen Jahrbüchern“ folgenden Aufsatz: „Mein Austritt aus dem Jesuitenorden.“ Er definiert den Ultramontanismus so: „Ein weltpolitisches, antireligiöses System, das unter dem Deckmantel der Religion und unter Verquickung mit Religion weltlich-politische, irdisch-materielle Herrschafts- und Machtbestrebungen verfolgt, ein System, das dem geistlichen Haupte der katholischen Religion, dem Papste, die Stellung eines weltlich-politischen Großkönigs über Fürsten und Völker zuspricht.“

Franz Xaver Kraus, geb. im Jahre 1840 zu Trier, war katholischer Theologe, 1878 Professor der Kirchengeschichte in Freiburg.

Dieser definierte den Ultramontanismus so: „Mir scheint, daß diese Merkmale (nämlich diejenigen, welche dem ultramontanen System zu allen Zeiten eigen gewesen sind) sich in fünf Punkten zusammenfassen: 1. Ultramontan ist, wer den Begriff der Kirche über den der Religion setzt; 2. ultramontan ist, wer den Papst mit der Kirche verwechselt; 3. ultramontan ist, wer da glaubt, das Reich Gottes sei von dieser Welt und es sei, wie das der mittelalterliche Kurialismus behauptet hat, in der Schlüsselgewalt Petri auch weltliche Jurisdiktion über Fürsten und Völker eingeschlossen; 4. ultramontan ist, wer da meint, religiöse Ueberzeugung könne durch materielle Gewalt erzwungen oder dürfe durch solche gebrochen werden; 5. ultramontan ist, wer immer sich bereit findet, ein klares Gebot des eigenen Gewissens dem Anspruche einer fremden Autorität zu opfern.“

Diese Zitate aus einem Aufsatz über Ultramontanismus in „Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie“.

Die sich äußernde und wachsende Macht des Bischofs von Rom in der Kirche.

Die darauf hinführenden Schritte. Der erste Schritt war der, daß der Bischof einer Stadt sich über die Bischöfe der umgebenden Landgemeinden setzte, so daß diese ihre selbständige Stellung aufgeben und sich dem Bischof der nächsten Stadt unterordnen mußten, wie der Presbyter in der Stadt dem Bischof untergeordnet war. Es entstand damit die Diöcese. Der nächste Schritt bestand darin, daß, nachdem sich die Diöcesen einer Provinz zu einer Synode zusammengeschlossen hatten, der Bischof der Hauptstadt der Provinz über alle anderen Bischöfe derselben Provinz sich setzte. So kam es zum Metropolit, der dann Synoden berief, den Vorsitz bei den Versammlungen führte und die Aufsicht über die Bischöfe seiner Provinz führte. Der dritte Schritt war der, daß sich wieder ein anderer über den Metropolit erhob, nämlich so, daß solche Bischöfe, die ihren Sitz in Hauptstädten größerer Hauptteile des römischen Reiches hatten, zu Herren über diese Hauptteile wurden. Solche waren die von Rom, Alexandrien und Antiochien. Man nannte diese Patriarchen, Exarchen.

Und nun schloß sich diesen Schritten der vierte an, die **Erhebung des Bischofs von Rom** über alle anderen Bischöfe, Metropoliten und Patriarchen der Kirche.

Diesen Schritt förderte Cyprian, Bischof von Karthago, gestor-

ben im Jahre 258, ungemein, wenn es ihm auch ferne lag, dem Bischof von Rom eine Sonderautorität über alle anderen Bischöfe der Kirche einzuräumen, wie sie schon zu Cyprians Zeiten von jenem beansprucht wurde. In seinem Buch *De unitate ecclesiae* bezeichnete Cyprian den Bischof von Rom als den, der das Haupt der Kirche sei, und zwar nicht darum, weil er Bischof in der Hauptstadt des ganzen römischen Reiches sei, sondern weil er der Nachfolger Petri sei und zu den übrigen Bischöfen die Stellung einnehme, welche Petrus zu den anderen Aposteln eingenommen habe. Wiewohl Cyprian, wie schon gesagt, in keiner Weise dem Bischof von Rom eine Gesamtgewalt über die ganze Kirche zuerkennen wollte, hat er doch mit seiner Voranstellung des Bischofs von Rom und mit seinem Hinweis auf Petri Stellung unter den übrigen Aposteln, wie er sie verstand, dazu beigetragen. Daß Cyprian nicht die Erhebung des Bischofs von Rom zum Haupt der Kirche veranlaßt, sondern nur gefördert hat, ergibt sich aus der ganzen Entwicklung, wie sie eben geschildert worden ist. Diese mußte sich ja konsequent dahin zuspitzen, daß der Bischof sich für den obersten aller Bischöfe hielt, der in Rom, der Hauptstadt des ganzen römischen Reiches, stand.

So haben wir gesehen, wie aus den ersten Anfängen, indem sich der Bischof über den Presbyter stellte, es in gerader Linie sich dahin entwickelte, daß der Bischof von Rom an die Spitze der ganzen Kirche trat, für sich alle Gewalt und Autorität beanspruchend.

Ob Cyprian der erste gewesen ist, der die Stellung des Bischofs von Rom mit dem Hinweis auf Petrum als ersten Bischof von Rom und den Ersten unter den Aposteln begründete, wird wohl schwer zu entscheiden sein. Jedenfalls ist dies gewiß, daß die Bischöfe von Rom sich immer auf Petrum als den ersten Bischof von Rom berufen, sich seine Nachfolger und Erben seiner angeblichen Vorrechte, von Christo selbst verliehen, genannt haben. Mit wieviel Aufrichtigkeit, ist eine andere Frage. Petrus paßte ihnen dazu, ihren Ansprüchen eine biblische Grundlage zu verschaffen, um auf die Gesamtkirche Eindruck zu machen. Jedenfalls hätte sich die Herrschaft des Bischofs von Rom so entwickelt, wie sie sich entwickelt hat, auch ohne Petrus.

Daß die Berufung auf Petrum ganz unbegründet ist, das wissen wir alle.

1. Die Frage ist nie zur Evidenz entschieden worden, ob Petrus je in Rom gewesen ist.

2. Petrus hat nie von dem Herrn etwas empfangen, das der Herr nicht in gleichem Maße auch den anderen gegeben hätte. Die Stelle Matth. 16, 18 ist leicht durch den griechischen Text entschieden, in dem die Worte: „Auf diesen Fels will ich bauen meine Gemeinde, lauten: epi tautee tee petra, also das Femininum, wo doch das Maskulinum, wenn der Herr den Petrus gemeint hätte, stehen müßte. Die Löse- und Bindewalt gibt der Herr Matth. 18, 18 der Gemeinde: „Höret er die nicht, so halte ihn als einen Seiden und Zöllner“; ebenso Joh. 20, 21.

3. Die Kirche hat nur einen Fels, auf dem sie steht, Christum: „Der Stein, den die Bauleute verworfen, ist zum Eckstein worden.“

4. Wäre Petrus wirklich in Rom und dort Bischof im Sinne, wie er hier vorliegt, gewesen, dann hätte er ohne Frage schon vorher ein solches Vorrecht beansprucht und auch geübt. Aber was finden wir? In seinen Briefen das Gegenteil. Da nennt er sich nicht Bischof, sondern sogar einen **Mitältesten**, suenpresbyteros, und stellt sich damit auf eine Stufe mit den Ältesten der Gemeinden. Dazu ermahnt er sie ganz im Gegensatz zu dem, was man von einem Herrscher erwarten muß:

„Weidet die Herde Christi, so euch befohlen ist, **nicht als die über das Volk herrschen**, sondern werdet Vorbilder der Herde“; 1 Petrus 5, 3. Aber die Gemeinden redet er so an: „Ihr aber seid das auserwählte Geschlecht, das **königliche Priestertum**, das heilige Volk“ usw.; 1 Petrus 2, 9. Nächst dem Herrn hat Petrus nur eine Autorität anerkannt und geachtet, die Gemeinde. Bei der Wiederbesetzung des durch Judas Ende vakant gewordenen Apostelamtes verfuhr Petrus nicht eigenmächtig und ernannte einen Nachfolger, sondern rief die Gemeinde zusammen. Diese selbst stellte Kandidaten auf und wählte aus diesen einen, der ohne weiteres als vom Herrn berufen von allen Aposteln anerkannt wurde. Als es sich um Diakonen handelte, riefen die Zwölf, nicht Petrus, die Gemeinde zusammen. Diese schlug sieben vor und wählte sie. Nur der, der nicht auf die Schrift hört, wird sich auf Petrus berufen.

5. Das Lehramt hat der Herr ohne Unterschied allen Aposteln aufgetragen: „Geht hin und lehret alle Völker.“

6. Im Gegensatz zu irgendeiner Voranstellung Petri hat der Herr ihn und alle anderen Apostel mit ihm auf die gleiche Stufe gestellt und zwar nicht oben, sondern ganz unten. Als sie einst dar-

über stritten, wer unter ihnen der Größte sei, sagte ihnen der Herr: „Wer unter euch will groß sein, der sei euer Diener.“

**Bald machte der Bischof von Rom seine Ansprüche, das
Oberhaupt der ganzen Kirche zu sein, geltend.**

Das soll im Folgenden gezeigt werden. Aus der Geschichte der römischen Päpste ein erschöpfendes Bild davon zu geben, wie die Machtansprüche des Bischofs von Rom in der Kirche sich von einem zum andern steigerten, immer herausfordernder und verletzender wurden, immer mehr von der Autorität anderer Kirchenämter verschlangen, bis er alles in sich vereinigt hatte, davon muß hier abgesehen werden. Das Material ist zu umfangreich. An einzelnen Fällen zu zeigen, wohin der Sinn und das Streben der Bischöfe von Rom sich neigte, nämlich zur absoluten Alleinherrschaft in der Kirche, wird den Zweck dieser Arbeit erfüllen.

Als erste Nachfolger Petri auf dem Bischofsitz zu Rom nennen die päpstlichen Kataloge Linus, Clemens und Anaclet. Ueber den Erstgenannten ist nur wenig bekannt. **Linus**, dessen Amtszeit noch in das erste Jahrhundert fällt, soll nur ein Presbyter der Gemeinde zu Rom, nicht Bischof gewesen sein, da noch im Anfang des 2. Jahrhunderts diese Gemeinde das Bischofsamt gar nicht kannte. Das Bestreben, von Petrus aus eine ununterbrochene Reihe von römischen Bischöfen, Päpsten, aufzustellen, führte dazu, daß man Linus zu einem Bischof machte.

Clemens, Clemens I. genannt; offenbart schon etwas von dem Geist seiner Nachfolger. In der Gemeinde zu Korinth war ein Streit ausgebrochen. Die Presbyter dort stritten um die Autorität und Stellung in der Gemeinde. Ursache dieses Streites, wie auch von einigen Geschichtsforschern behauptet wird, war die Stellung des Bischofs in der Gemeinde. Die Gemeinde zu Rom schrieb an die Gemeinde zu Korinth einen zur Ruhe mahnenden Brief. Aber Verfasser dieses Briefes war jedenfalls Clemens. Ihn nennt Dionysius von Korinth in einem Brief aus dem Jahre 170 den Verfasser. Dem stimmt auch Irenäus von Lyon zu. Dieses Verfahren, an sich freilich nur gutzuheißen, erscheint in einem ganz andern Licht, wenn man den Geist der Bischöfe Roms in Betracht zieht. Was die Lehre in dem Briefe betrifft, so wird gesagt, sie sei nicht mehr rein, indem beide, Christi Tod und die Rechtfertigung, geschwächt werden.

Ueber **Anaclet** und **Cleutheros**, 174–189, haben die Quellen nicht viel zu sagen.

Viktor, 189–199, Viktor I. Viktor war es, der den sogenannten Osterstreit focht. Ein Presbyter mit Namen Blastus war in der Gemeinde zu Rom aufgetreten und verwarf als unrichtig die Zeit, in der man zu Rom und Umgegend das Osterfest feierte. Er behauptete, das Osterfest müsse nach dem Gesetz Moses am 14. Tage des Monats Nisan gefeiert werden. Da er sich hierfür auf die Praxis vieler kleinasiatischer Gemeinden berufen konnte, gewann er in Rom großen Anhang und verursachte eine Spaltung. Viktor, der an der Weise Roms festhielt und diese durchsetzen wollte, konnte anfangs gegen Blastus nichts ausrichten. Darum versuchte er, Blastus seine Hauptstütze, die kleinasiatischen Gemeinden mit ihrer Praxis zu nehmen. Er drohte diesen mit Aufhebung der Kirchengemeinschaft. Um diese Drohung durchsetzen zu können, forderte er alle anderen Gemeinden auf zu einem Gutachten, das dann auch zu seinen Gunsten ausfiel. Dann vollzog er den Ausschluß jener Gemeinden in Kleinasien.

Dieser ganze Streit, in dem es sich ja rein um ein Mittelding handelte, zeigt uns schon den geistlichen Verfall der Gemeinden jener Zeit. Was Viktor betrifft, war die Kraftprobe, die er gewagt hatte, zu seinen Gunsten ausgefallen.

Calixt I., 217–222. Ueber diesen wird uns mitgeteilt, er sei ein Sklave gewesen, habe ein Geschäft angefangen und dabei, wohl nicht durch eigene Schuld, viel ihm anvertrautes Geld verloren. Er wurde gefangen genommen und bestraft. Viktor befreite ihn. Später wurde er Bischof von Rom. Er soll gesagt haben, daß ein Bischof auch wegen einer Versündigung zum Tode nicht abgesetzt werden müsse. Die Anforderungen an den Klerus, ganz gegen Pauli Instruktion an Timotheum und Titum, stimmte er herab.

Fabian, 236–250. Die Mitteilungen über diesen sagen uns, wie er durch ein Wunder Bischof von Rom geworden sei. Bei einer Bischofswahl war er zugegen mit vielen anderen, er selber ganz unbekannt. Die Wahl wollte nicht zur Entscheidung kommen. Da kam eine Taube geflogen und ließ sich auf Fabian nieder. Als die Versammlung das sah, hielt sie es für einen Fingerzeig Gottes und wählte den Fabian. Er wird auch sonst als ein Wundertäter bezeichnet. Unter ihm wurde Rom in sieben Seelsorgerbezirke eingeteilt und der niedere Klerus in fünf Grade.

Stephanns I., 254–257. Ueber diesen schreibt D. M. Hauck, er sei klar und konsequent, aber auch selbstbewußt und rücksichtslos gewesen, bedacht auf die Stellung der Bischöfe im allgemeinen und auf seine in Rom insbesondere. Als die spanischen Bischöfe Basilides und Martialis abgesetzt worden waren und an Stephan appellierten, vertrat dieser ihre Seite mit der Begründung, ein Bischof sei unabsetzbar. Mit Cyprian von Karthago geriet er auch in einen Streit, der zuletzt in einem Bruch zwischen beiden Männern endete. Dieser Streit betraf die Ketertaufe. Stephan ging darin so weit, daß er eine Gesandtschaft afrikanischer Bischöfe nicht annahm und auch seiner Gemeinde ihre Beherbergung verbot. In diesem Streit handelte es sich um folgendes: Wenn ein Ketzer zur Kirche übertreten will, muß er noch einmal getauft werden? Die kleinasiatischen, afrikanischen Gemeinden und vornean Cyprian bejahten diese Frage, Rom dagegen verneinte sie.

Cyprians Stellung war ohne Frage die richtige. Es gab in jener Zeit schon viele Haeresien, Montanismus usw., von denen eine verstümmelte Trinitätslehre, die teils in einer Leugnung der Gottheit Jesu Christi, teils in einer Leugnung des Heiligen Geistes bestand, gelehrt wurde. Wiewohl diese auch taufte, taufte sie doch nicht im Namen **Gottes**, des Vaters, Sohnes und des Heiligen Geistes, sondern zum Teil im Namen Gottes, zum Teil im Namen eines von Gott ausgezeichneten Menschen. Das war demnach nicht eine Taufe in den **dreieinigen Gott**, sondern die Setzung einer Taufe von Menschen und in Menschen, mit den Worten der wahren Taufe geschmückt, daher wert- und wirkungslos. Mit Recht forderte Cyprian daher die allein gültige Taufe für solche, die aus dem Kreise der Haeretiker zur Kirche übertreten wollten. Stephan und Rom standen anders; sie erklärten eine zweite Taufe für unnötig.

Wir beachten hierbei, daß die Praxis Stephans nicht die der Kirche Roms von heute ist. Selbst Lutheraner, wenn sie zu dieser Kirche übertreten, werden ungetauft, trotzdem ihre Taufe vollgültig war.

Wir finden auch hier wieder, wie der Bischof von Rom die Stellung Roms durchzusetzen sucht, sich in alle Streitigkeiten mischt, um diese Stellung zur Geltung zu bringen. Gelingt ihm das nicht, läßt er es zum Bruch kommen. Was nicht biegen will, muß brechen. Der Geist Roms.

Wir wenden uns nun zu der Zeit vom Anfang des 4. bis gegen

Ende des 6. Jahrhunderts und hören, was Dr. S. Schmid, Prof. der Theologie an der Universität Erlangen, zusammenfassend über diesen Zeitabschnitt sagt. Im Auszug: Im Westen ragte der Bischof von Rom über alle anderen Bischöfe hervor als Bischof der einzigen apostolischen Gemeinde des Abendlandes und der Hauptstadt der Welt. Schon das erste ökumenische Konzil erkannte ihm die geistliche Oberhoheit über zehn Provinzen in Mittel- und Unteritalien an. Immer mehr breitete sich seine geistliche Macht im Westen aus. Selbst in der Kirche des Ostens galt er für den vornehmsten Patriarchen des Westens, ja für den einzigen Patriarchen, so daß sogar der Bischof von Konstantinopel mit dem ersten Rang *nach* dem Bischof von Rom zufrieden war. **Aber die römischen Bischöfe fingen früh an, sich daran nicht genügen zu lassen.** Auf Grund dessen, daß sie die Nachfolger Petri seien, erhoben sie den Anspruch, an der Spitze der **ganzen Kirche** zu stehen. Am weitesten ging darin Leo I., 440–461, der behauptete, daß er als Nachfolger Petri, als erster unter allen Bischöfen, das Recht habe, Gesetze zu geben und zu richten, während niemand das Recht habe, ihn zu richten.

Das erregte einen Kampf, der damit zuletzt endete, daß sich **die Kirche des Ostens** gänzlich von der Kirche des Westens absonderte. Woimmer sich ihnen eine Gelegenheit dazu bot, suchten die Bischöfe Roms sich in die Angelegenheiten der orientalischen Kirche zu mischen. Leider unterstützten die östlichen Bischöfe dies zum Teil dadurch, daß sie beschloffen, Synode von Sardica 343, in streitigen Fällen solle der Bischof von Rom die Entscheidung geben. Der Orient hatte viel mit Häeresien zu tun: Arian, Nestor, Eutyches. Schon vor Leo I. hatte Valentinian III., 445, ein Edikt erlassen, daß den Bischöfen als Gesetz gelten sollte, was der apostolische Stuhl verordnet habe, und daß jeder Bischof, der vor den Stuhl des Bischofs von Rom gefordert werde, dort erscheinen solle. Woimmer sich dazu ein Anlaß bot, mischten sich die römischen Bischöfe in die Dinge des Ostens, nur zu dem einen Zweck, ihre Oberhoheit geltend zu machen.

Daß man im Orient mit der Zeit merkte, worauf das ganze Streben der Bischöfe Roms gerichtet war und daß im Grunde es sich bei der Einmischung in seine Streitigkeiten weniger um die Feststellung der Lehre als um Gründung ihrer Oberhoheit über die ganze Kirche handelte, läßt sich denken. Daß das verstimmt und zum Widerspruch reizte, ist ebenso gewiß.

Es seien hier einzelne Fälle angeführt, um zu zeigen, wie die

römischen Päpste sich fort und fort in die Angelegenheiten der östlichen Kirche mischten, um ihre Oberhoheit zum Ausdruck zu bringen und um auch diese Kirche unter ihre Herrschaft zu stellen.

Ein solcher Fall ereignete sich unter Gregor I., 590–604. Dieser Papst liebte es, sich *servus servorum Dei* zu nennen. Er betrachtete zwar jedes Amt in der Kirche als einen Dienst. Da aber Petrus und seinen Nachfolgern der Auftrag geworden sei, seine Brüder zu stärken, sollte jeder Bischof die Pflicht haben, sich von dem Nachfolger Petri willig dienen zu lassen: „Welcher Bischof wäre nicht dem römischen Stuhle unterworfen, wenn ein Fehler an demselben gefunden wird?“

Der Streit Gregors I. mit dem Patriarchen Johannes Sejunator von Konstantinopel war folgender: Dieser hatte zwei Priester wegen Häresie körperlich züchtigen lassen. Gregor hielt ihm das vor und drohte, er werde eine Appellation seitens jener Priester annehmen. In einem sich rechtfertigenden Briefe an Gregor nannte Johannes sich immer wieder den **ökumenischen Patriarchen**. Dies suchte Gregor wie schon sein Vorgänger Pelagius ihm zu verbieten. In schärfster Weise schrieb er einen Brief an Johannes und auch an den Kaiser, in dem er sagte, daß nicht einmal der römische Bischof, dem doch der Primat und die Sorge für die ganze Kirche übertragen sei, sich „allgemeiner Bischof“ nenne. Hatte Gregor vergessen, welche Ansprüche Leo I. und vor ihm Valentinian III. gemacht hatten, die doch sachlich auf den „allgemeinen Bischof“ hinausliefen? Und behaupteten seine eigenen Worte nicht sachlich dasselbe? Dieser Streit setzte sich unter dem Patriarchen Cyriakus, Johannes' Nachfolger, fort. Kaiser Mauritius, der seinen Patriarchen schützte, wurde durch Phokas vom Thron gestoßen und samt seinem Bruder, seiner Gemahlin und acht Kindern hingerichtet. In einem Glückwunschschreiben, welches Gregor an diesen mörderischen Thronräuber richtete, herrscht heller Zübel über den Regierungswechsel. Dieser Brief wurde ein halbes Jahr nach jenem Massenmord geschrieben. In einem einige Monate später geschriebenen Brief an Phokas und seine Gemahlin herrscht derselbe Zübelton. Im Vertrauen auf den Beistand des neuen Kaisers ermahnt er diesen, „das Aergernis des gottlosen und stolzen Titels aus der Kirche zu entfernen“. Er erreichte seinen Willen erst nach seinem Tode, indem Phokas Rom als Haupt aller Kirchen (*caput omnium ecclesiarum*) anerkannte (Wilhelm Walkther).

Nikolaus I., 858–867, und Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel. Dieser Papst behauptete, daß der Papst der unumschränkte Herrscher der Gesamtkirche sei, alle Bischöfe abhängige, päpstliche Beamte, die Synoden Organe zur Verkündigung und Ausführung des päpstlichen Willens. Das kirchliche Recht könne nur insoweit als Recht gelten, als es päpstliches Recht und von den Päpsten gebilligt sei. Der Papst sei geradezu das lebendige Gesetz und zugleich Inhaber der obersten Gerichtsbarkeit, persönlich aber als Stellvertreter Christi, Sprachrohr des Heiligen Geistes, Organ der göttlichen Weltregierung, selbstverständlich keinem menschlichen Gerichte unterworfen.

Der Patriarch Ignatius war abgesetzt und Photius eingesetzt worden. Ein von Photius an Nikolaus gerichtetes Schreiben beantwortete dieser damit, daß er eine Gesandtschaft nach Konstantinopel schickte, um teils den Fall zu untersuchen, teils alte päpstliche Ansprüche zu erheben. Diese Gesandtschaft richtete nichts aus. Ein großes Konzil in Konstantinopel im Jahre 861 erklärte sich gegen Ignatius und für Photius. Ignatius appellierte nun an den Papst, der diese Gelegenheit zur Einmischung auch wahrnahm. Er richtete ein Rundschreiben an die Patriarchen des Ostens (862), alle Bischöfe anzuweisen, Photius nicht anzuerkennen. Als dies nichts fruchtete, ebenso wenig ein Appell an Kaiser Michael und Photius, erklärte Nikolaus auf einer römischen Synode im Jahre 863 „kraft Urteils des Heiligen Geistes, der durch ihn rede“, Photius für abgesetzt und exkommuniziert. Photius antwortete damit, daß er seinerseits auf einer großen Synode in Konstantinopel im Jahre 867 Nikolaus als Tyrann und Irrlehrer absetzen und exkommunizieren ließ.

Der Bilderstreit, 726–843. Dieser Streit begann eigentlich unter dem Kaiser Leo, dem Tsaurier, 717–741. Die Mohammedaner hatten sich damals über eine Anzahl der kaiserlichen Provinzen ausgebreitet; viele traten vom Christentum zum Mohammedanismus über, weil die Mohammedaner den Christen vorwarfen, sie seien Götzendiener, indem sie die Bilder anbeteten. Um nun das Vordringen der mohammedanischen Araber aufzuhalten, beschloß Kaiser Leo, ein Bilderverbot ergehen zu lassen. Das war demnach ein politischer Zug. Er stieß aber dabei auf großen Widerstand seitens des Volkes und der Mönche.

Sein Sohn Konstantin setzte den Angriff auf die Bilderberehrung fort und zwar weit schärfer als sein Vater Leo. Im Jahre

754 berief er ein ökumenisches Konzil nach Konstantinopel, das auf seinen Befehl den Bilderdienst verwerfen mußte. Aber trotz seines strengen Vorgehens gelang es Konstantin nicht, die Bilderverehrung völlig auszurotten. Auch folgenden Kaisern, Leo V. und Theophilus, 829–842, gelang dies nicht. Theodora, des letzteren Witwe, machte diesem Streit dadurch ein Ende, daß sie die Bilder wieder in die Hauptkirche Konstantinopels zurückführen ließ. Von dem an feiert die griechische Kirche das festum orthodoxiae.

Auch in diesen Streit mischten sich die Bischöfe von Rom, nämlich dann, nachdem jenes Konzil zu Konstantinopel, von 300 Bischöfen besucht, allen Bilderdienst verboten hatte. Stephan III. ließ durch eine Synode dieses Verbot verwerfen. Sein Nachfolger Stephan IV. sprach auf einer Lateransynode im Jahre 769 das Anathema über alle Bilderfeinde aus.

Daß diese fortwährenden Eingriffe in die Angelegenheiten der östlichen Kirche schließlich zum Bruch zwischen beiden Kirchen führen mußten, ist nicht zu verwundern. Denn man merkte in Konstantinopel sehr wohl, daß es sich bei diesen Eingriffen, was die Bischöfe Roms betraf, sehr wenig um die Lehre handelte, sondern hauptsächlich um die Unterwerfung der orientalischen Kirche unter die Herrschaft Roms, dessen Bischöfe die **ganze Kirche** als ihr Reich ansehen. Der endgültige Bruch kam im Jahre 1054. Der Streit, der ihn zum Teil herbeiführte, betraf den Gebrauch ungeäuerten und geäuerten Brotes im heiligen Abendmahl. Die griechische Kirche brauchte letzteres, die römische Kirche ersteres. Leo IX., 1049–1054, war damals Papst. Auf einer Synode zu Rheims hat dieser Papst die Stellung der römischen Bischöfe so definiert: Allein der Pontifex (der Titel Pontifex Maximus seit dem 5. Jahrhundert üblich) des römischen Stuhles ist der Primas der Gesamtkirche und apostolisch.

Der Patriarch Cerularius von Konstantinopel hatte der römischen Kirche ihre Irrlehren vorgehalten, unter anderem auch den Gebrauch ungeäuerten Brotes im heiligen Abendmahl. Er hatte das in einem Brief an den Bischof Johannes zu Trani in Apulien, der zur griechischen Kirche gehörte, getan. Dieser Brief kam dem Cardinal Humbert zu Gesicht, der ihn wieder Leo IX. zukommen ließ. Leo schickte eine Delegation von dreien, unter ihnen Humbert, nach Konstantinopel, mit einem Brief von ihm, in dem er alle seine Hoheitsrechte geltend machte und sich besonders entrüstet darüber aussprach, daß der Patriarch von Konstantinopel sich die Bezeichnung

oecumenicus zulege. Das reizte Cerularius nur noch mehr zum Widerstand. Als Roms Delegaten erkannten, daß sie nichts erreichen könnten, gingen sie in die Sophienkirche und legten eine Bannbulle, die über Cerularius und seinen Anhang den Fluch aussprach, auf den Hauptaltar nieder und verließen Konstantinopel. Cerularius sprach darauf den Bann über Rom aus. Damit war die Trennung vollzogen.

Die nun schon reichlich bezeugten Ansprüche der Päpste auf Oberhoheit in der Kirche hörten freilich mit dieser Trennung nicht auf, sondern wurden von allen Päpsten in der Folgezeit erneuert. Ihre dogmatische Fixierung fand die absolute Oberhoheit des Papstes ohne Frage beim Vatikanischen Konzil, 1869–1870, in der Infallibilitäts-Definition. Diese, am 18. Juli 1870 als Kap. 4 angenommen und hier aus dem lateinischen Original übersetzt, lautet: „Mit Zustimmung des heiligen Konzils und daß es ein göttlich geoffenbartes Dogma sei, definieren wir: Der römische Pontifex, wenn er ex cathedra redet, das ist, wenn er im Amt als Hirte und Lehrer fungierend, gemäß seiner höchsten apostolischen Autorität eine Lehre über Glauben und Moral, von der Univerſalkirche zu bewahren, definiert, unter göttlichem Beistand, ihm selbst im seligen Petrus verheißen, kann das mit solcher Unfehlbarkeit ausrichten, mit welcher der göttliche Erlöser will, daß seine Kirche im Definieren einer Lehre über Glauben und Moral unterrichtet werden soll; und daher sind die Definitionen ebendesselben römischen Pontifex **an sich**, nicht aber aus der Zustimmung der Kirche, **unveränderlich**. Wenn aber jemand wagen sollte, was Gott verhüten wolle, dieser unserer Definition zu widersprechen, der sei verflucht, anathema.“*

Mit dieser Definition war der Kirche mit ihren Kardinalen usw. endgültig jede Autorität genommen, die des Papstes zur Lehre ge-

* Kapitel 3, Vatikan. Konzil vom 18. Juli, definiert des Papstes Oberherrschaft in der Kirche so: „Wenn jemand sollte sagen, der römische Pontifex habe nur das Amt der Untersuchung und Leitung, aber nicht die volle und höchste Gewalt der Gerichtsbarkeit in der gesamten Kirche, nicht allein in Sachen, welche sich auf Glauben und Moral beziehen, sondern auch in solchen, welche sich auf die Verfassung und Regierung der Kirche, über den ganzen Erdfreis verbreitet, beziehen, oder derselbe habe nur hervorstehendere Teile, aber nicht die ganze Fülle dieser höchsten Gewalt, oder die Gewalt desselben sei keine ordentliche und unmittelbare, sei es in Betreff aller und einzelner Kirchen, sei es in Betreff aller und einzelner Hirten und Gläubigen, der sei verflucht, anathema sit“; übersetzt aus dem lateinischen Original.

macht, die griechisch-katholische Kirche nochmals verflucht, dazu alle protestantischen Kirchen in der Welt. Auch auf uns lastet der päpstliche Fluch.

Es sei nur noch kurz hinzugefügt, daß die päpstliche Sucht nach Herrschaft sich auch auf das Volk erstreckte. Dazu verhalfen die Missionare, Mönche, die Priester, die Wunder, Reliquien, das Interdikt, der Bann und vor allem die Beichte vor dem Priester. Auf der 4. Lateran-Synode im Jahre 1215 befahl Innozenz III., daß jeder Gläubige beides Geschlechts alle seine Sünden wenigstens einmal im Jahr vor dem Priester bekennen müsse, und er solle, nach Vermögen, solche Bußübungen auf sich nehmen, wie sie ihm auferlegt werden, unter Strafe der Exkommunikation und Verweigerung eines kirchlichen Begräbnisses. Welche Gewalt hat man doch über andere, wenn man ihre Geheimnisse kennt! Ja, die Päpste haben es wahrlich verstanden, auch das Volk zu knebeln und in den Gehorsam unter ihre Faust zu bringen.

W. S o e n e c k e.

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

“What Christ?” — Pastor Otto H. Bostrom, Ph. D., in the *Lutheran Outlook* for October, 1943, discusses a meeting of the Bronx-Manhattan-Westchester Inter-Synodical Lutheran Pastors' Conference. He aims to show “how futile it is to seek for the intellectual kind of ‘unity of faith’ that so many of our Lutheran leaders insist upon.” He is of the opinion that *theses* becloud the issue. The matter under consideration at the conference was the fellowship with Christ in Communion. The reporter deplores that the committee in charge of the program “fell into the error of presenting . . . a set of explanations,” and instead of heeding the suggestion of a speaker “that the whole assembly, instead of discussing this unity in holy Communion, go up into the sanctuary of the church to celebrate holy Communion and thus partake of the unity of Christ,” rather “maintained that if Christ was to be the point of union for us all, we must determine *What Christ?*” He charges the committee, and the conference, that “there was a relapse into the old fallacy that intellectual ‘unity of faith’ must first be achieved.”

Under the sub-head *Practice Unity Instead of Discussing It*, he then offers his comment in the following words:

“The writer would like to make an observation and a suggestion. The observation: We Lutherans believe that the spiritual realities are objective and not dependent upon our ‘faith’ or understanding for their existence as

realities. God is what He is, whether you or I know Him truly or not. Christ, then, also is what He is regardless of the exactness of our conception of Him. But by saying that it makes a difference *what Christ* we believe in, the objective Christ, Christ as He is in Himself, is set aside for the subjective Christ, or Christ as we think of Him. And when Christ in His prayer for unity says, 'I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one,' it is clear that He has reference to Himself as He truly is and not to any varying theological conception of Him which His followers might formulate. Or should we suppose that the disciples had identical intellectual definitions of their Savior? Hardly! Therefore, if there is basis for unity in holy Communion, it must be found in the real person of Christ, 'the same yesterday, today and even forever,' and not in identical thought images that we might possibly attain through intellectual discussion."

His suggestion may be seen from these words: "Let us set aside all plans for unity through intellectual agreement. They are an illusion and altogether futile. Let us instead practice fellowship in the various spheres of Christian life, such as fellowship in humble confession of sin, fellowship in worship and praise, fellowship in holy Communion, and fellowship in doing the work of the Lord. *This is the only road to oneness in Jesus Christ.*"

So far from Pastor Bostrom. Italics in the last sentence are ours.

It is true "that the spiritual realities are objective and not dependent upon our faith." Our faith, or unbelief, does not change God or Christ, nor affect the reality of the Supper. But does that mean that our faith, even in the sense of understanding, is a matter of indifference? If that were true, then why observe any confessional lines at all? Why not practice fellowship with all Protestants? with Catholics? with Jews? If, as all concede, confessional boundary lines must be observed at all, then the question can not be brushed aside: How far? And anyone operating with sweeping generalities fails to carry his point, because he is proving too much.

Again when Pastor Bostrom says, "Should we suppose that the disciples had identical intellectual definitions of their Savior?" we readily grant that they did not. And we add, nor did any individual disciple have the "identical intellectual definition" at all times during his career. There are degrees of understanding. Look at the disciples, and notice what weaknesses were found in their understanding till the very day of Christ's ascension. Look at the weakness which even a Peter evinced still later in Antioch. Weaknesses in understanding do not bar the unity of faith — so long as they are weaknesses.

There were great weaknesses in the understanding of some of the early Christians in Jerusalem. In Acts 15 they are described as true believers, standing in the faith, *pepisteukotes*, but with a Pharisaic background, of which they had not completely rid themselves when they became

Christians. They insisted on circumcision and on keeping the law of Moses as necessary to salvation. But they were ready to listen to instruction, as Acts 15 records in detail. And what was the result? Did "theses becloud the issue?" The assembly without a dissenting vote, "with one accord" (*homothymadon*, i. e., unanimously) adopted the motion submitted by James. Their weakness had threatened the unity of faith for a time, but it was overcome by a discussion resulting in theses.

A similar group of people, the Judaizers, invaded the churches in Galatia. They refused to be considered as weak in the faith, rather they posed as teachers of superior rank. They confused their hearers and disturbed their faith. What did Paul do about it? Did he say, "We can not all have identical intellectual definitions. What of it? The spiritual realities are objective and not dependent on our understanding?" Did he suggest that they celebrate holy Communion and thus partake of the unity in Christ? Read his epistle to the Galatians. They were not weak brethren, they were false brethren who troubled the Christians. His attitude over against them he tersely summed up in the words: "I would that they were even cut off which trouble you" (Gal. 5, 12).

Let us not brush confessional differences aside as irrelevant. Let us not evade the question *What Christ?* Else this very attitude will lead us into false unionism, instead of the true unity of the faith. M.

Presbyterian-Episcopal Union Postponed. — We take the following bodily from the *Presbyterian Guardian*. It is an editorial over the initials — J. P. C. (John P. Clelland).

"The general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, has committed the question of union with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. for 'further study.' That means that the decision on unity with the Presbyterians has been postponed for three years or until the next meeting of the general convention.

"Since 1937, committees of the two churches have explored, discussed and resolved. The question of union has received a considerable amount of publicity in the religious press and influential leaders of both communions have brought much pressure to bear to consummate the union. Now after six years the whole problem is left unresolved for another three years.

"Thus again the unity-wooing Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has been rebuffed, if not jilted. Almost a decade ago it proposed union to the United Presbyterian Church but the United Presbyterian Church said No. In recent years it has made gesture after gesture towards the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. (the Southern Church) despite a noticeable lack of enthusiasm south of the Mason and Dixon line. And now the latest object of its affections is showing a marked coyness.

"If the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were seeking union with other churches on the basis of loyalty to and agreement upon the teachings

of Scriptures, it might well deserve our sympathy and commendation. Such however is not the case. The largest and most powerful of American Presbyterian churches in its zeal for union has shown a continued willingness to sacrifice principle and abandon conviction. Thus it displays its loss of the historic Presbyterian consciousness. Presbyterians have been a people who believed in their carefully formulated creeds and abhorred sacrifice of convictions for expediency's sake. But the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. no longer believes in its creed and is therefore quite willing to indulge in promiscuous wooing of other church bodies.

"The rock on which its attempt to unite the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches has foundered is that of the Episcopal succession. Canon Wedel of the Washington Cathedral said in the general convention, 'The great problem is, of course, that of winning any Protestant church to accept the Episcopal system of Bishops. All negotiations with other churches are based upon this assumption.' Unity commissions with deft and ingenious formulations have tried to evade this basic question but the Episcopal Church is not yet ready to do so. There are many in the Episcopal Church who want to evade it, and perhaps eventually the Episcopal Church will evade it — but they did not evade it at Cleveland.

"We Presbyterians do not believe Episcopal bishops are successors of the apostles. We hold the Episcopal Church to be in error in its doctrine of Episcopal succession but we respect the Episcopalians for holding, at least for three more years, to what they believe to be true."

So far the *Presbyterian Guardian*.

The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, which left the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. for reasons of doctrine and practice, is in a position to speak as above on the basis of its own experience. We need not now review the history of the past quarter century, but the inroads of Modernism culminating in the Auburn Affirmation, which the Presbyterian Church did not meet properly, finally left to the sincere minority no other way open than to separate; which they did under the leadership of J. Gresham Machen. Although we must reject their Calvinism as un-Scriptural, yet their courageous stand against the subversive errors of Modernism evokes our Christian admiration and should strengthen us in our faithfulness to the truth which God has given us.

The seeking of union, however, apparently is not altogether and solely on the side of the Presbyterians. Many Episcopalians seem to be willing to compromise. The majority report of the commission on unity presented "underlying assumptions," among which the following is highly significant.

"The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is part of the Holy Catholic Church. We have felt that this is the view of the bulk of Anglican thought, and also that it is a necessary implication of the wording of the so-called Declaration of Purpose: 'The two churches, one in the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Word of God, recognizing the Holy Scriptures as the supreme rule of faith, accepting the two sacraments

ordained by Christ, and believing that the visible unity of Christ's church is the will of God, hereby formally declare their purpose to achieve organic union between their respective churches.' Furthermore, the Presbyterian Church has always maintained that it is part of the Holy Catholic Church and is unwilling to negotiate on any other basis. To say that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is part of the Holy Catholic Church is to say that *its ministry is a real ministry of the Word and sacraments*, and that its sacraments are genuine means of grace."

If Episcopalians are willing to concede the truth of the words we italicized in the last sentence, then they must give up their "Apostolic Succession," and then Bishop Manning is right when he says, as reported, that the commission's "basic principles . . . are not really a proposal for union between the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches, they are a proposal for the Episcopal Church to accept essentially the Presbyterian form of the ministry and to become a Presbyterian church." Yet the majority of the commission in its report claims to represent "the bulk of Anglican thought."

We can not but deplore any softening of confessionalism. There is something worse than error: doctrinal indifferentism. M.

Religious Liberty in Russia. — We quote from the *Presbyterian Guardian*. "After a quarter of a century of religious persecution and suppression, Stalin has recognized the place of the Orthodox Church in Russian life and allowed that church to meet in Moscow and elect a Patriarch. Black-robed priests again walk the city streets, and it appears that a great change has taken place in the official attitude toward the 'opiate of the masses.' — Christians everywhere will rejoice in this change. At least, there is a recognition on the part of the Russian government of the power of religion in the life of a people."

Our joy at this turn of events is not unalloyed. Several disturbing thoughts arise. In spite of the fact that we were told to consider religious liberty in Soviet Russia as of approximately the same type that we are enjoying in America, such was decidedly not the case. While atheists, under the Soviet constitution, were free to make propaganda for their unbelief, the churches were prohibited to do so for their faith. They were prevented from giving instruction to the young and from operating seminaries for the training of future pastors. We can easily imagine the devastating effects of such a policy which has now been followed for a quarter of a century. Only the older people among those now living have received an education on a religious basis, while those in the prime and flower of their lives have grown up without such instruction, having been trained, instead, in atheistic materialism. In view of these facts, what will a restoration of the Greek Orthodox Church mean at this late hour?

Still more disquieting thoughts remain to be allayed. There certainly were many pious men among the priesthood of the Russian Church who

conscientiously ministered to the spiritual needs of the people, but the Church by and large functioned politically as a department of the secular (Czaristic) government. Will things now change in this respect? The *Presbyterian Guardian* voices its doubts in these words: "Albeit we may be permitted to wonder if the obscurantist and tyrannical church of the Czars has learned its lesson."

Add to this the fact that it is only the Greek Orthodox Church which has been restored. True religious freedom has not yet been granted. As long as the other churches and denominations are barred even from the limited privileges now restored to the Greek state church, it is premature to speak of religious freedom, or even toleration, in Russia. The *Presbyterian Guardian* may not be wide of the mark when it expresses the suspicion that a "desire for a good press in the democracies may have been the dominant motive."

We seek comfort in the assurance of our Lord that the well-being of His church is not dependent on the attitude of any human government. He rules in the midst of His enemies (Ps. 110; Ps. 2). And the prisoner Paul rejoiced that by his chains "the word of God is not bound" (2 Tim. 2, 9).
M.

The death of Dr. M. Reu on October 14, 1943 will be felt as a distinct loss to the cause of positive Christianity in general and to the Lutheran Church of our country especially. While we were not in full agreement with him and in the course of the union negotiations of recent years frequently took occasion to say so, it was not done in a spirit of spitefulness but from a sincere sense of duty, whenever we felt that an utterance of this outstanding and highly esteemed Lutheran theologian was tending to weaken the clear position of our Church on the basis of the Holy Scriptures and the Confessions in matters of faith and life. We agree to the statement of *Concordia Theol. Monthly*: "We esteemed him highly not only on account of his rare attainment as a scholar and author, but because we saw in him a conservative theologian who loved the Lutheran Confessions and did not hesitate to defend them." (Dec. '43.)

The following biographical sketch is from the same number of *Concordia Theol. Monthly*: "Dr. Reu was born November 16, 1869, in Diesbach, Bavaria. After the preparatory studies at a Gymnasium, he took the course in the Mission Institute at Neuendettelsau. In 1889 he came to America and served first as assistant pastor at Mendota, Ill., and then as pastor of a church in Rock Falls, Ill. In 1899 he was called to the position where he was to do his life's work — a professorship at Wartburg Theological Seminary in Dubuque, Iowa. Because the faculty is small, he had to teach a great variety of subjects, and by and by he had taught every course given in the school. In 1904 he became the editor of the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, a position he occupied to the end. Articles, book

reviews, editorial comments were produced by him in staggering abundance. At that, he did not employ a stenographer or secretary, and practically everything he wrote was put on paper by himself in longhand. His many books and brochures largely pertain to Luther's life and writings, and undoubtedly in the field of Luther research he was without a superior in this country."

In recognition of his painstaking labors in the gathering of the material for his opus magnum *Quellen zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Unterrichts im evangelischen Deutschland zwischen 1530 und 1600* the University of Erlangen conferred the degree of *doctor theologiae* on the deceased. Of his many other writings none is better known especially among the younger generation of our clergy than his *Catechetics* which has been and still is used as a textbook in our seminary. It is, at least in the estimation of this writer, unquestionably the best and most thorough book on this branch of practical theology, setting forth the history and art of teaching Christianity, which is extant in our country.

When in 1923 during the meeting of the first Lutheran World Convention at Eisenach Dr. Reu gave a courageous testimony of his faith in the verbal inspiration of the Bible in opposition to the prevailing opinion of the overwhelming majority of the assembled representatives of the Lutheran church bodies all over this earth, our *Quartalschrift* not only recorded this fact at the time but spoke warm words of highest commendation. And it is with a sense of deep satisfaction that we reprint for our readers in the obituary of a man to whose opinions voiced in connection with the endeavors for Lutheran unity we have repeatedly taken exception a confession of faith written in 1921. It is quoted by *Concordia Theological Monthly* of December 1943 from *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* of August 1926. Dr. Reu writes: "Nothing should and may bind us merely because it has been hallowed by history, no Quenstedt or Hollaz, nor Gerhard or Chemnitz, nor Melancthon or Luther, unless we find their teaching in the Scripture, the "*ius divinum*." This applies even to the Confessions of our Church, to which we have vowed to be loyal only because they have flowed out of the Scripture, this 'pure Fountain' of Israel. Least of all may our own reason be made the source and touchstone for our religious and ethical thinking. Such 'freedom of thought' would be a blow in the face of the man whose confession at Worms we celebrate, thanking God for it. Neither may such a role be given to 'science', which today seeks through its sweeping pronouncements and its 'higher criticism' to render Scripture uncertain for us, to destroy the equation: The Scripture is the Word of God, and to mix who knows how much philosophy into our system of doctrine. It is true that we wish and must think and work scientifically, so that no method and knowledge suitable for assisting us in gaining ever better understanding of the words of Scripture remain unknown to us; but all this must merely serve this sovereign, so that in matters of faith we do not propose anything that is not supported by the 'majesty of God' itself. Here the rereference to the

'jealous' God is in place, who does not give His glory to another nor His praise to any graven image. If Scripture, and Scripture alone, is not everything to us, then it is nothing to us." These are indeed golden words.

L.

"Communion Service That Makes History." — In several church papers we had read brief references to a joint Communion Service which Missouri Synod Lutherans held together with members of other synods not in confessional agreement with the Synodical Conference. So far we had ignored these notes, till an editorial in the *Lutheran Companion* (for August 11, 1943) under the caption quoted at the head of this item caught our eye. If this is to be considered as a "history making" event, it should find a place in our column for "Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen". Without comment we reproduce the editorial of the *Lutheran Companion*.

"On June 3, which was Ascension Day, there took place in New York City a communion service that will undoubtedly make history in the Lutheran Church. It was held in the Lutheran Church of Our Savior, which belongs to the Missouri Synod, and the pastor of that congregation had invited neighboring Lutheran churches to participate. The celebrant was the Rev. Fredrick Meyer, pastor of Fordham Lutheran Church, which is a part of the American Lutheran Church.

"The service was a direct result of inter-synodical conferences of Lutheran pastors which have been held in New York City for a number of years, the purpose of which has been to foster Lutheran unity. Remarkably enough, the dynamic for these conferences has come from the Missouri Synod group. The Rev. Wilbert E. Benson of the Augustana Synod is president of the intersynodical organization, which is known as the Bronx - Manhattan - Westchester Intersynodical Lutheran Pastors' Conference.

"The inter-synodical communion service was the culmination of a meeting held on June 1, when a set of theses relative to the Lord's Supper was discussed and the following resolution unanimously adopted: *We are agreed that in the holy communion, which is also the preaching of the Word (1 Cor. 11, 26), Christ is in reality present. We therefore believe that there already exists internal unity among us as Lutherans.*

"The Ascension Day communion service in New York City may be regarded as one of the most significant events in recent Lutheran unity strivings. Although it concerns only a small group of pastors, it indicates very definitely the urge for unity which is present everywhere. Perhaps the unofficial character of the event adds to its significance rather than detracts from it. It is in the rank and file of the Church, after all, that unity must first be achieved if it is to have any real and lasting value."

So far the editorial.

We add a footnote found in the *Lutheran Witness* for August 17, 1943, which disapproves of the action of the New York congregation: "Until that

is done (namely, "that we remove those bars which now *prevent us* from" engaging in joint church work, M.) any joint Communion service such as that reported from Our Savior's Church, New York, is entirely out of order and is an obstacle to true unity." M.

* * * *

By request we withheld the above item from our October issue, in the hope that in the present issue we might be able, together with the offence, to report also its proper removal. As the editorial in the *Lutheran Companion* clearly shows, its author received considerable comfort in his unionistic attitude from the action of Our Savior's and through him the offence was passed on to all readers of the *Companion*, some of whom, we assume, must have been grieved in the spirit, while others, like the editor, were strengthened in their false attitude, and still others may have experienced a shock in a hitherto sound stand so that they began to waver. The spiritual harm caused by Our Savior's was certainly grave and severe.

The *Lutheran Witness* for November 23, 1943, devotes an editorial to the case under the heading *Inter-Synodical Communion*, which we here reproduce in full.

"It may be possible that our congregation will be criticised," is the way the pastor put it in his parish paper when a Communion service was celebrated in Our Savior's Church, New York City, in which members of the American Lutheran Church communed with members of the Missouri Synod Congregation. The presentiments of the pastor have proved well founded. Also the *Lutheran Witness* has had a brief reference to the matter when in its issue of August 17 it said that until the bars are removed which now prevent us from exchanging pulpits, a joint Communion service such as here described "is entirely out of order." We feel, however, that something should be said in justification of this note of censure.

"There are three possibilities, and only three, involved in such a service as that described — a joint celebration of the Lord's Supper by congregations and pastors of the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church, who have had joint conferences discussing the teachings and principles of the Lutheran Church.

"1. It is possible that these conferences had revealed *differences* in teaching and conflicting views on Gospel principles. If a joint Communion service were arranged for the purpose of declaring that we can 'agree to differ' in doctrines of faith, we would call such a service unionistic and contrary to sound Lutheran principles.

"2. It is possible that the Lord's Supper in a given case has been celebrated on the theory that this will be an *aid to union*, since the Sacrament is also a meal of communion, and that by joining in its observance spiritual fellowship can be obtained. This would not be acceptable to those who believe, as we do, that the Sacrament of the Altar should have

unity in the faith not as a *purpose* yet to be achieved, but as a *condition* for joining in its celebration.

"3. It is possible also that such a service is celebrated by those who have found themselves in *complete agreement doctrinally* and have established a unity of faith and practice. In such a case, each party would regard the other as professing the true Christian doctrine (as being in *statu confessionis*). Such was the case when Luther and his co-workers partook of Holy Communion in 1536 at Wittenberg with the Reformed theologians, who, it appeared, had accepted the doctrine of the Real Presence and were willing to testify it to their own people who as yet were not in fellowship with the Lutherans. Our Augsburg Confession says that for true unity there is necessary not an agreement in ceremonies, but 'agreement concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments.' *Satis est*, says the Confession, 'It is enough.' Yet also in such a case we would say that a joint Communion service at this time is 'out of order.' Our Synod resolved in 1938 that altar, pulpit, and prayer fellowship should be practiced only after church fellowship has been officially established and announced officially by the President of Synod. Now, we know that Synod is only a human institution. In fact, no specific teaching of our Synod is more deeply ingrained in all our congregations and conferences than this. Synod can not command or prohibit unless it can quote a 'thou shalt' or 'thou shalt not' of Scripture. But a matter may be very wrong, improper, even if it is not sinful. As members of the Missouri Synod, pastors and congregations should for the common good and for the preservation of unity in our own midst live up to agreements arrived at, after due discussion and in the spirit of prayer, by the representatives of our congregations assembled in convention. Where Synod can not legislate, it can plead the fraternal bond on behalf of living up to synodical resolutions."

So far the *Witness*.

We deplore the fact that the editor of a church paper does not at all enter into a discussion of the spiritual harm done in the case under consideration but limits himself to the minor matter of what he calls an impropriety committed against a human agreement. M.

A New Name for Open Questions? — In speaking of Dr. Reu, our *Northwestern Lutheran* called him our "opponent" because of his position on certain doctrinal questions. An exchange takes exception to this. "The *Northwestern Lutheran* publishes a fine editorial about Dr. Reu and then spoils it all by referring to him in the last word of the last sentence as our 'opponent.' Dr. Reu was one of the best friends which the Synodical Conference has had." The fact that he opposed us on certain doctrinal issues is then brushed aside with the phrase that we of the Synodical Conference "did not see eye to eye with him."

What were some of the doctrines in which Dr. Reu did not see eye to eye with us? We mention his assumption of a *first resurrection*, of a *millennium*, and quote a sentence on the state of departed souls, which he calls an "intermediate state." He says that the departed soul "digests, so to speak, the impression of its earthly life, and the *wounds caused by sin gradually heal*. Possibly we may assume that the fellowship with Christ *increasingly sanctifies* the soul, and that the habits of sin, which were found even in the departing believer, are now ultimately exterminated" (Dogmatics Vol. II, p. 227. — Italics are mine, except the word "possibly," which was underscored by Dr. Reu himself. M.) — Even after Dr. Reu's death we are made to hear him speak "of an effect of the Lord's Supper upon the body" (*Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for December 1943).

We now mention chiefly the "noble souls." We reprint the paragraph from his *Christian Ethics*. "Because man, though yet under the guilt and the power of sin, does not willfully despise the law of God and its correction — to do so were merely to increase the height of the wall of separation between himself and God —, he is now, though not yet in the kingdom of God, in a place appreciably nearer than he was before. This means a great deal. This longing, however, to be free from the contradiction to God's will as well as this consciousness of such contradiction itself is to be found only in noble souls; in others their success in meeting the external demands of the law produces a sense of pride and haughty self-sufficiency which hinders the work of restoration just as much as, or even more than a flagrant disregard of the law."

Thus according to Dr. Reu there is a twofold reaction in natural man against God's law, which difference means a great deal, bringing the "noble souls" appreciably nearer to the kingdom of God. We of the Synodical Conference still hold to the *eadem culpa*, as maintained by the Formula of Concord. And with the *Brief Statement* we teach that natural man in no wise has the ability of "refraining from wilful resistance" (No. 12). We were at the time (soon after the publication of Dr. Reu's *Christian Ethics*) happy to report, and we repeat it here, that Dr. Reu openly disavowed the position held by Melancthon in his later years, but to our knowledge he never withdrew his remarks about the *noble souls*. — Is this matter concerning the total depravity of natural man an open question in which it is not necessary to see eye to eye, and where a softening of the *eadem culpa* does not make one an opponent?

Was Dr. Reu a friend of the Synodical Conference? We remember how he (in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for January 1940, and at other times) tried to distinguish between two trends in the Missouri Synod, one represented by the *American Lutheran* group, which he joyfully endorsed, and another which he charged with wilfully obstructing any union endeavors (*die "die Einigungsverhandlungen zu stören" suchen*). The same charge he raised against the small (*kleine*) Norwegian Synod and the

Wisconsin Synod, declaring over his signature that he might hesitate to meet with representatives of the last named body.

We say this not by way of disparagement, nor do we wish to be understood as minimizing the importance of Dr. Reu for the advancement of conservative Lutheranism in America. We rejoice in the special gifts with which he was endowed. The church was benefited by them. Nor do we deny that Dr. Reu tried to be conservative. Yet the fact that a man of his eminence supported views as outlined above contrary to the Scriptures tended to work great harm. — And no matter how friendly a man may be disposed toward the Synodical Conference, by teaching, e. g., "noble souls" as in the above quotation he undermines the work of our church, which proceeds on the assumption of *eadem culpa* of natural man as a Biblical fact. On this vital point, at least, it is necessary to "see eye to eye."

M.

"It Is To Weep!" — These words form the beginning of an editorial in the *Lutheran Standard*, from which we quote a paragraph on the failure of achieving Lutheran unity.

"As to promoting Christian unity, we have failed both toward fellow Lutherans and toward brethren outside the Lutheran fold. We have, indeed, done well in guarding 'the doctrine of the Gospel.' But we have confounded the Biblical concept 'doctrine' with the human interpretation of doctrine. We have used the unfeeling knife of theological differences — to say nothing of the clashes of personalities and the wilful blindness of prejudice — to sever the bond of Christian fellowship which the Spirit Himself creates in those who are one in Christ and in His Gospel. We have boasted about holding fast to the Scriptures and by making divisive things which the Scriptures do not make divisive, have brought upon ourselves the condemnation of the Scriptures themselves. We have hurried to accuse one another of heresy when more of the mind of Christ would have caused us to accuse ourselves of proud uncharitableness. — It is to weep!"

Frankly, we do not subscribe to the sentiment voiced in this paragraph. True, formalistic and dead orthodoxy, personal ambitions and suspicions and jealousies have from the beginning hampered the work of the church and are to this day ever lurking dangers that threaten the progress of the Gospel. Yet to make the sweeping charge that "we," all Lutherans engaged in the efforts at unity, have failed solely, or primarily, because of them in the manner stated in the paragraph, is an unwarranted judging of hearts. We not only assume by a stretch of charity, but we are constrained to assume by our very faith, that all men actively engaged in the union endeavors are honestly motivated by nothing but their love for the truth and toward their fellow Christians. They may be mistaken in their stand, but the sincerity of their conviction and the fervor of their love dare not be questioned. We say this of all, whether they share our doctrinal position or oppose us.

M.

"The Prophet" of the Lachish Letters. Who is the prophet of the Lachish Letters? Since these letters written towards the end of Zedekiah's reign (587 B. C.) have been uncovered in the burned ruins of the city of Lachish not yet a decade ago, scholars have unremittingly sought an answer to this question. In a clear Hebrew script, undoubtedly used by Jeremiah when he "wrote in the book" (32, 10) and by Baruch, when this scribe wrote down Jeremiah's words "upon a roll of a book" (36, 2.4) *han-nabi*, "the prophet," is found mentioned in several of these eighteen Lachish Letters. Even apart from this first reference to one of Israel's prophets on an inscription these letters represent the most important find for Biblical scholars which has been made to date in a Palestinian tell and ruin. Written in classical Hebrew they give us an insight into the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar and into the social and political conditions of the age of Jeremiah "agreeing perfectly with the picture drawn in the book that bears his name." While all these data and facts can not be overestimated, the Bible student, however, will not rest content until he finds an answer to the question: Who is the prophet of the Lachish Letters?

"He can only be Jeremiah," the Rev. J. W. Jack tells us in the *Expository Times* (September 1938). "The prophet mentioned in the letters must have been Jeremiah," we are informed by the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* of 1938. "This is entirely possible," Prof. R. S. Hauptert adds in the *Biblical Archaeologist* (December 1938). Over against such unwavering statements in full agreement with one another Professor Torczyner of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, editor of the Lachish ostraca, maintains and maintained in all his publications that the prophet of the Lachish correspondence is Uriah, the son of Shemiah of Kiriath-jearim (comp. Jer. 26, 20). But do not the letters themselves settle this dispute? Are not the Hebrew characters of the name of "the prophet" to be found in the text of these letters?

The *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* of 1938 assures us that such is the case: "The prophet' — his name occurs in letter XVII, where the first sign is broken off, but the rest, —*rmiah* . . . is clearly visible." This assertion is supported by *The Expository Times* of 1938 as follows: "Scholarship will come . . . to see in the prophet not Uriah, but Jeremiah, whose name seems to be clearly mentioned in Letter XVII." And Professor W. F. Albright in *The Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (1938, p. 16) adds: "In XVI we have a tantalizing reference to [.y] *ahu han-nabi*, who is identified by Torczyner with his 'Uriyahu the prophet,' but who may just as well be [Yirme'y] *ahu han-nabi*, 'Jeremiah, the prophet'."

Can these findings of trained scholars leave us in doubt as to the correct answer to our question? Everyone, who is acquainted with the thorough study devoted to inscriptions by these scholars will not be surprised — and least of all the scholars themselves — at the final outcome which the decipherment of an inscription so often takes. In the *American Journal of Archaeology* (1939, p. 676) for instance "the supposed reference

to Jeremiah is declared incapable of proof." The "—rmiah" of letter XVII, which had been declared "clearly visible" in the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* of 1938 is "out of the question" according to Cyrus H. Gordon in *The Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*" (1938, p. 18). Instead we are to read: [’a] doni, "my lord." The *ahu han-nabi* of letter XVI, however, stands as read and approved by all scholars. But it proves nothing, since there were undoubtedly many prophets whose names ended the same way (*ibid.* p. 16). In other words the text of these letters, as it has been preserved in the burnt ruins of Lachish, does not end the dispute, because in XVI, the one and only letter where a part of the name of the prophet is preserved, all but the last two syllables are broken off leaving us to face the "tantalizing reference" to [y] *ahu han-nabi*.

Yet we are not without the circumstantial evidence gleaned from these letters which makes it "entirely possible" that the prophet is none other than Jeremiah. The letters contain the correspondence which was carried on between the military officer Hoshaiiah stationed at an outpost point not far from Lachish and Jaosh the commanding officer of Lachish. Hoshaiiah seems to have been siding with "the prophet," who had sent a letter of warning (*hisshamer* "beware" apparently the substance of the letter) to Shallum, son of Jaddua, member of a military mission on its way to beg help from Egypt. Jaosh on the other hand is no friend of "the prophet." He has sent Hoshaiiah a letter from the king and letters from the ruling princes saying: "Pray read them." And Hoshaiiah having read them answers: "Behold the words of the princes are not good, but to weaken your hands and to slacken the hands of the men who are informed about them . . . And as the Lord thy God liveth it is true that since thy servant read the letters there has been no peace for thy servant." In other words Jaosh had received complaints of officers concerning a certain person whose words were as they claimed, detrimental to the national interest. Jaosh had forwarded these letters to Hoshaiiah and the latter returning the letters vindicates himself in the following manner: "Who is thy servant but a dog that thou hast sent to thy servant the letters . . . Now thy servant hath returned the letters to my lord. May the Lord cause thee to see . . . according to His desire . . . How can thy servant benefit or injure the king?"

The princes and captains play the same role in these letters as they do in Jeremiah 36–38. The princes or high officials accuse Jeremiah to Zedekiah of "weakening the hands of the men of war that remain in this city, and the hands of all the people, in speaking such words unto them" (38, 4). And again Irijah, a sentry, who was posted at the Benjamin Gate, "took Jeremiah the prophet, saying, Thou fallest away to the Chaldeans . . . and brought him to the princes" (37, 13f.). Here and there the same officials are involved with the very same title (*Sarim*), here and there the same accusation is made, namely that of weakening the hands (*rapha* in both instances). The only difference is that in the Lachish Letters

the princes are apparently accused of "precisely what they accused Jeremiah of doing, namely of weakening the hands of the troops and of all the people (Jer. 38:4)." But "this is not surprising," Professor Albright argues, since "a conservative group of this kind is notoriously given to inconsistency" (*Bulletin* 1938, pp. 15-16).

Who is "the prophet" of the Lachish Letters? After a careful perusal of all the minute study spent on these inscriptions by trained scholars we'll do well to be guided for the time being by their own final answer: "Some writers have confidently identified this prophet with Jeremiah. This is entirely possible, but we can not be certain and should be careful about pushing the evidence too far" (*The Biblical Archaeologist* 1938, p. 32).

P. Peters.

Büchertisch

The Cross Athwart the Sky. Lenten addresses by R. E. Golladay, A. M., D. D. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1939. Cloth. Price, \$1.00.

In attempting to review this book, we are confronted with the unpleasant realization that there is nothing in it to commend, and much to condemn. We refuse to support its theology, we find its style and composition very crude, and we dislike its fictitious addition to Biblical narratives.

Perhaps our readers will find in this one paragraph from the introduction a confirmation of what we have just stated, provided these statements are not due to a printer's error: "For Lent there is only one subject that is wholly appropriate — to present Christ Jesus as a teacher of morals, a guide, an example and do it in a wholly orthodox fashion, for Lent is wholly heterodox. Jesus is all this. And there are plenty of times when He may be thus presented. But if this is all men know of Christ Jesus, they miss the most fundamental part of all. Before Christ Jesus can be a guide and example He must be a Redeemer, a Savior. And Lent is the appropriate time of all times for presenting this truth." If this is clear to our readers after the first perusal, they may perhaps also be content with this style of writing in the sermons.

Or can we be expected to be edified by this description of our Savior's agony: "There were times when Jesus' flesh felt that the burden was almost too heavy, the pain too severe, the price too great; but He caught His breath, took hold of himself, and cried out, "Father, Thy will be done."

If the style isn't appealing, the doctrinal conclusions drawn from some of the texts are worse. We need but examine a few samples from the story of Jesus and Barabbas to assure ourselves of that fact. The general heading reads: Choices That Determine Destiny. How did Pilate's choice determine destiny? We would say, by forfeiting his salvation, brought to

his attention by the blessed Savior himself. Not so the author. "As men always do, he paid for it. Dogged by irresoluteness, Pilate became more and more ruled by expediency. Increasingly he became a moody man filled with remorse. In a few years he . . . was deposed and banished. At Luzerne . . . a mountain peak . . . called Pilatus. Here, tradition says, Pilate committed suicide by leaping down . . . The arch-coward and traitor of the race; a traitor to his own better self (*sic!*), to his fellowmen, to God."

What sort of destiny did the Jews determine by their choice? "By their rejection of Jesus, they forfeited hope; for they had prepared the way for the destruction of their city and temple and the overthrow of their nation. This is the outstanding example of all history of what it costs to reject Christ Jesus." Is that all it costs?

The remarks made by the author about Jesus' choice and destiny are, to say the least, very peculiar. "He stood by, unflinchingly, unflatteringly, to the end. And in so doing, Jesus decided destiny — His own, ours, humanity's. True, Jesus had to die to make His choice good. But what of it? Death is not the worst thing in life. It is only a passing incident in the eternal progress of life. Now Jesus is on the throne. He is the hope, the only hope, of the world."

And what sort of application does Dr. Golladay find in this rich text? A brief sentence will indicate the trend and at the same time serve to justify the severity of our criticism. "Anyone with open eyes can not fail to note how large a part of the lives of successful people is the result of making and sticking to right choices." *Sapienti sat!* S.

A Short Explanation of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism. — A Handbook of Christian Doctrine. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Price, 50 cts.

This book is a revised edition of the old "*Schwan Catechism*," so well-known and widely used within the Missouri Synod not only but also in the other synods of the Synodical Conference.

A committee of eleven men, appointed in 1929, set to work. When the committee reported in 1941 to the Convention of the Missouri Synod that its work had been completed, only four men of the original membership remained. The Synod resolved that "after due consideration and action upon suggestions received through the mails and memorials, the Revised Catechism be published in an attractive form."

The make-up of the book is, indeed, pleasing and a fine example of the printer's art.

As to the treatment of Luther's text there will always be differences of opinion among Christian pedagogs. The exposition under discussion is no exception to this rule. Although we think very highly of it in general and are convinced of its usefulness we are not in agreement with the revising committee on all points. To give one or two illustrations: We consider

it a pedagogical advantage to treat the Ten Commandments in the light of the words "I am the Lord thy God," thus reminding the pupils from the outset that it is the Savior-God who is speaking to them. — The revised edition contains a paragraph on election in practically the same words as those found in the old "*Schwan*." We hold there is no real need to treat the doctrine of predestination in a book of this nature since Luther himself does make no mention of it. His Small Catechism was not intended to be a book on dogmatics treating every doctrine of the Bible separately but a book of instruction in the chief parts of the Christian doctrine "as the head of the family should teach them in a simple way to his household."

The changes which have been made in the arrangement of the material and in the text of the exposition are, in our opinion, all for the better. The notice of the publication of the revised edition of *Schwan's Catechism*, here given, is accompanied with our warm approbation. Pupils studying it under the guidance of faithful pastors and teachers will derive great spiritual benefit from it.

L.

Lutheran Annual 1944. — Amerikanischer Kalender für deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1944. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis Missouri. Preis: 25 cents.

Beide Kalender unserer Schwestersynode von Missouri bringen das, was man von einem Kalender im allgemeinen und besonders von einem kirchlichen Kalender erwarten darf. Hervorzuheben wäre, daß der deutsche Kalender im Anschluß an die Erinnerung, daß der "*Lutheraner*," das deutsche Kirchenblatt der Missouri-Synode, im Jahre 1944 seinen hundertsten Geburtstag feiert, kurze Lebensbeschreibungen von Männern bringt, die der Synode im Kirchen-, Schul- und Regieramt hervorragende Dienste geleistet haben.

L.

Lutheran Confessional Theology. — A Presentation of the Doctrines of the Augsburg Confession and the Formula of Concord. By C. H. Little, D. D., S. T. D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. \$1.25.

By this book on the particular symbols of the Lutheran Church the author, Professor of Doctrinal Theology in the Ev. Lutheran Seminary of Canada (U. L. C. A.) takes a place in the line of outstanding students of the Lutheran Confessions which have appeared in the synods which now constitute the United Lutheran Church of America: Dr. Charles P. Krauth, Dr. Henry E. Jacobs, and more recently Dr. J. L. Neve. In terse and lucid style Dr. Little sets forth the doctrinal content of the Augustana and the Formula of Concord, not merely listing the references to Scripture by chapter and verse, but weaving the pertinent passages into his text in a most skilful manner. Avoiding the cumbersome *apparatus* of scholarship which often goes with such works, and any objectionable professional diction or manner, the entire arrangement of the book is such as to serve

equally well the layman who is looking for an opportunity to improve his understanding of Lutheran doctrine, and the pastor who seeks a model for presenting these truths to his people in all simplicity.

Nor is the content less pleasing than the form. The author's treatment of such doctrines as those of Original Sin (Augustana, Art. II), Free Will (XVIII), Justification (IV), and Election (F. C. XI) is, in this reviewer's judgment, sound in every way. Dr. Little does not hesitate to speak of "God's objective justification of the world" — nor to include 2 Cor. 5, 19 among the proof passages. He concludes his discussion of Election with a staunch reaffirmation of the verdict rendered by the Formula of Concord: "It is false and wrong when it is taught that not alone the mercy of God and the holy merit of Christ, but that also in us there is a cause of God's election, on account of which God has chosen us to eternal life."

In these days when even in conservative circles there is an increasing note of uncertainty as to some of the old doctrinal positions, it is heartening to find Dr. Little including two points to which no specific articles are devoted in our Confessions, the doctrines of the Antichrist and of the Inspiration of the Scriptures. Concerning the former his conclusions are summed up in these words: "In view of the above quotations" (which show the position of the Confessions on the doctrine in question) "it is manifest that our Confessions regard the Pope or the papal system as the veritable Antichrist. There should therefore be no difference among Lutherans on this question." His findings on the question of Inspiration are equally satisfactory: "It is quite certain that our Confessions furnish no ground for holding that the Scriptures are inspired only in spots and that they teach emphatically that the Scriptures do not merely contain, but actually are the Word of God, the living Word that abideth forever."

We heartily recommend this book.

E. R.

The Tragedy of Calvary. By C. A. Freseman. A poem on the Passion of our Lord. Cloth. 102 pages. Price, 75 cts. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio.

In the preface the author sheds light upon the genesis of this sacred poetry. He writes: "The fact that he had never seen nor heard of anything of the kind, suggested to the author that an attempt be made to set the Passion History to verse. The original intention was not to write for publication, rather, what to some might seem a selfish motive, merely personal gain. The hours spent in the work were indeed profitable and . . . the thought occurred that the resultant verse might prove as helpful to others as it did to himself . . . In the hope that this little volume may in some measure edify all who may read it and, what is more, may glorify the Savior of sinners, it is offered to the reading public."

The publishers add this brief note: "The whole story of Christ's suffering and death is told in excellent verse, with heart-searching interpretation and application. The reader's interest is not only sustained but

heightened as the narrative progresses. A thoughtful reading of this book leaves one profoundly impressed and truly edified. Many striking stanzas in this poem make excellent quotations." S.

Eleventh Bulletin of Distinctive Choral Music for the Choral Union.

1943-1944. Issued by The Lutheran Walther League, 875 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois.

No doubt this new bulletin is being awaited with considerable interest by the choir directors of the Lutheran Church. Perhaps a listing of the articles found in it will help to heighten this interest. Here are the titles: Voice Classifications — A Few Suggestions For Teaching Our Choirs To Chant The Introits — Graduals — Making Music with the 1944 Program — 1944 Mass Chorus Concert Program. The remainder of the Bulletin lists selections recommended for the seasons of the church year and for various other occasions. S.

Cross Examined. A series of sermons, Lent-Easter. By Edward Kuhlmann. Cloth. 95 pages. Price, 85 cts. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio.

On the inner flap of the wrapper protecting this little book is found the following analysis: Cross Examined consists of seven Lenten and one Easter sermon. The majority of the Lenten sermons are introduced with a brief cross-examination of persons figuring prominently in the Passion of our Lord. In each sermon the meaning of the cross is examined for the individual. Life is cross-examined in the light of the cross, revealing man's sinfulness and his need of a Savior. Contents: Witness for the Prosecution — The Pharisee; Witness for the Prosecution — The Sadducee; Witness for the Prosecution — A Money-Changer; Witness for the Defense — Peter; Witness for the Defense — Pilate; Witness for the Defense — The Defendant, Christ; The Challenge of the Incomplete; The Garden by the Gate.

By this time the reader has caught the pun in the title. Perhaps some people can appreciate a pun in the title of a book of Lenten meditations; we can not. Those who prefer a wealth of touching narratives to the unfathomable riches found in the Passion story itself will be glad to own this book. The first "sermon" contains the story of a crippled child, something from Whittier, something else on the cathedral of Rheims, the singular dream of an English mother, a letter from the sister of Hindenburg, and the confession of a Christian physician. Naive people might venture to ask how the author could find enough space besides to say much about the Savior, but the answer is quite simple: he didn't.

We used the word "sermon" in quotation marks, because the book actually contains essays, not sermons, — essays quite choice as to style, but far from choice in regard to the treatment of the Passion History. We refuse to have patience with a preacher who conditions the Gospel of our

Lord Jesus Christ, and the author undertakes to do just that: "But, you ask, is this pardoning love offered to all? Yes, to all. Before it can be accepted, however, there is an obligation that must be met . . . Conitition is always the promise to pardon." When will such Christian pastors finally learn to preach the precious pardon of God in Christ *without any strings attached*? If our Savior did it, if Paul rejoiced in doing it, why can not we? Certainly the preaching of repentance must have a place in our sermons, but it is entirely out of place when it is demanded as a requisite, even as we are holding out to poor wretched sinners the refreshing promise of God that He will cleanse us and pardon us and receive us into His arms. Such preaching nullifies the power of the Gospel.

There is more, much more of this legalistic tone in the sermons. We submit only two other samples. "The real keeping of Lent lies in doing battle against the dominance of sin in our lives . . . a renewed dedication of our lives to Christ." "This is Christianity at its best — this struggle toward a goal that continues to advance to new heights. . . . On the height of heights stands Jesus. To His moral elevations no man may yet attain, but in striving to attain it any man may find blessedness and strength." So Goethe was right after all. Cross examined? We'll have none of it. S.

Come Into My Heart. By Rev. Henry Young. Eight Lenten-Evangelist Sermons. Cloth. 79 pages. Price 75 cts. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio.

We quote the publisher: Under the general theme "There Is a Knock At Your Door" (Rev. 3:30) the author presents eight sermons: I. By Someone Who Knows You (John 10:11); II. By Someone Who Loves You (1 John 4:10); III. By Someone Who Seeks You (Luke 19:10); IV. By Someone Who Cares For You (1 Peter 5:7); V. By Someone Who Speaks To You (John 1:14); VI. By Someone Who Reigns For You (Rev. 17:14b); VII. By Someone Who Died For You (Rom. 7:24); VIII. By Someone Who Lives For You (Mark 16:6). These sermons have a strong evangelistic cast.

We are happy to agree with the publishers on this last descriptive remark about the sermons. They are indeed evangelistic in tone and make very edifying reading. We fail to see why they should be designated Lenten sermons, however. The texts are not Lenten texts, and the occasional references to the sufferings and death of our Savior do not make them Lenten addresses. We have never insisted that there must be Lenten sermons. But if a series of sermons is published under this particular term, Christian readers are justified in their demand that these sermons are not merely edged, but profusely overspread with the primary colors of the Passion story: the Black of sin, dark fear, agony, death; the Red of sacrificial all-atoning blood; the Blue of indestructable, unconquerable, joyously embracing faith.

From a homiletical viewpoint various objections might be raised in regard to the sermons. The chief parts under the theme do not always find support in the text and this may explain why the texts are so rarely stressed. In addition, the text becomes all the more submerged because of extremely numerous quotations from Scripture. Scanning the pages of the first sermon, for instance, we counted 28 Bible passages on the eight very small pages. And by the way, in one sermon there occurs again that mistaken application to the glories of eternal life based on the words, "Eye hath not seen, etc."

One statement on page 20 has, as far as we know, no support in the Scriptures and is ill-advised. "You are to learn to love yourself. 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' This takes for granted a love for yourself. You need not learn to love yourself in a sinful, selfish way, but you are to learn to love yourself for what you can be in Christ. If God loves you then you ought also to love yourself for what He can make out of you, and it shall all be to His glory." The conclusion derived from the quoted passage is fallacious. God merely recognizes the fact that we human beings do love ourselves, but He does *not* anywhere urge this love of self.

In spite of the criticism we have presented we nevertheless repeat that these sermons make refreshing reading. They should prove edifying and comforting especially to Christians confined to their homes because of illness, and pastors will find in this little book some excellent reading material for bedside visits.

S.

Courage in Christ. Radio messages broadcast in the eighth Lutheran Hour by Walter A. Maier, Ph. D., professor of the Old Testament, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri. XX and 387 pages. Cloth. Price, \$1.50. Concordia Publishing House, St Louis, Missouri. 1941.

For Christ and Country. Radio messages broadcast in the ninth Lutheran Hour by Walter A. Maier, Ph. D. XXII and 392 pages. Cloth. Price, \$1.50. 1942.

Victory Through Christ. Radio messages broadcast in the tenth Lutheran Hour by Walter A. Maier, Ph. D. XXVI and 411 pages. Cloth. Price, \$1.50. 1943.

There is a wealth of precious, soul-sustaining, Christ-centered thought in these three volumes of sermons. They are a well-stocked arsenal of spiritual weapons which the child of God so badly needs in the defense of his soul against powers of evil that are arrayed within and without it in these distressing times. There is in them a presentation of the truths of Scripture remarkably rich in tender comfort for hearts in pain and wretchedness. We know full well that the power of such preaching lies in the saving strength of God's blessed Word, but it would also be an act of ingratitude toward the Lord if we were to overlook the gift of present-

ing these truths so clearly and forcefully which He has granted to the author. While we can not approve of the spectacular manner in which much of the application is carried out and while we view with distinct disfavor the many "proof passages" from statesmen, scientists, and other notables in the world of men, we are nevertheless convinced in our hearts that the readers of these sermons will rejoice as we did over the refreshing and edifying testimony of the author to the unspeakable riches of God's grace toward us in the Lord Jesus Christ.

So much for the contents of the book as reading material for the Christian reader. The reviewer must, however, also bear in mind that these are collections of radio addresses, that they were originally produced for hearers, not for readers. Viewed in this light, certain features of these sermons have been and still are objectionable. We shall not refer again to those characteristics which have been disapproved of in previous issues of the *Quartalschrift*. Moreover, we do not propose to take up much space here for the discussion of other points in these radio addresses which are open to question, if not even to criticism.

The time has come, and is overripe in fact, to give some serious and critical thought to the Lutheran radio sermon in general and for this the sermons before us give us an opportunity. The blessings of radio sermons have been enthusiastically proclaimed in our circles and their possibilities painted in the most glowing colors. From all that has been said and written one is led to believe that this new twentieth century instrumentality for the spreading of the "comfortable Word" deserves to be adopted by the Church with unalloyed bliss. It would be rank ingratitude toward our Creator to deny that radio has served the spread of the Gospel, even as it would be folly to deny that this prodigious discovery has increased almost beyond comprehension the indoctrination of "strangers to the Commonwealth of Israel" and the dispensing of spiritual comfort to numberless children of God in distress who are either beyond the reach of properly constituted "Seelsorge" or enjoy its beneficent services only rarely. On the other hand it is also folly on our part if we give no thought to certain problems which confront us in the field of radio preaching, problems which may well cause confusion among members of congregations and create situations of grave concern between pastors of congregations and the radio preachers.

The author of these sermons frequently addresses himself to Christians at large in a manner which appears to indicate that he is willing to serve them as a monitor, a spiritual guide, and a father-confessor. Moreover, among the scores upon scores of letters received and published by him there are many which indicate that members of Christian congregations are ready to avail themselves of the opportunity of employing his spiritual advice. Finally we are not given reason to suppose that this service is denied to any Christians, be they members of our own or of other Christian congregations outside of the Synodical Conference.

Should this not give us cause for serious thought? Shall we merely pass it off with a shrug of the shoulder or with the remark that our radio preaching does after all serve as an excellent means of bringing Christ to the nation? Shall we suddenly forget all the efforts of our church in the past to safeguard the relations between a pastor and his flock? Has the church ever failed to criticize sharply the attempt of any pastor to encroach upon the spiritual responsibilities entrusted by God to another man? Is the domain of radio preaching so sacrosanct that questions such as these may be simply brushed aside as being no longer of any importance?

Our readers will not misunderstand us. We do not say that a Lutheran radio preacher would necessarily offer spiritual advice which is un-Scriptural, or preach sermons which are not what they should be. But what if he does? What recourse has the pastor of a congregation, should he in all sincerity deem it inadvisable or even detrimental to the welfare of his members to hear a certain preacher over the air or to receive spiritual advice from him? Before the days of radio every pastor was well protected in his own field of labor. He simply did not call in such men as guest preachers or as temporary assistants for his flock whose preaching methods or whose pastoral practice he considered unsatisfactory. May a pastor no longer exercise this control in the case of radio preaching?

We believe that it is the duty of the Church to provide this control if radio preaching is to prove a continued blessing to the church at large and to the world, and such provisions can be successful if proper measures of control are put into practice everywhere within the Synodical Conference. To bring this about it will be necessary that every radio preacher is held accountable to some conference or to his synod for his preaching methods, his doctrinal stand, and his spiritual advice. Only in this manner will every pastor in our Church have the opportunity, should he deem it necessary, to voice objection to any preaching over the air by radio preachers within the Synodical Conference and in extreme cases to bring about the removal of preachers who might prove objectionable. Until such arrangement has been arrived at in our midst, the brethren in the ministry have cause to feel ill at ease concerning such statements in Dr. Maier's radio addresses as appear to encroach upon the field of private pastoral care. S.

"The God of the Bible and Other Gods." By Dr. P. E. Kretzmann. 196 pages. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, 1943. Price, \$1.50.

This book from the prolific pen of Dr. P. E. Kretzmann will interest particularly the student of Comparative Religion but will be of value also to the pastor and theologian for the materials it contains, which emphasize the unique character of Biblical Christianity and the inadequacy and unreasonableness of all other religions. It puts into brief form a great deal of information with regard to these other religions and brings out their

essential characteristics, generally in a very satisfactory manner. It is intended especially as an argument against the popular evolution theory as applied to the field of religion, meeting the evolutionists on their own ground, that of human reason and logic and of the established facts regarding the various religions. It accepts the theory that there has been, not an evolution of religion from lower forms — animism, fetishism, etc., — to the pure monotheism of Christianity, but rather a degeneration from early monotheisms to later polytheistic and pantheistic systems of religious thought. The author says: "It will readily be seen that the discussion accepts the conclusions of P. W. Schmidt and of Samuel W. Zwemer in their respective books on *The Origin of the Idea of God* and *The Origin of Religion*, subscribing in particular to the two statements: 'The origin of the idea of God is not by any process of evolution, but by instinct or by an objective-subjective revelation. — The evidence of primitive monotheism is found not only in every area of primitive culture, but also in the earlier forms of the great ethic religions.' (Zwemer, 1. c. p. 13.)"

We believe that there is a serious fallacy back of much of the argumentation for "primitive monotheism," as found in the writings of the Catholic scholar, Father Schmidt; and Princeton University's Dr. Zwemer. In their reaction against the views and false claims of modern evolutionists, they err "in excessu" and claim for early pagan religions a monotheistic character which these in reality possessed to no greater degree than later pagan religions have done. Dr. Kretzmann guards against this error in most cases, showing, e. g., that the "primitive monotheism" of Egypt has a "pantheistic background" (p. 14) and "fell far short of the ideal as revealed in the Bible" (p. 15). (Cf. similar statements with regard to other countries on pp. 19, 28, 57, 61, 86, etc.) In summing up, he says: "None of the extinct religions, none of the primitive, or pagan, religions now existing has been able to rise above a vague monotheistic conception" (p. 32). He also points to the true origin of the monotheistic ideas of God that are always found in false religions, whether ancient or modern, when he discusses the limitations of "the natural knowledge of God" and says: "There is not, and can not be, an adequate understanding of the one Supreme God without the revelation offered in the Bible of the Christians. We are dealing throughout with the peculiar phenomenon of *truth struggling for recognition, but consistently repressed and falsified*,* because of man's perverted nature" (p. 58).

That is, all men know by nature that there is a God whom they should worship and obey. But, as St. Paul says: "When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, — but changed the truth of God into a lie" (Rom 1, 21, 25). Therefore heathen religions are always a complete chaos of truth and falsehood, in which even the truth is given a false twist, so that it becomes impossible to show that there is anything at all really true in them. For those who depart from the revealed truth of God

* Our italics.

believe in lie, and a lie is always confusion. The Hindu scholar, H. B. Sarkar, admits this, in effect, when he says in his book, *Chinese Religion through Hindu Eyes*: "It is impossible for Nature-worshippers to be sincere monotheists. *They would never, in fact, care to define their exact position.** Outsiders can vaguely guess that they are polytheistic from one point of view and monotheistic from another, or to use a bit subtler phraseology, henotheistic from the one and pantheistic from the other" (p. 277).

As a matter of historical fact, there never has been any true monotheism apart from faith in God's revealed Word, even Mohammedanism and Rabbinical Judaism being "pantheistic monotheisms," as W. St. Clair Tisdall points out in his *Christianity and Other Faiths.* Dr. Zwemer also characterizes Mohammedanism as "the pantheism of Force" (1. c. p. 4). But, when he contends that "the prophet Mohammed did not proclaim a new deity, but fought Arabian pagan idolatry and called the Arabs back to the worship of the one living God" (cf. *Theol. Monthly*, 1943, p. 609), he reveals that he is caught in the syncretistic error of Zwinglians and Papists who believe that even such pagan philosophers as Socrates, Seneca, etc., worshiped the one true God; and at the same time his statement illustrates the fact that those who are regarded as "monotheistic" are thereby classed as having the true God. By his emphasis on the defects of "the natural knowledge of God," Dr. Kretzmann avoids such errors.

Unfortunately, he does not follow these Biblical principles in every case, but is misled by the authorities he quotes into ascribing certain monotheistic expressions in ancient Chinese religion to a "primitive revelation": "It certainly seems that in the original form of the ancient Chinese religion, a remnant of the tradition of the Noachian times survived for almost two millenniums" (p. 90). Now the fact is that Dr. Legge, who is the chief authority for this theory regarding Chinese religion, held consistently that the god, Shang-Di, in China was the true monotheistic God, not only in early ages, but down to the present day. He recognized the obvious fact that there was no real difference between the Shang-Di of the earliest Classics and the Confucian Shang-Di of today. There is no half-way house between his position and that which puts Shang-Di in exactly the same class as Veruna in India, Zeus in Greece, Marduk in Babylon, etc. The evidences for "Noachian monotheism" are in reality far stronger in ancient Babylonia and India than they are in China, there being only a very tenuous connection between China and the religion of Babel. The only reason why China has so often been represented as superior to other countries in this respect is that there have been too few investigators who have studied the matter independently of the syncretistic findings of such earlier students of Chinese religion as the Jesuits, Legge, etc., and who have had enough knowledge of the language to detect the misleading translations in their renderings of the Classics. Dr. Kretzmann's criticisms of

* Our italics.

Shang-Di worship in China today (p. 100ff.) should be extended to every period of Chinese history; then it would be consistent with the facts and Bible teachings throughout.

It is, we believe, a fallacy also to argue against false religions on the basis of human reason and logic alone. For, as Dr. Kretzmann correctly states: "Reasonable as monotheism is from the standpoint of those who know the truth and who read the proofs of the divine power and eternal godhead aright, it is definitely established in the history of religion that man prefers to be unreasonable in religious matters" (p. 61). It is, then, a rather vain exercise in logic to try to prove the unreasonableness of heathen polytheisms when addressing those who make their own reason their god. The scholarly Hindu philosopher, Sarkar, pays his respect to writers on Comparative Religion, just in this connection, in these words: "One of the great superstitions of the modern age has been the glorification of the so-called monotheism. Monotheism has been awarded by scholars the place of honor in the schedule of religious systems. It is supposed to be the ideally best system. Students of comparative mythology and comparative religion have, therefore, managed to detect in their favorite Indo-Aryan lore grand conceptions of monotheistic faith. Asiatic scholars also in their anxiety to be abreast of the modern spirit have fallen an easy prey to this superstition. Taking the cue from European students, Asiatic students have been tempted to catalogue the faiths of the Confucianists, Taoists, Vedists, Buddhists, — etc. — as monotheistic. Nothing can be farther from the truth. A preconceived theory or the imagination of closet-philosophers can not give the lie to facts" (p. 277).

Many modern writers identify Christian monotheism as belonging to an out-moded monarchical age and claim that our modern democratic age must do away with the idea of one supreme god and credit *all* men with, at least, something of the divine. In brief, the most we can say for any religion that is not based throughout on the revealed Word of God is that "it is essentially composite, pluralistic, polytheistic, with a monistic or monotheistic *undercurrent*," — to quote Sarkar again. And that applies both to ancient religions and to modern non-Christian religions. Thus Unitarianism becomes "essentially pluralistic" by its deification of every "good man," while Christian Science is obviously pantheistic, as is evolutionary Modernism, etc.

We believe it necessary to voice these criticisms of an otherwise excellent book, since the tendency to overrate certain heathen religions has borne bitter fruit in the Missouri Synod's China Mission, as those familiar with the "Term Question" controversy there will appreciate.

Geo. O. Lillegard.

* * *

Alle hier angegebenen Sachen können durch unser Northwestern Publishing House, 935-937 North Fourth Street, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin, bezogen werden.

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben von der Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Synode von
Wisconsin und anderen Staaten.

Jahrgang 41

April 1944

Nummer 2

Study on 1 Corinthians 15

NOTE. The Milwaukee City Pastoral Conference of the Wisconsin Synod has for several years devoted a number of its monthly meetings to a series of discussions on questions of Eschatology. Our glorious hope of a resurrection unto eternal life is the present topic. The undersigned was asked to present a brief study on Paul's comprehensive argument in 1 Cor. 15. The following is the first part, as submitted and discussed on November 15, 1943.

An army chaplain is reported, unblushingly, to have stated that in conducting a number of soldier burials "he never was asked to, and in fact never did, speak of the glorious hope of the resurrection." Paul never could thus conceal his hope in the resurrection. When questioned by the materialistic Epicureans and the pantheistic Stoics in Athens, he openly spoke of the coming resurrection. His position was: "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" (Acts 26, 8). So he said to the sophisticated "chief captains" and the "principal men" of Caesarea, who at Festus' invitation had come with Agrippa and Bernice to hear this strange prisoner. People who doubted the resurrection he considered to "have no hope" (1 Thess. 4, 13). If any teacher adulterated the doctrine of the resurrection, teaching as did Hymenaeus and Philetus "that the resurrection is past already" (2 Tim. 2, 17), he called their doctrine "profane and vain babblings," and charged them with "overthrowing the faith" (1. c. vv. 16. 18). To Paul the doctrine of the resurrection was essential for the Gospel, and he tolerated no tampering with it. When uncertainties in the matter troubled the Corinthian church, he penned, by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the exhaustive treatise on resurrection in the 15th chapter of his first (extant) letter to that congregation.

Verses 1-4.

(1) Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I have preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; (2) By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. (3) For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; (4) And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.*

It arrests our attention, and certainly is noteworthy, that Paul begins his discussion of the resurrection with an emphatic reference to the Gospel. He addresses his readers as *brethren*, thereby assuring them not only of his love for them and of their common interests, but also of the faith which they hold jointly. This brotherhood he prizes highly and because this brotherhood fills him both with concern and with hope, he now is going to speak to them on the matters as he does.

He begins with an emphatic *gnōrizō*, which here might best be rendered with *I call your attention to*. In their doubtings about the resurrection they evidently lost sight of the Gospel. If they ever had kept the Gospel in mind, it is unthinkable that they could have wavered but for a moment, that they could hesitate in the least about accepting wholeheartedly the hope of the resurrection. They would cling to it most tenaciously.

It is not a new Gospel, nor a new aspect of the Gospel, which Paul is about to present, but the old Gospel as he preached it to them on his first visit now more than five years ago; the old Gospel as they then received it in faith, the hope of their righteousness, life, and salvation; the old Gospel which proved its worth, its life-giving power ever since they first heard it, and continues to be the mainspring of their life; they *stand* by virtue of it, stand in their sanctification, stand up under the cross, stand their ground against all enemies, stand in the judgment of God, seeing that by it they are constantly *receiving their salvation* (*sōzesthe*).

* For ready reference the text of the King James version is being reprinted with the essay. The study itself and the discussions of the Conference were based on the Greek original.

Paul does not have to add anything new to the Gospel. He can ask for the statement (*logos*) with which he proclaimed it, if they are retaining it. *Unless, unless* — this is so preposterous an assumption that Paul doubles the thought in two different expressions *ektos ei mē*. Now unless what? Unless ye believed *in vain*. Unless your faith was an empty, useless thing. — Preposterous! Every Corinthian could testify what his faith had meant to him, and that he would never give it up. Rather die than give up this treasure-filled faith. Faith an empty thing? Never. Herein Paul fully agrees with them. The Gospel he delivered unto them was the same one which he also had accepted, and which he never again would drop.

But what is that Gospel? What is the very statement (*logos*) in which Paul proclaimed that Gospel? Paul enumerates three facts as constituting the Gospel in a nutshell: that Christ died, that He was buried, that He rose again. This is the Gospel as Paul preached it *en prōtois*, the Gospel reduced to its basic elements, to its first principles.

The first fact is the vicarious death of Christ. He died *for (hyper) our sins*. Paul does not enlarge on this doctrine in this place. It must be mentioned, and he does mention it, but lets it go at that. He adds, however, that the vicarious death of Christ took place “according to the Scriptures.” The Old Testament does not incidentally refer to the vicarious death of Christ, rather, that is its main theme from the very beginning on down through the ages, in all its history, in all its prophecies, in all its forms and symbols: everything points to the sacrificial death of Christ to make atonement for our sins.

Paul mentions as a second basic fact the burial of Christ. We may be somewhat at a loss what precisely to make of the burial of Christ. Not many sermons are preached on it. Yet here we see, where Paul enumerates the basic facts of the Gospel he does not fail to include the burial. Like Paul, the Apostles' Creed makes mention of the burial.

Jesus himself referred to His future burial very emphatically on one occasion. When He was in the home of Lazarus and his sisters Mary and Martha He justified Mary's act of

anointing Him with expensive nard: "Let her alone, why trouble ye her? She hath wrought a good work on me. . . . She hath done what she could; she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying" (Mc. 14, 6.8). Or as John records (chap. 12, 7): "Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this." Also the great chapter in the Old Testament on the vicarious suffering and death of our Savior contains a reference to His burial: "He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death" (Is. 53, 9). The burial puts the final touches on His sacrifice; it serves as a seal on His death.

While Paul sometimes stresses the fact that we have *died* with Christ — as in Gal. 2, 20: "I am crucified with Christ"; or in 2 Cor. 5, 14: "We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead" — on other occasions he mentions the burial instead; as in Rom. 6, 4: "We are buried with him by baptism into death"; or in Col. 2, 12: "Buried with him in baptism."

The third basic fact is the resurrection on the third day: *and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.*

Consistently the Scriptures mention the third day as the day of resurrection. Jesus calls attention to the fact that this time was pre-figured in the story of Jonah: "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Mt. 12, 40). The question how the various statements concerning this period of time can best be harmonized, has so often been treated that we need not enter on a discussion now, particularly since Paul in his argument about the resurrection makes no special use of the precise time (Cp. the brief remark by Schaller in his *Biblical Christology*, p. 75).

We note, however, as interesting and instructive a change in the tense of the verb. While for the death and burial of Christ Paul used the simple historical Aorist, thus merely stressing these events as facts (*apethanen, etaphē*), he records the resurrection with a Perfect, *egēgertai*. The resurrection is not merely an event of the past, completed in the past: it has results which continue in force in the present. Jesus, our Savior, lives never again to undergo death, lives ever to dis-

pense life to His followers, lives a life triumphant over death, lives to restore to life even those who have, according to all appearances, hopelessly fallen victims to death. Neither the English nor the German language is able to reproduce adequately by any verb form the full force of the Greek Perfect, which names an action as completed in the past and as having lasting results which continue to the present and in the present. In fact, the latter is always the more important thought of the statement. — Well does this reminder fit into the argument of Paul concerning our hope of resurrection.

Twice in enumerating the basic facts of the Gospel Paul adds the modifier “according to the scriptures,” the reference being to the Old Testament. Just as the Old Testament, not incidentally but definitely, predicts the death of our Savior, so also it predicts His resurrection. We have already referred to the story of Jonah and the whale, which prefigured both the burial and the resurrection. The great chapter on the suffering and death of Jesus, Is. 53, makes the clear prediction that after His suffering for our sin has been completed “he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days,” adding that His will be a life filled with vigorous activity: “The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.” The 16th Psalm voices the sure expectation that the Savior’s soul will not be left in hell, and that the Holy One will not see corruption, while the 110th Psalm foresees the exaltation of our Lord to the right hand of God in heaven. In this hope Job found comfort against his afflictions. His Redeemer was a *living* Redeemer. — But why multiply quotations to illustrate Paul’s “according to the scriptures”?

We note, however, carefully that Paul uses this emphatic modifier twice, and omits it concerning the burial. This method seems to subordinate the burial somewhat over against the other two facts, the death and the resurrection of the of the Savior. Apparently the burial has not the independent value of the others. It must be viewed, not in itself, but in connection with those. On the one hand it completes the death, testifying to its reality. “Dust to dust.” On the other, it prepares for the resurrection. Note the details with which the Gospel records elaborate on the burial: the names of the

men taking care of it, the official permission procured from Pilate, the witnessing women, the temporary preparation of the corpse, the newness of the tomb, the nearness of the place, the garden, the stone door, the seal, the guards. The great resurrection, indeed, was well prepared, the stage was set elaborately.

The three basic facts of the Gospel constitute a unit, the death and resurrection of Jesus being indissolubly linked together by His burial.

The broad Gospel foundation having been laid, Paul proceeds to secure firmly the one factor which he intends to use with telling force in his argument. The question in Corinth did not turn about the atonement for our sins. All were agreed that the death of Christ had completely and definitely disposed of our guilt. What they failed to see was that the hope of resurrection is an integral part of our faith. To make them conscious of this hope, and to reassure their faith on this point was the aim of Paul's presentation. So he turns to the resurrection of Christ and shows how well it is attested. He does so in

Verses 5-11.

- (5) And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; (6) After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. (7) After that, he was seen of James, then of all the apostles. (8) And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. (9) For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. (10) But by the grace of God I am what I am; and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain, but I labored more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me. (11) Therefore whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed.

If we study the connectives in this enumeration of witnesses we find that Paul twice says "then," twice "after that," and once "last of all." "After that" and "last of all" seem to introduce major members in the enumeration, while "then" seems to point to a subdivision. Furthermore, these connectives do not seem to indicate a temporal succession of apparitions of our Lord, but rather a certain logical grouping of the witnesses. There are thus told four classes:

First there is Peter and the Twelve.

Secondly, there are the more than 500 brethren.

Third, James and the others, outside of the Twelve, who were known as apostles.

Lastly, there is Paul himself, who brought the Gospel to the Corinthians.

Concerning the first class Paul does not add a single word. It was sufficient to mention them. Every one in Corinth was familiar with the fact that these men had seen the risen Lord, and that they performed their work, their preaching, their miracles, their alms, their organizing, etc., in the conviction that they stood in the service of a living Savior who had been exalted to the right hand of God.

Concerning the second class Paul stresses several facts. The first is that there were more than 500 brethren who saw Him simultaneously. For us, who believe in verbal inspiration, it is an unquestioned fact that Paul wrote these words under the direction of the Holy Ghost. Foreseeing future objections to the resurrection of Christ, the Holy Spirit took occasion at the difficulties in Corinth to silence in advance an argument which otherwise might have some weight with the unwary. The first man to oppose Christianity on scientific grounds and with scientific weapons, Celsus, tried to dispose of the resurrection in this way: Who saw the Lord after His resurrection? An hysterical woman! In this way he tried to discredit the testimony. The Holy Spirit parried this thrust in advance by having Paul record the fact that more than 500 brethren saw Christ at one and the same time. If it must be granted that one person could be deceived by his imagination, was it likely, and could you expect unbiased men to assume, that more than 500 persons should be victims of the same hallucination at the same time? The claim of such a mass hallucination is simply preposterous. This fact confronts every one with an unescapable dilemma: either we must admit the truth of the testimony of the 500, which moreover has already produced a vigorous, hopeful faith in the hearts of thousands; or we must assume an almost fathomless gullibility on the part of the 500, and must, in addition, explain how so stupendous a deception could produce the blessed fruits which

were experienced by thousands of believers. In view of this dilemma, to accept the historicity of the resurrection of Christ taxes our intellect far less than to reject it.

Concerning this second class Paul, furthermore, has this to say: that the majority of those 500 or more witnesses were still among the living, and thus could be questioned and cross-examined at any time. When Paul wrote his first letter to the Corinthians, more than a quarter century had passed since Jesus' resurrection. Think what this means. It is now about a quarter century since the first World War. How many of any given group of 500 during World War I are still living today? Should we not thank God for His providential care extended to these 500 witnesses of the resurrection of our Savior? Concerning some, a comparatively small number, Paul says that they have fallen asleep, asleep in Jesus whose resurrection they had been privileged to attest. Paul does no more than to mention the fact that they fell asleep.

The third class of witnesses which Paul introduces consists of James and all the apostles. These were not among the Twelve. James was the first chief presbyter of the congregation at Jerusalem, whom we meet as such at the Council in Jerusalem, about the year 51. Read Acts 15, and the other references to this meeting. The apostles here mentioned in distinction from the Twelve were men like Barnabas (Acts 14, 14), Andronicus and Junia (Rom. 16, 7), and others, missionary men of that type. All had at some time seen the risen Lord.

Lastly, Paul mentions himself as a witness to the resurrection of Christ. His testimony should carry special weight. There was a great difference between him and the other witnesses. Compared with them, he is like an *ektrōma*, a dead foetus — yet brought to life. What Paul means to say with this comparison he tells us himself immediately. There follows an explanatory *gar*. While the other witnesses even in their darkest moments were assailed merely by doubts if Jesus really might be the One they were expecting, while they never lost their affection for Him and for the Word which He proclaimed, Paul on his part had rejected Jesus *in toto*. He saw in Jesus a curse, the ruin of the hope of Israel. With all

his heart he persecuted the church of God. No salvation could come to Israel unless this evil was stamped out root and stock.

What had come over this man, so that now he testified to the same Jesus whom formerly he hated and persecuted? He calls himself the least of the apostles, not worthy to have received the call as an apostle. What had effected this radical change in the man and had transformed him from a fanatic enemy into an enthusiastic supporter of the church?

Paul ascribes it all to the grace of God. "By the grace of God I am what I am." And the "grace of God" proved very effective in his case. He put in many hours of strenuous labor, and his efforts were always productive of results, so that he achieved far more abundant fruits than even the other laborers of our Lord. Paul points to these things, not in order to remind his readers of his untiring application to his work in their midst, nor to the blessings which they reaped from it, but to show the boundless efficacy of God's grace, which by far transcends our imagination. "Not I, Paul repeats, not I, but the grace of God which was with me."

The "grace of God" was with Paul in a very concrete and tangible form. He knew of no other grace than that Jesus Christ had come into the world to save sinners, among whom he counted himself as chief. Paul employed no other means in his work than to preach Christ, and Him crucified. Everywhere, as in Thessalonica, he "reasoned with them out of the scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ" (Acts 17, 2. 3). With this word of grace alone he operates everywhere, and with it achieved his success, so phenomenal that in 2 Cor. 2, 14, he compares his mission journeys to one unbroken triumphal procession, granted by God in Christ.

But first of all this grace of God had proven its effectiveness in Paul himself. He considered himself, and he will remain for all times, the outstanding example of what the grace of God can achieve, changing a fanatic persecutor into an enthusiastic promoter of the faith he formerly destroyed.

To this man, so changed, the risen Lord had appeared. Should he not now be a reliable witness to the resurrection,

seeing it was the power of the risen Christ which had produced the change? He in his person was a living monument to the resurrection.

Now all these witnesses — to enumerate them again: Peter and the Twelve; more than 500 brethren simultaneously, most of whom could then still be questioned; James, the first presiding presbyter of Jerusalem and the other early missionaries; lastly, Paul the wonderfully remade man — all these witnesses are unanimous in their preaching that Jesus arose from the dead. In fact, this is the crowning part of their message. Note how Paul emphasizes this unanimity by a certain form of regrouping the witnesses, making two classes out of the four: he combines all the others in one and places himself in a class by himself. "Therefore, whether it were I or they, so we preach." The collective testimony of all the other eye-witnesses, on the one hand, and his personal testimony, on the other, are in perfect agreement. There is, historically speaking, no better attested fact than the resurrection of Jesus.

Having summarized the Gospel as every one of the appointed messengers preaches it, Paul adds emphatically, "and so ye believed." Twice he uses the adverb modifier *so* (*houtōs*): "So we preach, and so ye believed." Listen to any one of the Gospel messengers, the death and the resurrection of Jesus are the sum and substance of their message. If they omitted one of these basic facts they would cease to be Gospel messengers. *So* we preach: the tense of the verb (Present) stating not only the fact of this action but at the same time indicating the enduring character of the message. "So we preach" emphatically includes the thought that this is the content, ever, of our message.

"And so ye believed." This then states the fruit of such preaching. This message of the death and resurrection of Jesus aroused the dead hearts of the Corinthians to new spiritual life. This message kindled faith in their hearts. With this remark Paul reverts to what he said in the opening verses of the chapter: "which also ye have received . . . unless ye have believed in vain." The verb translated in v. 2 with *ye have believed*, and here in v. 11 with *ye believed*, in the

original Greek has the same form in both cases: *episteusate*, the Aorist. The meaning in both cases seems to be the same, in spite of the difference in the translation. The Aorist simply states their believing as a fact of the past. Sometimes the Aorist is used to indicate the beginning of an action (Ingressive Aorist). *Episteusa* is often used in that way: I began to believe, I came to faith. But it may well be doubted whether this was the thought in Paul's mind when he here in 1 Cor. 15 wrote *episteusate*: unless you *came to faith* in vain (v. 2), and so you *came to faith* (v. 11). The beginning of their past faith is clearly not the important thing, but rather their faith itself, its object and content: unless your faith was an empty, useless thing (v. 2), and, this was the foundation on which your faith rested and the treasure which it embraced (v. 11).

Paul has now laid a broad and solid foundation. He has re-enforced particularly that factor on which he plans to build his further discussion. This he has done not only with a view to fortifying his arguments, and to clinching his conclusion logically: he has prepared the hearts of his readers, he has revived their faith, and made them conscious once more of both its glorious foundation and content. He is now ready to attack the doubts which harassed the Corinthians. M.

(To be continued)

Der Antichrift

Die Ansprüche der Bischöfe von Rom in bezug auf Alleinherrschaft über alle Reiche der Welt.

Wie in dem vorhergehenden Aufsatz gezeigt wurde, hatten nun die Päpste ihre Herrschsucht, die nach absoluter Alleinherrschaft über die ganze Kirche strebte, befriedigt, d. h., was die westliche Kirche betraf. Denn das Streben, auch die östliche Kirche ihrer Gewalt unterzuordnen, war im Jahre 1054 endgültig gescheitert, als beide Kirchen übereinander das Anathema ausgesprochen hatten.

Mit der Einnahme dieses ersten Reiches aber, der Kirche, war die Sucht der Päpste nach Gewalt und Herrschaft keineswegs befriedigt; sie begehrte mehr. Sie wollte alle Reiche der Welt, Kaiser und Könige und Fürsten zu ihren Füßen sehen. Davon sei jetzt die Rede.

Auch hier liegt ein langes Kapitel vor uns, das sich durch viele Jahrhunderte hindurchzieht. Wir finden, daß bereits in den ersten Jahrhunderten Bischöfe Roms sich in die Politik mischten und versuchten, ihren Willen den weltlichen Herrschern aufzudrängen. Ihren Höhepunkt erreichte dieses Streben päpstlicher Herrschsucht in Papst Gregor VII., 1073 bis 1085. Vom 14. Jahrhundert an begann der Einfluß der Päpste über die Regierungen zu schwinden. Päpste wie Johannes XXII., Clemens VI., Bonifazius IX. und andere, von denen einige durch Konzilien wie Konstanz, 1414, sogar abgesetzt wurden, hatten dafür gesorgt durch ihren aller Beschreibung spottenden gottlosen Wandel, daß die Päpste überall nur noch der größten Verachtung begegneten. Mit dem 14. Jahrhundert freilich haben die päpstlichen Ansprüche auf absolute Weltherrschaft keineswegs nachgelassen; sie sind heute noch so groß wie vordem. Der „Mensch der Sünde“ bleibt sich gleich, bis ihm der Herr an jenem Tage ein Ende bereiten wird. Hierfür, für die unerfättliche Herrschsucht der Päpste, die auch heute alle Weltreiche verschlingen möchte, haben wir keinen besseren Beweis als das Concilium Vaticanum mit seinen Beschlüssen, 1869–1870.

Auch hier, wie es ja in allen anderen Dingen ist, begegnen wir einem allmählichen Anwachsen. Erst nur hin und wieder leise Forderungen, die sich mit den Jahren steigern, bis sie in maßlose Ansprüche ausarten, besonders in Italien, Spanien, Portugal, England, Frankreich, Dänemark, Schweden und hauptsächlich in Deutschland. Schon Karl Martell, 714–741, und Pippin der Kleine, 741–768, mußten die Herrschgelüste der Päpste erfahren. Karl der Große, 768–814, der seine Unabhängigkeit dem Papste gegenüber sich freilich zu wahren mußte, ließ sich die Kaiserkrone aus der Hand des Papstes Leo III. geben, ein Zeichen päpstlicher Herrschsucht, daß sie es sind, die allein das Recht haben, weltliche Kronen aufzusetzen und abzunehmen; ein Herrscher über alle Reiche der Welt, der Papst. Welch endlose Kämpfe mußten Nachfolger Karls des Großen doch mit den Päpsten ausfechten, Friedrich I., Friedrich II. und allermeist Heinrich IV., 1056–1106, mit Papst Gregor VII.! Wir sind hiermit in den dunklen Tagen des Mittelalters. Auf seiten der römischen Päpste sehen wir hier eine schier unbeschreibliche Tiefe bodenloser List und Verschlagenheit, Treulosigkeit, echt politischer Unwahrhaftigkeit, voll kluger Berechnung, auf welcher Seite am meisten zu erobern sei, nur darauf bedacht, auf alle Kaiser, Könige, Fürsten, Grafen usw. den

päpstlichen Daumen zu drücken. Man muß die Geschichte dieser Jahrhunderte lesen, um sich ein zutreffendes Bild zu machen von der Tiefe römischer Herrschgellüste. Hören wir, was Kaiser Friedrich II., 1215–1250, in einem Rundschreiben an die christlichen Fürsten, in dem er sie zum 5. Kreuzzug aufforderte, in bezug auf die Päpste urteilte (Gregor IX. hatte ihn in den Bann getan, weil er mit der Ausführung des 5. Kreuzzugs zauderte): „Das ist die römische Weise, die ich auch erkannt habe. Hinter widerlichen Redensarten, die von Honig und Del überfließen, verbirgt sich die unerzättliche Blutgagerin; sie, die sich meine Mutter nennt, behandelt mich wie eine Stiefmutter, die alles Uebel stiftet. Wenn das Römische Reich von Feinden und Ungläubigen angegriffen wird, so greift der Kaiser zum Schwert und weiß, was seines Amtes ist und was seine Ehre erheischt; wenn aber der Vater der Christenheit, der Nachfolger Petri, der Statthalter Christi, uns bedrängt, was sollen wir da beginnen?“ (Hagenbach).

Hagenbach über Innozens III.: „Wie er, die andern vor ihm, von einer Seite zur andern schwankt, bald zu diesem, bald zu jenem, immer, was seinen Herrschaftsgelüsten am günstigsten.“

„Im Jahre 1177 kam es zwischen Kaiser Friedrich I. und Papst Alexander III. in Venedig zum Frieden, für den Kaiser demütigend, ein neuer Triumph der päpstlichen Macht. Oeffentlich und süßfällig mußte der Kaiser vor dem Papst Abbitte tun und ihn als rechtmäßigen Nachfolger Petri anerkennen. Der Papst setzte seinen Fuß auf den Nacken des Kaisers und sagte: „Auf Löwen und Ottern wirst du treten“ Ps. 91, 13 (Hagenbach). Wir alle wissen, wie Gregor VII. Kaiser Heinrich IV. im Jahre 1077 zu Canossa im Schlosse der Gräfin Mathilde demütigte. Gregor weilte dort zur Zeit. Heinrich IV. war von ihm in den Bann getan worden. Heinrich kam nach Canossa mit der Bitte, der Papst möchte doch den Bann aufheben. Was tat aber Gregor? Drei Tage lang ließ er Heinrich, in ein Büßergewand gekleidet, in der Kälte draußen vor dem Tore stehn, bis er ihm auftrat.

Die Geschichte der Jahrhunderte, in denen die Päpste ihre absolut ungeredtfertigten Ansprüche auf Weltherrschaft mit allen ihnen zu Gebote stehenden Mitteln zu erreichen suchen, ist freilich so groß, daß hier auf Einzelheiten nicht eingegangen werden kann. Es liegt hier nur dies als Ziel vor zu zeigen, wie der geweißsagte „Mensch der Sünde“, der **nur** in der Herrschaft **über alles** Befriedigung findet,

auch darin in den römischen Päpsten seine Erfüllung gefunden hat, daß diese von einer unerfättlichen Gier nach Herrschaft sich zum Oberhaupt aller Weltreiche zu machen suchten, wie es ihnen betreffs der Kirche gelungen war.

Um recht hervorzuheben und zu bekräftigen, daß das Papsttum seinem ganzen Wesen nach nichts als unbegrenzte Herrschsucht ist, **nur dies allein**, die auch alle Reiche der Welt verschlingen möchte, so daß alle Könige, Fürsten und Präsidenten, sich ihrer Abhängigkeit von Rom bewußt, nur auf die Winke und Instruktionen hören, die von Rom ausgehen, seien einige Zitate von Historikern angeführt und dann, was Päpste selbst in dieser Hinsicht gefordert haben.

Dr. **Heinrich Schmid**, Universität Erlangen, schreibt in seiner Kirchengeschichte, B. I, S. 236: „Das Papsttum in der Zeit seiner Blüte“: „Nachdem es Jahrhunderte hindurch unentschieden geblieben war, welche der beiden Gewalten, die weltliche oder die geistliche, die Oberhand haben sollte, entbrennt gegen Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts ein Kampf zwischen diesen beiden Gewalten, der mit einem nahezu vollständigen Sieg der geistlichen Gewalt endet. Das **eigentliche** Papsttum ist das Ergebnis dieses Kampfes. Dasselbe ist seinen Grundgedanken nach durchaus keine neue Erscheinung, denn längst schon war es ausgesprochen, daß der römische Bischof oberster Inhaber und Herr, wie der geistlichen, so auch der weltlichen Gewalt sei.“

„Es kam jetzt nur darauf an, daß Männer auftraten, die entschlossen waren, die Gewalt, die bereits die Zeit ihnen zusprach, nach beiden Seiten hin, nach Seite der Kirche und nach Seite des Staates, auch wirklich zur Geltung zu bringen. Ein solcher Mann aber entstand in Gregor VII. und er gab den Päpsten einen solchen Impuls, daß sie nicht eher ruhten, als bis sie ihr Ziel erreicht hatten.“

K. Venrath, protestantischer Theologe, Universität Bonn, über Ultramontanismus: „In dem eindringenden, weithin orientierenden Artikel „Römische Kirche“ stellt Rattenbusch als das Unterscheidende des „römischen Typus“ hin, daß das Christentum, während es für den Protestantismus eine **Weltanschauung**, vielmehr für den römischen Katholizismus eine **Herrschaft** sei. Natürlich ist jener Weltanschauung beziehungsweise ihren Vertretern Recht und Trieb der Expansion damit nicht abgedungen, aber die Expansion bezieht sich prinzipiell nur auf das geistige Gebiet und die Mittel sollen und werden dem entsprechen. Dagegen ist nicht allein erklärlich, sondern geht aus dem Wesen des römischen Katholizismus hervor, daß die Geltendmachung

der Herrschaft durch ihn je nach Lage der Verhältnisse auch auf dem weltlichen Gebiete gesucht wird.“

F. Rattenbusch über „Römische Kirche“: „Ueber den Staat kann der Katholizismus zu jeder Zeit sehr „loyale“ Gedanken äußern. Die Idee, daß der Papst wohl gar einmal ein weltlicher Universalmonarch werden könne, der auch „unmittelbar“ wie die Kirche, so die Reiche dieser Welt regieren könne, ist mindestens zur Zeit aufgegeben. (?) In „seiner Sphäre“ ist der Staat nach der Erklärung Leo's XIII. selbständig und berechtigt, Gehorsam zu verlangen vom Katholiken wie von jedem. Aber wenn das Gebiet des Staats als das des „bürgerlichen Lebens“ definiert wird, so zeigt der Papst nur sehr unbestimmt, wie dies Leben von demjenigen, welches die Kirche ihrerseits nicht minder „selbständig“, unbedingt frei und autoritativ beherrschen soll, unterschieden werden könne. Die Kirche hat „allein“ und „alles“ in ihrer Gewalt, was „zum Himmel führt“. Dem Staate gehört das rein weltliche Gebiet. Aber die Kirche will doch mit in der Welt leben und hat höchst weltliche Interessen in Vermögensdingen usw. Sie selbst will definieren können und nach ihren entscheidenden Entscheidungen unbedingt respektiert sehen, was ihr da „zukomme“. Und nun bedenke man weiter, daß die Kirche doch nicht nur die fides, sondern auch die mores als „ihre“ Sphäre betrachtet. Die Enzyklika Leo's (Immortale Dei, 1. November 1885) tritt für den „göttlichen Ursprung“ der Staatsgewalt als einer „Ordnung“ ein. Sie scheint alle „Revolution“ zu verwerfen, ist aber im allgemeinen mehr ein Appell an die Fürsten, sich an die Kirche, die sie „schütze“, vertrauensvoll anzulehnen, als eine wirkliche Belehrung darüber, was des Staates sei.“

Rattenbusch „scheint bei diesen Auslassungen selbst seine Zweifel zu haben, daß nämlich durch diese echt jesuitischen Ausführungen die alten päpstlichen Ansprüche auf Weltherrschaft nur verdeckt sind. Indem er aus „Staatslexikon“, herausgegeben im Auftrage der Görresgesellschaft zur Pflege der Wissenschaft im katholischen Deutschland, 1. Aufl. 5 Bände, 1887–1897, P. V. Gaffner, Bischof von Mainz, zitiert, sagt er: „Das ist ein lehrreicher Kommentar zu jenen neuesten päpstlichen Auslassungen.“ Gaffner: „Bei voller Anerkennung der Verschiedenheit, Selbständigkeit und Unabhängigkeit beider Autoritäten (König und Papst) kann es doch nie und nimmermehr als ein Verhältnis der Gleichgültigkeit noch der Koordination gefaßt werden. Der christliche Herrscher ist in seinen gesetzgebenden, richter-

lichen und politischen Funktionen, ebenso wie in seinem Privatleben, dem Lehramt und Hirtenamt wie dem priesterlichen Amte der Kirche unterworfen. Alle Einrichtungen, Gesetze und Handlungen der weltlichen Regierungen unterstehen der Direktive der höchsten kirchlichen Autorität, sofern es dieser zukommt, sie in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Interessen der sittlich-religiösen Ordnung zu prüfen und zu regeln.“

Dr. K. R. Hagenbach, Prof. der Theol. zu Basel, „Vorlesungen über die Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters vom 7. bis 12. Jahrhundert,“ 1860. Erste Vorlesung, S. 5: „Jetzt erst, im Zeitalter von Karl dem Großen bis auf Gregor VII. und von da wieder weiter bis auf Innozenz III. sehen wir die päpstliche Macht, die bis dahin noch in natürlichen Schranken gehalten war, mit Riesenschritten vorwärtsdringen. Der Gedanke, nicht nur der Bornehmste zu sein unter den Bischöfen, sondern die ganze apostolische Gewalt, von der die übrigen Bischöfe nur ein Ausfluß war, in sich zu vereinigen, mit einem Wort, der Gedanke, sich als der sichtbare Statthalter Christi im ausgedehntesten Sinne des Wortes darzustellen als den Herrn der ewigen Stadt und **des ganzen Weltkreises** (urbis et orbis), der Gedanke beherrschte mehr und mehr die Träger der päpstlichen Würde. Und dazu waren die Verhältnisse günstig.“

Derjelbe: „Mehr als einmal werden uns die Päpste als die Beschützer des Rechts, als die Verteidiger der Unschuld, ja, als Vertreter der Humanität erscheinen gegenüber den Roheiten der Jahrhunderte, aber ebenso oft werden wir unser Lob wieder beschränken müssen, wenn wir die schöne Stellung getrübt sehen durch die Sünde des Hochmuts und einer **unbegrenzten Herrschucht**.“

Derjelbe: „Diesen (Bonifazius) sendet der Papst mit Briefen an Karl Martell und die thüringischen Großen. Er empfiehlt nicht nur, er gebietet, er droht. Segen verheißt er denen, die seinen Gesandten als einen Gesandten und Diener Gottes aufnehmen; Fluch und Verdammnis haben alle die zu erwarten, die sich ihm widersetzen. In allen diesen Schreiben drückt sich **das Hoheitsgefühl** der Päpste entschieden aus.“

Ueber Bonifazius derselbe, 2. Vortrag, S. 31: „Daß Bonifazius in demselben Maße die Herrschaft Roms befördert, als er das Christentum zum Siege führte, das ist freilich eine Tatsache, die feststeht. Als ein Sendling des römischen Stuhles teilte auch Bonifazius dieselben Vorurteile, in denen wir das römische System befangen sehen und griff auch wohl zu denselben Maßregeln der Gewalt gegen

alle die, welche sich der unbedingten Herrschaft Roms nicht fügen wollten.“

Derjelbe: „Nikolaus I., 858–867, ein Mann von feltlenen Gaben und eifernem Charakter, trat mit Forderungen auf, die über alles hinausgingen, was die Päpste bisher errungen hatten. Nicht der Erste zu fein im Range, der Oberfte zu fein unter den Priestern der Kirche innerhalb der Schranken staatlicher Ordnung, nicht das genügte ihm, fondern was bei ihm unverhüllt hervortritt und was er mit ebenjo viel Gefchick und Erfolg durchführte, das war der Gedanke: Alle kirchliche Macht, heiße fie konftitutive oder gefezgebende oder richterliche Gewalt ift in der Perfon des Papftes konzentriert und in feiner Hand vereinigt.“

Meander (von Hagenbach zitiert) über Innozens III.: „Innozens war von der Idee der päpftlichen Weltmonarchie ganz erfüllt und mußte zur Verwirklichung derfelben die Umftände mit Kraft und Klugheit zu nutzen. Seine Tätigkeit war von ungeheurem Umfange; fie verbreitete fich nach allen Weltgegenden. Aufmerksam war er auf alles, was in Kirche und Staat überall vorfiel. Ueber Bifchöfe und Fürften machte er feine höchfte richterliche Gewalt mit Feftigkeit geltend.“

Ausfprüche von Päpften und ihres Anhanges über weltliche Gewalt der Päpste.

Augustin Triumphus von Ancona (Augustiner): „Die Gewalt des Papftes ift unmittelbar von Gott. Er kann jede weltliche Macht abfezen; das Urteilen des Papftes als Richter ift größer als das der Engel. Der Papft hat Gewalt über Himmel und Erde; er kann Kaijer erwählen. Der Kaijer ift ein Diener des Papftes. Der Papft hat unmittelbar das Recht, die Wahl eines Kaijers zu beftätigen. Er kann die Gefetze des Landes ändern. Der Papft hat in diefem Leben keinen Richter über fich.“ (The Dark Ages von Th. Graebner.)

Derjelbe: „Ift es möglich, daß jemand, wenn er mit des Papftes Urteil nicht zufrieden ift, fich an Gott wenden kann? Nur der Papft ift Gottes Stellvertreter, nur, was er löst und bindet, ift von Gott. Gottes und des Papftes Urteil find eins. Niemand kann fich vom Papft zu Gott wenden, denn das Urteil des Papftes ift das Gottes, da der Papft die Schlüssel hat und die Tür zu Gottes Ratzimmer öffnet. Niemand kann fich vom Papft auf Gott berufen“ (ebendaſelbſt).

Benzelinus, 1325: „Es muß für ketzerisch angesehen werden zu glauben, daß unser Herr Gott der Papst, der Autor des angeführten Dekrets, nicht habe die Macht, so zu befehlen, wie er befohlen hat.“ *Credere autem Dominum Deum nostrum Papam, conditorem dictae decretalis, sic non potuisse statuere, prout statuit, haereticum censetur*“ (ebendasselbst).

Päpste:

Gelasius I., 492–496, in einem Brief an den griechischen Kaiser Anastasius, 494: „Zwei sind es, von denen diese Welt hauptsächlich regiert wird, die geweihte Autorität der Bischöfe und die königliche Gewalt; von diesen Aemtern ist das der Priester ein umso schwerwiegenderes, als sie beim göttlichen Gerichte auch für die Könige der Menschen werden Rechenschaft geben müssen.“ Schluß: Nur für das, das anvertraut ist, muß man Rechenschaft geben. Muß der Papst Rechenschaft geben auch für die Könige, sind sie ihm, seiner Weisheit und Autorität anvertraut. So schon im 5. Jahrhundert.

Nikolaus I., 858–867. Ueber diesen Papst schreibt S. Behmer (in Realencyklop. für protest. Theologie, D. N. Sauer): „Nikolaus geht weiter als die Pseudo-Isidorien (darüber später). Er begnügt sich nicht mit dieser die völlige Unabhängigkeit der Kirche von aller weltlichen Gewalt zu proklamieren, alle Staatsgesetze, die kirchlichen Rechten entgegenstehen, für unverbindlich zu erklären, die Bischofswahlen, die Gerichtsbarkeit über Geistliche, die Einberufung und Abhaltung von Synoden, ja selbst die Verfügung über die Pfarrkirchen und damit über das Kirchengut für die Kirche resp. für den Papst zu beanspruchen, er fordert auch unverhüllt den Ehrenvorrang vor allen weltlichen Fürsten und faktisk sogar eine förmliche Oberhoheit über alle weltlichen Gewalten. Die erstere Forderung ergibt sich schon aus der Tatsache, daß er in Briefen an Fürsten seinen Namen in der *inscriptio* stets an erster Stelle nennt und es energisch rügt, wenn die Fürsten in ihren Briefen diese Regel der Etikette nicht respektieren; die letztere, der Anspruch auf faktische Oberhoheit, geht aus seinem ganzen Verhalten den Fürsten gegenüber hervor: er mißt sich sehr häufig in ihre Angelegenheiten und nicht etwa bloß, um ihnen zu raten, sondern um ihnen zu befehlen, was ihm gut dünkt. Man sagt nicht zu viel, wenn man behauptet, Nikolaus habe die mittelalterliche Papstidee geschaffen.“

Gregor VII., 1073–1085, einer der größten Päpste, der die Papstidee mit allen Mitteln und Ausdauer durchzusetzen suchte. „Die

Grundvoraussetzung der Wirksamkeit Gregors ist die Vorstellung, daß die Kirche als göttliche Institution von der Welt als der Sphäre des Ungöttlichen spezifisch verschieden ist und vermöge ihrer Ueberlegenheit zur Herrschaft über die Welt berufen ist. Unter Kirche verstand er den Organismus der Hierarchie mit dem Papst an der Spitze. In der Schätzung des Papsttums ging er dabei so weit, daß er es mit der Kirche geradezu identifizierte und von hier aus seine Aufgaben und Rechte bestimmte.“

Ueber seine Auffassung des Papsttums hat sich Gregor VII. so ausgesprochen in seinen Briefen: „Der Papst ist der Statthalter Christi. Ihm gilt, was Christus zu Petro sagte: Du bist der Fels, auf den ich meine Kirche gebaut habe. Er hat die Schlüssel des Himmelreichs, seiner Gewalt ist alles unterworfen, auch die höchste weltliche Gewalt, und seiner Macht hat alles zu gehorchen. So groß auch die weltliche Macht des Kaisers ist, sie verhält sich zur päpstlichen wie der Mond zur Sonne. Das Licht des Mondes erblaßt vor dem der Sonne. Wie der Mond sein Licht von der Sonne hat, so hat auch der Fürst seine Macht vom Papst. Er hat den Fürsten das weltliche Regiment anvertraut und sie haben dem Papst darüber Rechenschaft abzulegen; der Papst hat das Recht, Fürsten abzusetzen“ (Dr. G. Schmid).

Alexander III., 1159–1181. Die Herrschsucht dieses Papstes zeigt sich ganz besonders in der Weise, wie er Kaiser Friedrich I. und den König Heinrich II. von England behandelte.

Nachdem sich Friedrich I. und Alexander III. längere Zeit über mancherlei Vorrechte gestritten hatten, mußte sich dieser Kaiser, von vielen Mißerfolgen zum Nachgeben gedrängt, im Jahre 1177 zu einem Friedensvertrag bequemen, dessen erster Punkt so lautete: „Der Herr Kaiser Friedrich I., wie er den Herrn Papst Alexander III. als katholischen und universalen Papst angenommen hat, so wird er ihm auch schuldige Ehrfurcht erweisen. Auch seinen Nachfolgern, rechtmäßig gewählt (nämlich durch die Kardinäle), wird er dieselbe Ehrfurcht erweisen.“

Heinrich II. widersetzte sich auch diesem Papst. Die äußerlichen Veranlassungen waren auch hier nicht die eigentliche Ursache, sondern Kaiser und Könige suchten sich gegen die unberufenen Eingriffe der Päpste in ihr Amt zu wehren. In diesem Streit zwischen beiden gab Heinrich II. von England, durch die Furcht vor dem angedrohten Interdikt und Bann dazu getrieben, schließlich nach und leistete im

Jahre 1172 vor dem päpstlichen Legaten folgenden Eid: „Die unerlaubten Verfahren, welche ich zu meinen Zeiten in meinem ganzen Lande eingeführt habe, widerrufe ich von Herzen und verbiete, daß sie weiter befolgt werden. Daß fortan Berufungen an den apostolischen Stuhl ungehindert geschehen, erlaube ich und werde es keinem verbieten. Außerdem schwören wir, ich und mein älterer Sohn, daß wir von Papst Alexander und dessen rechtmäßigen Nachfolgern das englische Reich empfangen sollen und halten werden und daß wir und unsere Nachfolger ununterbrochen uns nicht als wahre englische Könige rechnen werden, bis diese selbst uns für katholische Könige halten.“

Innocenz III., 1198–1216. Unter den nach Macht strebenden Päpsten war dieser Papst ohne Frage einer der vornehmsten. Deutschland, Frankreich, England, Spanien usw. mußten dies erfahren. Indem er sich den Stellvertreter Christi nannte, bezog er auf sich die Worte Christi: „Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt im Himmel und auf Erden.“ „Schon dem Petrus habe Christus die Leitung der ganzen Welt übertragen. Wenn Petrus auf dem Meer wandelte, so bedeutet das Meer die Völkerherrschaft. Der Papst ist wie Melchisedek König und Hoherpriester in einer Person, und wie in der Bundeslade die Tute neben den Tafeln des Gesetzes lag, so ruht auch in der Brust des Papstes die furchtbare Kraft zu zerstören und die Vergünstigung der Gnade.“

Ähnlich wie Gregor VII. so definierte auch Innocenz III. den Unterschied zwischen Papst und Kaiser: „Gleichwie der Mond sein Licht von der Sonne erlangt, welcher in Wahrheit geringer ist an Quantität und Qualität zugleich, ebenso in bezug auf Stellung und Wirkung, so empfängt die königliche Gewalt von der päpstlichen Autorität den Glanz ihrer Würde; je mehr er in dessen Gesichtskreis hängt, mit desto kleinerem Licht wird er geschmückt, und je mehr er von dessen Gesichtskreis entfernt ist, umso mehr profitiert er an Glanz.“ Innocenz wollte mit den letzten Worten dieses Ausspruchs wohl eine Drohung äußern: Je näher der Mond zur Sonne steht, desto weniger Licht hat er, und umgekehrt; je mehr sich der Kaiser dem Papst aufdrängt und ihn bedrängt, desto weniger wird er vom Papst erhalten, aber desto mehr, je mehr er die Autorität des Papstes respektiert.

Dr. S. Schmid nennt Innocenz III. „den bedeutendsten aller Päpste,“ nämlich so, wie eben Päpste sind.

Bonifatius VIII., 1294–1308. Wie Alexander III. mit Heinrich II. von England erfolgreich gewesen war, indem er diesen unter seine Botmäßigkeit zwang, so versuchte auch Bonifatius im Jahre 1298 dem König Eduard I. seine Autorität aufzudrängen. Eduard hatte sich Schottland unterworfen. Für Schottland verwandte sich Bonifatius, indem er behauptete, Schottland sei ein Besitz des römischen Stuhles. Wegen angeblicher Antastung römischen Besitzes forderte er Eduard von England vor seinen Richterstuhl. Dieser legte die päpstliche Bulle dem Parlament vor. Die Antwort des englischen Volkes war fest und würdig: „Schottland ist nie ein Lehen der römischen Kirche gewesen, der König wird daher nicht vor eurem Richterstuhl erscheinen, wollte er es, wir würden es nicht dulden.“ Bonifatius mußte sich fügen. Seine weltbeherrschenden Pläne waren damit gescheitert. Der Verlauf der Geschichte zeigt, daß von nun an die Regierungen nicht mehr so biegsam waren wie vordem, wiewohl Roms Ansprüche auf Weltherrschaft nie aufgehört haben.

Wie anmaßend Bonifatius war, das zeigt sein langjähriger Streit mit Philipp IV. von Frankreich. Aber dieser Streit zeigt ebenso, daß der Respekt der Könige vor dem Papst im Abnehmen war und sie seine Waffen, Bann und Interdikt, nicht mehr fürchteten.

Bonifatius VIII. ist sehr wahrscheinlich der Erfinder des sogenannten Jubeljahres, das nach ihm alle hundert Jahre sollte gefeiert werden; von späteren Päpsten wurde dieser Zeitraum zuerst auf fünfzig, dann auf 33 und zuletzt auf 25 Jahre herabgesetzt. Im Jahre 1300 proklamierte Bonifatius durch die Bulle *Antiquorum* habet fidem das Jahr 1300 als Jubeljahr und damit verbunden vollen Ablass, den Römern, wenn sie dreißig Tage lang die Basiliken der Apostel Petrus und Paulus täglich besuchen würden, allen Fremden, wenn sie dies fünfzehn Tage lang tun würden. Der Andrang war riesig; Hunderttausende von Pilgern kamen nach Rom. Bei diesem Fest erklärte ein Kardinal in einer Rede, vor Bonifatius gehalten, der Statthalter Christi sei zugleich geistlicher und weltlicher Herrscher und die Kirche habe die Pflicht, zugleich mit dem geistlichen und weltlichen Schwert die zu bekämpfen, welche diese doppelte Herrscherstellung des Papstes nicht anerkennen wollen. Dasselbe sprach Bonifatius aus in seiner Bulle *Unam sanctam* vom Jahre 1302: „Beide Schwerter sind in der Gewalt der Kirche, das geistliche und das weltliche; jenes muß von der Kirche, dieses für die Kirche geführt werden.“

Trotzdem schon im 13. noch mehr im 14. Jahrhundert des

Papstes Autorität über Könige und Fürsten im Schwinden war und seitdem bis auf diesen Tag ihre mittelalterliche Höhe nicht wieder erreicht hat, darf dennoch niemand meinen, die Päpste hätten, durch fortwährende Niederlagen müde gemacht, ihre Ansprüche auf die Weltherrschaft fallen lassen. Im Gegenteil, diese Ansprüche werden auch heute noch erhoben, wiewohl in einer vorsichtigen und verdeckten Weise.

Papst IV., 1555–1559, also während des Tridentinischen Konzils vom Jahre 1545–1563, erklärte im Jahre 1559 in der Bulle *Cum ex apostolatus officio*: § 1. „Der Papst, welcher Gottes und Christi Stellvertreter auf Erden (in terris) ist und über die Völker und Königreiche die Fülle der Gewalt inne hat und alle richtet, kann von niemand gerichtet werden.“ § 3. Alle Hierarchen und alle Herren und Fürsten bis zum Kaiser hinauf sind, sobald sie nachgewiesenermaßen in Keterei oder Schisma verfallen, von selbst, ohne daß es eines besonderen Rechtsborgehens dabei bedürfte, ihrer Stelle und deren Ehren und Einkünfte völlig und für immer verlustig und zum Bekleiden derselben fernerhin untauglich und können nie wieder als dazu tauglich erklärt werden.“ Diese Bulle bestätigte **Pius V.**, 1566–1572, und fügte hinzu, daß der Papst vermöge seiner Allgewalt jeden Monarchen absetzen, jedes Land einer fremden Invasión preisgeben, jeden Besitzer seines Eigentums berauben könne und zwar ohne jegliche rechtliche Formalität (Venrath).

Das **Concilium Vaticanum**, 1869–1870, beschloß folgendes: Kap. XX: „Wenn jemand sagt, in der Gesetzgebung des politischen Staates, oder in der öffentlichen Meinung der Menschen sei begründet die höchste Norm des Gewissens öffentliche und soziale Handlungen betreffend, oder daß auf dieselben nicht anzuwenden seien die Urteile der Kirche, in welchen dieselbe vorschreibt, was erlaubt sei und nicht, oder daß kraft bürgerlichen Rechtes etwas kann erlaubt werden, was nach göttlichem oder kirchlichem Recht nicht erlaubt ist, der sei verflucht.“ Kap. XIII: „Wird zwischen der Kirche und dem Staat die Eintracht gestört, dann ist es die Schuld des Staates, der die Rechte und Pflichten der Kirche nicht respektiert.“ Kap. XIV: „Auch die Regenten sind an das Gesetz Gottes gebunden; das Urteil aber, wie es zu handhaben ist, gehört zu dem *supremum magisterium ecclesiae*.“

Man suchte diese Beschlüsse geheim zu halten. Sie wurden aber bekannt. Die Wirkung war verblüffend. Es regnete Proteste.

Diese Zeugnisse, aus dem päpstlichen Lager genommen, mögen

genügen, um zu beweisen, daß der „Mensch der Sünde“, die Päpste, nicht nur die Kirche, sondern auch alle Weltreiche als das Gebiet ihrer Herrschsucht betrachtet haben und noch fordern.

Was trug alles zur Förderung dieser päpstlichen Ansprüche bei?

Zum Teil waren es die in jener mittelalterlichen Zeit vielfach zerrissenen politischen Zustände, besonders in Deutschland. Die Geschichte jener Jahrhunderte bezeugt das. Wie oft mußten doch deutsche Kaiser, wenn sie in Italien waren, eilends nach Deutschland zurückeilen, um die dort ausgebrochenen Unruhen zu dämpfen! Wieviel diese künstlich erregt waren, wird wohl schwer nachzuweisen sein. *Divide et impera*. Und die Geschichte der Päpste belehrt uns darüber, daß die Päpste über den politischen Stand der Dinge immer genau informiert waren, solche Zustände mit kluger Berechnung für sich auszunutzen verstanden, sich auf die Seite schlugen, die nach ihrer Meinung am meisten Aussicht hatte, durch ihre Legaten die Feuer schüren ließen und die Front wechselten, wenn sich die politische Lage änderte. Es ist dies eine überaus traurige Geschichte sittlicher Verkommenheit und böswilliger Verschlagenheit.

Die **Kreuzzüge**, sieben im ganzen, der erste 1097, der siebente 1270. Die äußere Veranlassung zu diesen Kreuzzügen war die Eroberung des Heiligen Landes durch einen Fürsten der Seltschuken im Jahre 1073. Schon Gregor VII. hatte im Jahre 1074 den Plan zu einem Kreuzzug, um das Heilige Land zurückzuerobern, gefaßt; Urban II., 1088–1099, führte ihn aus. Peter von Amiens war es, der hauptsächlich Fürsten und Völker dazu begeisterte.

Alle diese Kreuzzüge gingen von den Päpsten aus. Hagenbach sagt: „Bernhard von Clairvaux, ein Hauptbeförderer der Kreuzzüge, bekannte, er habe im Auftrag des Papstes gehandelt, als er zu Kreuzzügen aufforderte.“ Kaiser Friedrich II. war von Gregor IX. in den Bann getan worden, weil er mit der Ausföhrung des 5. Kreuzzuges zauderte. Als er noch im Bann war, unternahm er doch den Kreuzzug ohne Rücksicht auf den Papst. Dieser erklärte diesen Kreuzzug für einen heillosen Frevel und untersagte allen, sich an demselben zu beteiligen“ (Hagenbach).

Was beabsichtigten denn die Päpste mit diesen Kreuzzügen? Hören wir, was Hagenbach sagt: „Die Kreuzzüge trugen vieles zur Hebung der päpstlichen Macht bei. Die Päpste hatten ja von Anfang an das „heilige“ Werk in ihre Hand genommen. Sie sandten die Kreuzprediger aus in alle Welt, verfaßten die Kreuzbullen, sie ver-

hießen den Ablass, verteilten den Segen. Wie es von Rom her als ein Verbrechen betrachtet wurde, ohne diesen päpstlichen Segen auf eigene Hand einen Kreuzzug zu unternehmen, hat uns die Geschichte Friedrichs II. gezeigt. Zu dieser ideellen Erhebung des Papsttums gesellte sich aber auch eine materielle. Die Entfernung der weltlichen Fürsten aus ihren Ländern befreite den Papst von manchem seiner Gegner, die eben unterwegs starben, und gab den Päpsten Gelegenheit, sich ins weltliche Regiment einzumischen. Waren doch Könige und Herren, solange sie den heiligen Krieg führten, gleichsam die Soldaten des Papstes, dieweil sie die Soldaten Christi waren. Zudem ferner die Päpste die Veranstaltung der Kreuzzüge durch ihre Bevollmächtigten, ihre Legaten, betrieben, erhielten sie Gelegenheit, durch dieselben Organe auch anderes zu betreiben und sich so einen beständigen Einfluß auf die regierenden Häupter und die Oberkeiten der Christenheit zu sichern. Dadurch wurde zugleich die Macht der Landesbischöfe beschränkt, alles mehr unmittelbar an Rom und den römischen Stuhl geknüpft.“

Derjelbe: „Die Kreuzzüge wurden eine Hauptquelle der kirchlichen Reichthümer. Geld und wieder Geld ist bekanntlich die Forderung eines jeden Krieges; so wurden auch immer neue Geldforderungen gestellt, so oft eine Kreuzpredigt erscholl. Nun verschlang freilich der Krieg wieder selbst eine Menge des eingegangenen Geldes, aber die Kirche und namentlich die römische Schatzkammer kam dabei doch nicht zu kurz. Die Fürsten verpfändeten, um das bare Geld, das in den Händen der Kirche war, aufzubringen, ihre Ländereien an dieselbe. So hatte schon im ersten Kreuzzug Robert von der Normandie sein ganzes Herzogtum verpfändet und Gottfried von Bouillon hatte einen Teil seiner Besitzungen an die Kirche zu Verdun verkauft, ein anderer an den Bischof von Lüttich verpfändet.kehrten die Schuldner nicht zurück (was oft der Fall war), lösten sie das Pfand nicht ein, so verblieb es der Kirche.“

Zwei Dinge darf man bei der Frage, die Machtstellung der Päpste betreffend, die beide für sie günstig, für die Kaiser und Fürsten aber ungünstig waren, nicht übersehen, nämlich die **Investitur** und **Simonie**. Um was handelte es sich hierbei? Die Investitur bestand darin, daß Könige und Kaiser es als ihr Recht beanspruchten, Bischöfe usw. zu ernennen. Ja, sie forderten es als ihr Recht, bei der Wahl von Päpsten ihren Einfluß geltend zu machen. Hierdurch brachten sie geistliche Aemter und ihre Inhaber unter ihre Autorität. Zwei-

sehen den Päpsten und Kaisern war diese Ausübung der Investitur seitens der Fürsten ein Objekt fortwährenden Streitens, zumal zwischen Gregor VII. und Heinrich IV. Gregor bestimmte 1075: „Fürderhin soll kein Bischof, kein Abt von irgendeinem weltlichen Herrn, weder von einem Kaiser, noch einem König, Herzog, Grafen, oder wer es sei, seine Stelle sich geben oder in sein Amt durch Belehnung sich führen lassen.“ Nikolaus II., 1056–1061, erließ auf Hildebrands, später Gregor VII., Eingeben ein Wahldekret, in dem er bestimmte, daß in der Zukunft jeder Einfluß seitens des Adels und des Volkes auf eine Papstwahl solle ausgeschlossen sein und daß nur die Kardinäle dieselbe vollziehen sollten. Nach einer etwaigen Wahl war es dann dem übrigen Klerus und dem Volke erlaubt, dieselbe zu bestätigen.

Der Name Simonie stammt bekanntlich von jenem Zauberer Simon, Apostelgesch. 8, 18ff., der Petrus Geld anbot, um die Macht, durch Handauslegung die Gabe des Heiligen Geistes mitzuteilen, zu erlangen. Simonie wurde im Mittelalter viel getrieben, aber nicht nur seitens der Regierungen, sondern auch der Kirche. Man trieb Handel mit den geistlichen Aemtern.

Daß durch die Ausübung der eben genannten Dinge die Regierungen teils in die Rechte der Kirche eingriffen, teils sich eines greulichen Handels (Simonie) schuldig machten, ist außer Frage. Alle rechtlich Denkenden mußten das empfinden. Das aber wiederum schwächte die Stellung der Regierenden, wie es die der Päpste stärkte.

Die Hauptmittel aber der Päpste, um ihre Weltherrschaft zu fördern, Könige und Fürsten sich zu unterwerfen, waren das **Interdikt** und der **Bann**. Von beiden machten sie ausgiebigen Gebrauch, indem sie es an Drohungen nicht fehlen ließen. Widersetzte sich ein Kaiser, König oder Fürst den päpstlichen Forderungen, dann belegten die Päpste sein Land mit dem Interdikt, wodurch alle Kirchen geschlossen und alle Gottesdienste, Messen, Taufen, Begräbnisse usw. verboten wurden. Half diese Maßregel nicht, dann verhängten die Päpste den Bann, der einen Fürsten von der Kirche ausschloß, ihn der Vergebung und seiner Seligkeit beraubte und sein Volk des Treueids entband. Daß die Päpste mit diesen furchtbaren Waffen oft, wie die Geschichte zeigt, Erfolg hatten, lag wohl zum großen Teil an der Erziehung des Volkes durch die Missionare und Mönche, die es nie versäumten, dem Volk einzuprägen, der Papst als Nachfolger Petri habe absolute Gewalt, nicht nur über Bischöfe und Priester, sondern auch über Kaiser

und Könige. Infolgedessen, wenn der Papst eines Fürsten Land mit dem Interdikt belegte, ihn selbst mit dem Bann, hatte er sein Volk gegen sich. Das aber veranlaßte ihn, sich zu beugen. Woimmer dann, wie bei Bonifatius VIII. und König Eduard I. von England, die Könige ihr Volk hinter sich wußten, kehrten sie sich nicht mehr an das päpstliche Interdikt und Bann.

Im Anschluß an den jetzt vorliegenden Gegenstand dürfen gewisse **Schriften**, die erschienen waren und die päpstlichen Annahmen auf weltliche Herrschaft behaupteten und förderten, nicht vergessen werden: **Konstantinische Schenkung**, die **Pseudoisidorischen Dekretale** und die **Apostolischen Konstitutionen und Kanones**.

Die **Konstantinische Schenkung** soll eine von Kaiser Konstantin dem Großen, 306–337, an Papst Silvester I., 314–335, ausgestellte Urkunde sein. Schon vor dem Jahre 793 war diese Urkunde in Frankreich bekannt. Sie wurde schon im Jahre 1152 für eine **Fälschung** erklärt. Das glaubten aber viele nicht; noch gegen Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts beriefen sich Päpste auf dieselbe. Laurentius de Vallä wies ihre Unechtheit zur Evidenz nach. Durch dessen Beweisführung wurde auch Luther von der Unechtheit dieser Urkunde überzeugt; er veröffentlichte im Jahre 1537 die Schrift „Von der Donatio Constantini“, in der er unter anderem sagt: „Wer nu Ohren hat zu hören, der höre eine weidliche, fette, dicke, wohlgemäste Lüge, eine rechte päpstliche Lügen“ Erl. Ausg., B. 25, S. 177. Erst seit Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts hat man auch in katholischen Kreisen diese Urkunde aufgegeben.

Inhalt: Sie erzählt, welch wunderbare Taten die Apostel Petrus und Paulus durch den summus pontifex et universalis Papa Silvester verrichtet. Sie ermahnt alle Völker, sich zu dem Glauben zu bekehren, den der pater noster universalis Silvester predige. Er, der Kaiser, sei in Rom vom Ausatz befallen, durch Silvester bekehrt, getauft und geheilt worden. Dabei sei ihm klar geworden, welche Gewalt der Erlöser Matth. 16, 18 dem Petrus verliehen habe. Um sich für Petri Wohlthaten erkenntlich zu zeigen, habe er im Einverständnis mit seinen Satrapen, dem Senat, allen Optimaten und dem ganzen römischen Volk es für angezeigt gehalten, die potestas principatus der Vikare der Apostelfürsten anzuerkennen, und beschloßen, den Sitz des Petrus **über seinen irdischen Thron** zu erhöhen, indem er demselben imperialis potestas, gloriae dignitas, vigor, honorificentia verleihe. Er sanktioniert die sedes Petri über die praecipuae sedes

Antiochien, Alexandrien, Konstantinopel, Jerusalem und alle Kirchen des Erdkreises. Er vermachte den Päpsten den Lateranpalast, den ersten Palast des Erdkreises, verleiht Silvester sein kaiserliches Diadem, die Mitra, das Pallium, die Purpurchlamys und die Purpurtunika, das kaiserliche Zepter usw. Er verleiht dem Papst das ausschließliche Recht, Senatoren zu Merikern zu weihen; — er habe dem Papst aus Ehrfurcht gegen Petrus die Dienste eines Stallknechtes geleistet. Er überläßt dem Papst die Gewalt über die Stadt Rom, über alle Provinzen, Dörfer und Staaten Italiens und des Abendlandes. Seine Residenz verlege Konstantin nach Byzanz, denn es ziemt sich nicht, daß ein irdischer Kaiser da herrsche, wo von dem himmlischen Kaiser das Fürstentum der Priester und das Haupt der Religion seinen Sitz erhalten. Seine Nachfolger sollen nicht daran rütteln. Allen Zuwiderhandelnden wünscht er die ewige Verdammnis. Diese Urkunde habe er eigenhändig auf den Leib des heiligen Petrus niedergelegt, mit kaiserlicher Unterschrift und Datum. Schluß. — Daß diese Urkunde den Stempel der Unechtheit auf der Stirne trägt, ist klar. Man sieht ja klar, wie alle päpstlichen Ansprüche und Forderungen in ihr zum Ausdruck kommen. Diese Urkunde bezeugt nur eins, nämlich das, wonach die Päpste trachteten.

Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen und Kanones. Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen haben folgenden Titel: „Verordnungen der heiligen Apostel durch den römischen Bischof Klemens (3. Bischof) und Mitbürger.“ Diese Behauptung ist natürlich Fälschung. Diese Konstitutionen, von einem syrischen Geistlichen um die Mitte des 4. oder Anfang des 5. Jahrhunderts verfaßt, bestehen aus acht Büchern. Die 85 Kanones sind zu derselben Zeit verfaßt worden und stammen aus derselben Quelle.

Die Entstehung der Konstitutionen durch die Hand der Apostel wurde viel angezweifelt, weniger die der Kanones. Mit Recht; denn, wie die folgenden Citate zeigen werden, ist der Inhalt dieser Konstitutionen und Kanones durchaus nicht in Uebereinstimmung mit den Schriften der Apostel. Ja, man sieht, was sie eigentlich beabsichtigen, nämlich die Erhöhung des Episkopats.

Was den Inhalt der Konstitutionen betrifft, ist dies zu sagen: Neben Angaben in bezug auf kirchliche Feste, Fasten, Gebete, Gottesdienstordnung, Sakramentsverwaltung, Armenpflege usw. enthalten sie hauptsächlich Verordnungen, den Bischof betreffend, seine Weihe, seinen Rang, seine Obliegenheiten, seine Stellung als Gerichtsherr, die

Zahl der bei einer bischöflichen Ordination erforderlichen Bischöfe. Der Bischof ist das Hauptthema dieser Konstitutionen. Unsere Bezugsquelle sagt: „Er, der Verfasser, beginnt mit allgemeinen Ermahnungen für Männer und Frauen, geht aber bald zu dem Thema über, das ihm am Herzen liegt: dem Bischof und seinen Obliegenheiten.“

Was die Kanones, ursprünglich 85, betrifft, die auch apostolischen Ursprungs sein sollen, ist über ihren Inhalt folgendes zu sagen: In Kap. 85 ist der Bibelfanon des Alten und Neuen Testaments; dieser enthält nicht die Offenbarung, dagegen aber die beiden Clemensbriefe und die schon genannten Konstitutionen. „In kurzer gesetzgeberischer Form sprechen sie vom Gottesdienst am Sonntag, Mittwoch und Freitag, dem täglichen Gottesdienst, dem Gebet gegen Dämonen, der Gedächtnisfeier für die Toten, dem Alerus, der Feier von Weihnachten, dem vierzigstägigen Fasten, Ostern und Himmelfahrt, Einzelfragen der kirchlichen Gerichtsbarkeit.“ Man hat hier ein Bild des Abfalls der apostolischen Kirche, daß sie namentlich bald nach den Aposteln vom Evangelium ab in ein rein gesetzliches Wesen verfiel: lauter Gesetze, deren Befolgung bindend und nötig zur Seligkeit, — der Anfang der Papstkirche.

Neben der syrischen sind auch ägyptische, arabische und äthiopische Ausgaben dieser Sammlung apostolischer Konstitutionen und Kanones bekannt.

Die Pseudoisidorischen Dekretale.

G. Seckel, der Verfasser eines langen Aufsatzes über diese Dekretale, der hier benutzt wurde, beginnt mit folgenden Worten: „Die kühnste und großartigste Fälschung kirchlicher Rechtsquellen, die jemals unternommen worden ist und durch die sich die Welt Jahrhunderte hindurch hat täuschen lassen, sind die Pseudoisidorischen Dekretale.“

Diese Sammlung beginnt mit einer unechten Vorrede mit der Ueberschrift: „Die Vorrede des heiligen Isidor zu diesem Buch.“ Sie ist in drei Teile geteilt: 1. Dekretale von Clemens I. bis auf Melchisedes, gest. 314; 2. Konzilien; 3. Dekretale von Silvester, 314–335, bis auf Gregor II., 715–731.

Der erste Teil enthält 60 Dekretale von 30 Päpsten von Clemens I. an, alle unecht, fast alle erst vom Pseudoisidor fabriziert. Der zweite Teil enthält die Konzilien, zusammen 54, griechische, afrikanische und gallische. Der dritte Teil enthält Dekretale von 33 Päpsten, von Silvester bis Gregor II.

Die Zeit der Verabfassung dieser Dekretale, bei der schon be-

stehende Sammlungen benutzt wurden, wird allgemein auf das Jahr 852 gesetzt. Als Ort, wo diese Sammlung entstanden ist, bezeichnet die Förschung Westfranken und zwar die Stadt Reims.

Ueber das große Hauptziel dieser Sammlung sagt Seckel: „Das große Hauptziel ist die Emanzipierung des Episkopats sowohl von der weltlichen Gewalt als von dem überragenden Einfluß der Metropolitcn und Provinzialsynoden. Prozesse gegen Bischöfe seitens der Synoden und auch Obrigkeiten werden so erschwert, daß sie im Grunde unmöglich sind. 72 Zeugen, die alle einer äußerst scharfen Prüfung sich unterziehen müssen, sind nötig zur Verurteilung eines Bischofs. Die oberste Richter Gewalt über alle Bischöfe liegt in der Hand des Papstes. Seckel behauptet zwar, daß diese Dekretale nicht die Absicht gehabt hätten, des Papstes Allgewalt zu stärken, daß sie vielmehr die Bischöfe schützen wollten. Andere aber, wie z. B. Dr. S. Schmid urteilen anders. Dieser sagt: „Die Absicht des Fälschers war, die Kirche unabhängig vom Staat zu machen und ihr dadurch Macht und Einheit zu geben, daß die Pflicht aller Bischöfe, sich dem römischen Bischof als dem Nachfolger Petri zu unterwerfen, ausgesprochen wurde. Zugleich sollten die Landesbischöfe der ihnen lästigen Herrschaft der Metropolitcn dadurch entzogen werden, daß man sie alle bestimmter dem römischen Bischof unterwarf. Die untergehobenen Dekretale sollten beweisen, daß das alles von Anfang an Geheiß der Kirche gewesen sei.“ Ein anderer schreibt ähnlich: „Insbesondere handelte es sich dabei um eine vollständige Emanzipation der Kirche von der Staatsgewalt, speziell von der weltlichen Gerichtsbarkeit. Daneben ist die Stärkung des römischen Primats hauptsächlichliche Tendenz der Fälschung.“

Diese Urteile werden dadurch gestärkt, daß die römischen Päpste diese Dekretale benutzt haben, daß sie in die Rechtsammlungen und in das Corpus juris canonici aufgenommen wurden und die Rechtsentwicklung der Kirche seit Ende des 9. Jahrhunderts entscheidend beeinflussten.

Wer eigentlich der Verfasser der Pseudoisid. Dekretale gewesen ist, ist nicht bekannt; nur dies ist sicher, daß sie nicht von dem stammten, dem sie fälschlich zugeschrieben werden, nämlich von dem „heiligen“ Isidor von Sevilla, gest. 636. Seit dem 16. Jahrhundert ist die Unedtheit derselben über alle Zweifel erwiesen. Echt oder nicht echt, der böse Geist des Bischofs von Rom, der über die ganze Kirche und alle Reiche der Welt sich setzt, offenbart sich hier auch.

"My Kingdom is not of this World"

John 18:36

Essay delivered by Rev. Dr. Hr. Koch at the 27th Convention of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States in Watertown, Wis., August 4-11, 1943

(Continued from January Issue)

III

CHRIST RULES IN THE KINGDOM OF GLORY

We now come to the last realm of Christ's kingdom, the kingdom of glory. In the kingdom of grace the object of Christ's rule was the Church Militant, in the kingdom of glory it is the Church Triumphant. Everlasting joy and unrestricted communion with Christ, with the Holy Trinity will be the happy lot of the Church Triumphant. Only the elect will enter the kingdom of glory. The elect are those who have been chosen before all time and who are kept by the power of God through grace in faith unto the end. With the holy angels they will participate in the joys of heaven forever.

Before we enter into a discussion and description of the kingdom of glory it will be necessary to solve one seeming discrepancy. The question arises: "Does Christ still rule in the kingdom of glory? Does He not at the end of time, at the end of the kingdom of grace, deliver all things into the hands of the Father? Does that not clearly contradict and refute the claim of an eternal rule of Christ in the kingdom of glory?" To come to a clear understanding we shall have to examine a Scriptural passage regarding the length of Christ's rule, which seems to be a variance with an eternal rule of Christ in the kingdom of glory. In Holy Writ we find both statements: "Christ's kingdom is an eternal one," and: "At the end of time Christ will deliver all things into the hands of the Father." The Scriptural passage, which seems to contradict the eternal rule of Christ we find in I Cor. 15:28: "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." These words have been interpreted to mean that the Son is subordinated to the Father, is less than the Father, thus destroying the equality of the Trinity and also refuting the claim of an eternal kingdom of Christ as proclaimed in various other Bible passages. Even though we frankly

admit that as long as we sojourn here on earth not all of the mysteries in this passage will be revealed to us so as to leave no questions unanswered, we can at least say this with surety, that there is no contradiction between the two statements and that any interpretation claiming such a contradiction must be wrong from the very outset. How is this seeming contradiction to be solved? It is God, the Father, who subjected all things to Christ. To Him was given all power in heaven and on earth. At the end of time the Son delivers all things to His Father, lays the completed work into the hands of the Father. We must bear in mind that in I Cor. 15:28 we do not read that the Father be all in all, but God be all in all. This implies the Holy Trinity, Christ included, not only the Father. In the consummate kingdom of glory the Triune God will rule, the Son included. Each person of the Holy Trinity will take part in the rule and reveal its divine majesty and glory to the elect as well as to the angels. The Son, the second person of the Holy Trinity, equal in essence with the Father and the Holy Ghost, is included in this rule. Thus there is no contradiction between the passage in I Cor. 15:28 and such passages as Dan. 4:34: "Whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom is from generation to generation" and Luke 1:33: "He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." We can, therefore, truthfully say that Christ also rules in the kingdom of glory as well as in the kingdom of power and grace.

We have dealt with a seeming discrepancy regarding the rule of Christ in the kingdom of glory. A real discrepancy, however, exists between the teachings of Holy Writ, especially the words of Christ, "My Kingdom is not of this world," and the teaching of the millennialists or chiliasts, who look forward to a visible reign of Christ here on earth for a thousand years before the final coming of the kingdom of glory.

It will be impossible for us to deal at length with the millennialists and their errors. Hardly any two of the hosts of millennialists agree with one another. They all, however, agree in one thing, in the expected return of Christ to this earth to establish a visible kingdom and rule with His saints over the whole world for a thousand years till the day of judgment. According to most of them all of the Jews will be converted during that reign, grace

will then be irresistible, for the Jews at least. A time of universal peace will set in. The Church will then no longer be the Church Militant, but the Church Triumphant. This "visible kingdom of Christ" has been very aptly called the antechamber of the kingdom of glory.

The millennialists approach Scriptures with preconceived notions. In order to have Biblical support for their strange fantasies they are forced to distort Bible passages both of the Old and New Testament so as to fit into their own picture of a visible kingdom and rule of Christ. They are dissatisfied with the insignificant role and the smallness of the Christian Church here on earth. Especially in times of wars do they raise their voices to the highest pitch, hope for the final abolishment of all wars only to be time and again disappointed with new wars and rumors of war. They ignore the clear words of Scriptures that tell us that as long as this world exists there will be wars, that the world as a whole will never come under the sway of the Gospel, but will ever remain hostile to Christ and His kingdom until the day of judgment and that this hostility will increase toward the end of time. Since these facts do not fit into their imaginary picture of a visible kingdom of Christ here on earth, they simply ignore them, only harping on those passages that seemingly bear out their fantastic hopes, but only because of a faulty interpretation of Scriptures.

In the twentieth chapter of the Book of Revelation a reign of Christ with the souls of the martyrs for a thousand years is mentioned. On this mention of a thousand years the chiliasts base all their hopes and interpret the thousand years literally. Dr. Hoenecke in his *Dogmatics* (IV, 286f) has pointed out that in this chapter not a word is said about a visible rule of Christ here on earth, but such objections do not worry the chiliasts. They are interested in a visible kingdom and simply take it for granted that it must be here on earth. If we are to interpret these thousand years of Revelation as a rule of Christ with His faithful followers scripturally, we can only interpret them as a spiritual rule of Christ in the hearts of the believers beginning with the first coming of Christ into this world and ending with His second coming to judgment. Any interpretation that does violence to these basic facts must be branded as an unscriptural interpretation of the millennium as pictured in the twentieth chapter of the Book of

Revelation. It is a fundamental error of the chiliasts to twist the meaning of Bible passages so as to fit into their preconceived notions and hopes of a visible kingdom of Christ. It is a fundamental rule of interpretation of Holy Writ and for that of any text, that you cannot interpret a symbolical way of speaking literally, and vice versa. In Revelations 20 we clearly have a symbolical mode of expression; it must, furthermore, be maintained that no interpretation of Scriptures dare contradict any other passage of Holy Writ and that the difficult passages must be interpreted with the aid of the clear passages. Where it suits the chiliasts, they accept a literal meaning as is the case with the reign of Christ for a thousand years, and at the same time they interpret passages which permit only a literal interpretation symbolically. They ignore the clear passages in which Christ Himself says that when He comes He will come to judgment and come suddenly like a thief in the night. A visible reign of a thousand years would destroy every semblance of suddenness and all could figure out just about when judgment day would come. These clear words of Christ should have deterred the millennialists, but since they will not endure sound doctrine, they turn their ears away from the truth unto fables (II Tim. 4:4). The kingdom of Christ here on earth will remain under the cross until the end of the world (Acts 14:22, Rom. 5:1ff.). When Christ comes visibly for the second time, He will come to judge the quick and the dead. The time of this coming to judgment and of the Last Day will remain unknown (Matth. 24:42 and 25:13). There will be no general conversion of the Jews at the end of time (Rome 11:7). This is the clear teaching of Scriptures. Any interpretation of the millennium disregarding these basic facts must, therefore, be viewed as unscriptural and rejected.

It is to be deeply deplored that even among Lutherans and Lutheran church bodies false millennialistic hopes are cherished and fostered, since millennialism not only contradicts Scriptures, but also offers a false conception of the kingdom of Christ, lets the Christians dream of a visualization of earthly goals and creates the impression as though the Bible were an obscure book which did not speak and teach clearly regarding the second coming of Christ and His rule in His spiritual kingdom. One should think that Lutherans at least would and should have a better understanding for

the "It is written," which was so decisive for Luther and the Reformation, and also for his pronounced return to the clear teaching about the kingdom of Christ as not being of this world and merely a spiritual rule in the hearts of the believers. We deeply regret that within the former Iowa Synod chiliasm is still looked upon as an open question, that divergent teachings regarding the same are tolerated and not looked upon as divisive.

The millennialists have some things in common with the social gospelites and in other respects they differ. The social gospelites agree with the millennialists in their expectation of a visible kingdom here on earth in contradiction to Christ's clear words, "My Kingdom is not of this world." They differ from one another in the fact that the social gospelites do not view their visible kingdom as an antechamber of the kingdom of glory, whereas the millennialists do.

When we let the threefold kingdom of Christ pass in review before our spiritual eye we find that Satan, the father of lies, is the great adversary of Christ, the King of Truth. It is he, who turns the words of Christ around as though He wanted to say, "My Kingdom is of this world." He who wishes to understand the history of the kingdom of Christ, the history of the church and the world, and judge it correctly, must take this into consideration. The words of Christ, "My Kingdom is not of this world," are the only master key for the correct understanding of all history, be it Bible, church or secular. The struggle between Christ and Satan for the souls of men lies at the bottom of all the struggles of mankind, be they political, social or economic, be they carried out on the battlefield, in the political arena or in the various fields of science and education. How many wars have not been fought for the destruction of Christ's kingdom! How many radical reforms of and ideas about government have not arisen during the history of mankind, all tending to build a tower of Babel and to dethrone God! What havoc has not been wrought in the various fields of human wisdom? Materialism with its manifold isms has sought to explain and govern all things without God. Disastrous have been the results of evolution in the minds and hearts of those subjected to its influence. Wherever we look, whether it be into the state or school, the home or the church, it is always the wily trickster Satan who follows the same basic pattern of temptation

as in Paradise: "If you eat of this fruit, your eyes will be opened and you will be like God, knowing good and evil." Man is time and again deceived by Satan into thinking that he is walking through this world with open eyes, that he is his own master, is leading a righteous life before God and man. Man is led to believe by Satan that he is the measure of all things; in reality he is the docile disciple of Satan before his conversion. It is Christ, on the other hand, who completely atoned for all the sins of fallen mankind and destroyed the power of Satan on the cross. It is He who through the work of the Holy Spirit, through the Word and the Sacraments, tries to win the souls of those men who are still in the bondage of sin, away from the fiendish taskmaster Satan, to set them free from the bondage of sin, and to let them see the truth, which can make them free. Satan succeeded in tempting man, driving him out of Paradise. He also tried to tempt the Son of Man by his twisting of God's Word, but was foiled in his attempt by Christ insisting on: "It is written." This is the only effective weapon against Satan. "One little word can fell him." Strong are the bastions of Satan, powerful are his attacks upon the kingdom of Christ. Yet the very gates of hell shall not prevail. The great theme of all history is and remains the struggle between Christ and Satan for the souls of men still in the bondage of sin. If we bear this in mind, we shall not be dismayed or nonplussed when the powers of darkness are seemingly having everything their way. Looking closer we shall discern the wondrous ways of Christ with His Church, and with us personally, everyone and everything finally serving, whether knowingly or not, willingly or not, the greater glory of God, the further progress of the kingdom of God and the final triumph of the Church..

By way of contrast we see that the kingdom of Christ is the very opposite of all earthly, worldly kingdoms, remaining here on earth for us an article of faith, invisible and yet a reality, yes, the only enduring reality. Of all the earthly potentates Napoleon might be considered as one who tried to get all power of Europe into his hands. If he had been successful he would have gone on in his untiring ambition. For a time he ruled the destinies of Europe, but after a proud regime his path of glory led him to Saint Helena and to an inglorious end. There on Saint Helena he had time to ponder, time to compare the vast realm, which once was his and

now had vanished, with the everlasting kingdom of Christ, time to study the basic facts and forces of history, the reasons for the rise and downfall of nations and his own widespread kingdom and the continuous rule of Christ, the King with no army to back Him, merely with the power of the preached Word. To what conclusion did the famous Corsican come? He had to confess: "The horizon of Christ's kingdom reaches into the infinite, Christ rules beyond life and death, the past and the future are the same to Him, the boundaries of the Kingdom of Truth can only be the lie. Jesus has taken possession of the whole human race. Our existence was resplendent with all the brilliancy of glory, but the reaction came. The gold is washed away, through the downpours of calamities and misfortunes the very last particles of it are washed away. What an abyss between my great misery and Christ's eternal rule, which is being proclaimed throughout the world." At the beginning of his career Napoleon had thought that he could master every foe and every situation; at the end of his life he had learned to know the inner weakness and vanity of all earthly kingdoms and the eternal rule of Christ in His kingdom. The cross of Christ also towered over the wrecks of his vast empire. Napoleon at last had found the correct key for the true understanding of all history in the rule and words of Christ, "My Kingdom is not of this world."

Pilate is no more, the Caesars are no more, empires and kingdoms have come and gone and are tottering again under the impact of war. Kingdoms will continue to rise and fall, will flourish and perish. Only two realms of this world will continue to exist till the end of time, not because they are so perfect, as they pretend to be, but because of a divine prophecy and decree. Antichrist in his worldly kingdom of the Church of Rome will rule till He, whose kingdom is not of this world, will also bring him to fall with Satan. The Jewish race will remain till judgment day to serve as a continuous warning to all regarding the fate of those who reject Christ's invisible kingdom and Christ Himself. Thus has the Lord Himself prophesied and decreed. When all the sand shall have run down the hourglass of time, these two worldly kingdoms will also fall. Then the kingdom of grace will merge into the kingdom of glory. Till then the faithful will continue to pray, "Thy kingdom come!"

At the beginning of our discussion of the rule of Christ in the kingdom of glory we stated that it was the Church Triumphant over which he ruled in heaven in all eternity. We brought a solution of the seeming discrepancy as though Christ did not continue His rule in the kingdom of glory. We took issue with the real discrepancy between the teachings of Holy Writ and the false teachings and hopes of the millennialists. We reviewed the rule of Christ in His kingdom and found that we have the only key for the correct understanding of all history in the clear, majestic words of the King of Kings, "My Kingdom is not of this world." After having disposed of the negative misinterpretation of Christ's kingdom of glory and after having seen the basic importance of Christ's royal claim for the correct understanding of all things spiritual and secular, eternal and temporal, we should now like to bring the positive discussion of the nature and purpose of Christ's rule in the kingdom of glory.

Christ's kingdom of glory, or rather His rule in the kingdom of glory, is called the throne of His glory in Matth. 25:31: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory." Christ will finally deliver His Church Militant from all the evils of this world and translate it into the kingdom of glory to be henceforth the Church Triumphant, to enjoy the unrestricted bliss of eternal life and to see the glory and majesty of God unveiled. John 17:24 we read: "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me, where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me." Matth. 25:34 we find: "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand.; Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Furthermore: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Luke 22:29f.)

Christ's claim, "My Kingdom is not of this world," also holds true for the kingdom of glory. It will not find its realization here on earth. The gates of that paradise, which once was here on earth, the home of Adam and Eve, will not be reopened again. That paradise will not be restored as Jehovah's Witnesses would have us believe. Through their denial of fundamental Christian

doctrines they place themselves outside of the Christian Church and are doubly dangerous in these days of war hysteria, which offer a bountiful crop for all false prophets. It also will not be a perfected world as the evolutionists, the Unitarians and most of the social gospelites would want to convey. This world will be destroyed at the end of time. Christ's kingdom of glory can, therefore, not be a visible one *here on earth*, it cannot be of this world.

Just as Christ's rule in the hearts of His subjects in His invisible kingdom of grace is an article of faith, the kingdom of glory also remains an article of faith for us Christians, simply to be believed with a childlike faith as long as we are pilgrims in this vale of tears on our way to the heavenly mansions prepared for us by Christ, the King of Kings, Himself.

Christ, who is the Truth, comforts His disciples in their present tribulations with the coming glories of heaven. John 14:1f: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In My Father's house are many mansions: if it *were* not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am *there* ye may be also. And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know." Here Christ holds forth to His disciples the promise of heavenly mansions prepared for them. They are to believe in Christ and His promise and to know that the way to these heavenly mansions is through Him alone. Thomas the doubter, however, wants to be convinced, wants to know definitely before he will believe, and frankly says to Jesus: "We know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?" Then Jesus replies emphatically and majestically, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me." Here we have the royal promise of Him, who is the Truth. We believe Christ, fully knowing that for the time being the coming kingdom of glory is an article of faith to us. We have nothing tangible or visible to base our hopes on, nothing but the promise of Him who is the Truth and whose kingdom is a kingdom of truth. Jesus did not only say to Thomas, but to every one of us in like manner, "Blessed *are* they that have not seen, and *yet* have believed." (John 20, 29)

Epicurus may deny a heaven, Voltaire may be ready to sell

his place in heaven for a Prussian ducat (\$2.25), the Jew Heine may say that he will gladly leave heaven to the angels and the sparrows, the Russian Dostojewski may affirm: "From our earth no bridge, no path leads to a life beyond," Darrow, the atheistic opponent of Bryan in the trial about evolution, may boast that there is no God, no devil, no heaven, no hell, may deny that man has an immortal soul, we Christians nevertheless know and believe that there is a kingdom of glory, a heaven prepared by the King of Truth for His faithful subjects, into which He will receive His elect with the personal welcome: "Well done, *thou* good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord." (Matth. 25:21) In parables as well as in plain words Christ has spoken of this coming kingdom of glory. We believe it as assuredly as we believe in the fact that Christ, the Son of God, suffered and died under Pontius Pilate, an historical fact. Till we breathe our last breath, we by the grace of God, shall confess with the whole Christian Church here on earth: "And in Jesus Christ . . . who will come to judge the quick and the dead," and "I believe in . . . the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting. Amen." This is most assuredly true.

Human reason has time and again tried to reason out a life after death. Not all non-Christians deny the immortality of the soul and a life after death. We find this belief prevalent from the times of the ancient Egyptians till the present day. Whatever they all imagined the future life to be was pure fiction. The Spiritists have pretended and still pretend to be able to give us the truth about the life beyond. They have failed to do so. No reports have come down to us from those who promised to do so at their earliest convenience from the land beyond. We Christians need not rely on the vain imaginations of man, we have the blessed assurance of the King of Truth. His Word is Truth.

The knowledge of the immortality of the soul and a life after death is an inherent part of the natural knowledge of man which God has given to every person. In spite of sin man has retained a faint knowledge of such a life after death. He has followed his own imaginations and has tried to visualize life after death, has tried to shape it according to his own wishes and imagination. The Germanic tribes believed in Walhalla, the Mohammedans in

a paradise of the houris, a place for the unrestricted gratification of the sensual lusts of the Mohammedan warriors, an eternal harem, the Indians in the happy hunting grounds, soldiers frequently spoke and speak of the grand army which still marches on to victory in the great beyond. All this is wishful thinking and will come to naught. Yet even the most vivid imagination of man has never been able to visualize anything that can be compared with the pleasure and the bliss which is in store for the Church Triumphant in heaven. Paul was privileged to have a glimpse of heaven and heard unspeakable words. This very same Paul writes to the Corinthians (I Cor. 2:9): "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." We are aware of the fact that this passage in its context speaks of all God offers in His Gospel, all that God has prepared and done for us in Christ Jesus, and not specifically of the joys and glories of heaven, but it certainly is not wrong to apply these words as referring also to the blessedness that awaits us in heaven. The wisdom of God and the foolishness of the cross are hidden to natural man, but also the glories of heaven. The joys of heaven are the culmination of all the gifts of God to us, never seen or to be seen in the future here on earth, never heard of in man-made religions, yes, never even conceived in the mind of man. Such is the glory, such is the blessedness of the gifts of God already in the kingdom of grace and finally in the kingdom of glory. Man can see many beautiful places here on earth, veritable paradises, may hear the most beautiful music, it will all be a far way from the beauty of heaven with its angelic choirs. Man may stretch his imagination to the utmost, it will never approach the glorious reality which awaits us at the portals of heaven. Already here on earth God showers us with His spiritual gifts, in heaven we shall be partakers of the unrestricted ineffable joys of the kingdom of glory in all eternity.

The greatest bliss that is to await us is that we shall see Him, the King of Kings, our Savior and Redeemer, as He is. We shall see God Himself, the Holy Trinity. Already Job rejoices, "In my flesh shall I see God." (Job 19:26) Paul assures the Christians in Thessalonica: "And so shall we ever be with the Lord." (I Thess. 4:17) What unspeakable joy will it not be

for us to see Jesus who suffered and died for us, to talk to Him and to thank Him personally for His undying love, to join the chorus of the Redeemed in the glory of the Redeemer.

In heaven we shall be freed from all sins, no more temptations shall befall us, no more evils, sickness, no hunger and thirst, no more bloody wars with all their suffering and bloodshed. We shall then be delivered from all evil, as we pray in the seventh petition.

In the twenty-first chapter of the Book of Revelation John has recorded for us his vision of the heavenly Jerusalem. There we read in verse 4: "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away."

In heaven sin shall be no more. Here we lament with Paul: "O wretched man that I am." Here we suffer pain in a vale of tears, there God Himself will wipe away all tears from our eyes. Here we suffer hunger and thirst, poverty and want, there we shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more. Here death is a merciless enemy, our last enemy, there death shall be swallowed up in victory. What a deliverance from all evil!

Unspeakable joy on the other hand will be our glorious lot in heaven. (Ps. 126:25): "Then was our mouth filled with laughter and our tongue with singing . . . They that sow in tears shall reap in joy." The eternal life of heaven is a gift of the King of Kings to us, His faithful subjects, through no merit of ours. Paul writes to the Romans: "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:23). The unmerited kindness of our Lord should be an incentive for us to work and also, if need be, gladly to suffer for Him, who loved us unto death that we might have life everlasting. Everything is ours by grace, Paul saved by grace, the malefactor, you and I. Great shall be our unmerited reward in heaven. (Matth. 5:12)

The grand vision of the heavenly Jerusalem recorded by the Seer of Patmos inspired the well-known hymn of praise of the glories of heaven:

"My Kingdom is not of this World"

Jerusalem the golden,
 With milk and honey blest,
 Beneath thy contemplation
 Sink heart and voice opprest.
 I know not, oh, I know not,
 What joys await us there,
 What radiance of glory,
 What bliss beyond compare.

O sweet and blessed country,
 The home of God's elect!
 O sweet and blessed country
 That eager hearts expect!
 Jesus, in mercy bring us
 To that dear land of rest,
 Who art with God the Father
 And Spirit ever blest.

We cannot refrain from adding some verses of that precious gem in our Christian treasury of song on the joys and glories which all elect are to expect in the Life Everlasting. They also express our personal hope and fervent prayers:

Jerusalem, thou city fair and high,
 Would God, I were in thee!
 My longing heart fain, fain, to thee would fly,
 It will not stay with me.
 Far over vale and mountain,
 Far over field and plain,
 It hastes to seek its Fountain
 And leave this world of pain.

O happy day and yet far happier hour,
 When wilt thou come at last,
 When fearless to my Father's love and pow'r
 Whose promise standeth fast,
 My soul I gladly render?
 For surely will His hand
 Lead her with guidance tender
 To heav'n, her fatherland.

Then shall also songs of bliss arise from our lips:

Unnumbered choirs before the shining throne
 Their joyful anthems raise,
 Till heaven's glad halls are echoing the tone
 Of that great hymn of praise,
 And all its host rejoices
 And all its blessed throng
 Unite their myriad voices
 In one eternal song.

Yes, great shall be our unmerited reward in heaven. May the prayer of the malefactor ever be our prayer: "Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom," (Luke 23:42) and may Jesus answer all of us with the same words with which He received the dying thief: "To day Thou shalt be with me in paradise" (43).

Till that great hour of deliverance from all evil arrives we shall with all earnestness and gladness of heart help build His kingdom of grace, trusting in His divine promise: "Lo, I am with you alway, *even* unto the end of the world!" (Matth. 28, 20) All this we pray for and include when we pray: "Thy Kingdom come!" and end with the triumphant doxology: "For Thine is the kingdom and Thine is the power and Thine is the glory forever and ever. Amen."

OCULI

TEXT: John 6:49-56

"What sign shewest thou then, that we may see and believe thee? What dost thou work?" — thus the Jews questioned our Savior at the beginning of the discourse from which today's Gospel-text is taken. What dost thou work? What can you accomplish? What can you do that will benefit us? But they did not give the Savior time to answer. With a great show of zeal they at once gave the Lord to understand in what they were interested, and what kind of work He must do, and along what lines He must labor and work, if He would accredit Himself as the Messiah. They went on in this way: "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat." — It is truly humiliating for us to hear this: Jesus was expected to prove Himself divinely sent to the Jews by furnishing bread, by doing something for the belly. Yes, only He was to do something better and greater than was done in the wilderness in ages past. True enough, it was quite agreeable not to have to farm it in the desert and still have bread. But there was not enough variety in that; besides there was still too much effort involved. A Messiah was wanted who would provide something better, namely, an abundance of good things for the belly supplied freely and requiring no effort. It was such a Messiah the Jews expected in all seriousness.

But is this, this base-minded sensuality of the Jews, really humiliating for us? Indeed, for they are like us and we like them by birth. By nature they have the same flesh that is in us. The example of the Jews is humiliating for us, because it displays the fleshly mind and sensuality common to us all by nature. That is the spirit of all mankind. Just point your ears into the world! It is looking

for a Messiah and a Messianic kingdom, a veritable era of prosperity. As its chief glory men expect great wealth and many pleasures unbroken by effort or pain. Suppose this were achieved and would become a reality? What would we gain by it? We need something entirely different! That is what Jesus told the Jews. You need bread from heaven. But Moses gave you not that bread from heaven. Is there then no heavenly bread? Or if there is, is none given out? Our discourse will give us a comforting answer. We consider

BREAD FROM HEAVEN.

1. It is sadly needed.
2. It is ready at hand.
3. It has miracle-working power.

I.

It is sadly needed,

because we all are in bitter need. That is the first thing the Lord Jesus calls to our attention with these words of our text: "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead." Being subject to **death** — that is our bitter end. We repeat, our **bitter** need. Even now, while we still live, we get a foretaste of the truth that death is bitter. When the thoughts of death come over us with all their force, then it is as if bitter gall were being poured into the cup of life. If it can embitter life for us even now, what sheer bitterness must death itself be! That is the bitter need in which we **all** find ourselves. It is appointed unto **men** to die — we **all** are subject to that law. And this is not, as the unbelievers say, the course of nature, since we just happen to be creatures of this earth. Not at all! It is a decree of **punishment and wrath** issued by a holy God. All our days are passed away in His wrath. He hath set our sins in the light of His countenance. The wages of sin is death. Therefore departing this life with all its treasures and pleasures is not in itself all of death. Bitter, bitter as gall all this may be; but it is not the full bitterness. Nor was our Savior thinking only of the departure from this life when He said: "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead." He was thinking of the fact that they died an eternal death — condemned, rejected, as the Scriptures expressly say of them: God had no pleasure in them. Their death meant rejection, judgment, committal to the eternal death of damnation. In the same way it is appointed unto all men once to die, and after that the judgment, rejection by God. Now our need under death appears in its real bitterness. What misery, because of it, stalks us all as sinners through life, on every step of life's way! Ours is a starving away, a wasting away, a pining away into temporal death and into eternal death, into the death of hell's eternal torments! What, then, do we need? Bread for us who are famishing and perishing with hunger, bread from heaven, bread with heavenly powers. We need bread to give us life

of a heavenly nature, bread to give us strength, so that we may not sink into the death of hell, but may soar into heaven. Truly, it is the heavenly bread we need, because we all find ourselves in bitter need under death. Yes, we need it all the more, because no one of us possesses a remedy or a palliative against this great and bitter need of death.

In ourselves and by ourselves we are no better situated than Israel of which our Lord said: "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead." Nothing that we possess will afford us any aid against death and its bitterness. No material possessions, gifts, or pleasures will help. The children of Israel enjoyed most extraordinary material gifts, provided in a miraculous way. Manna was one of them. But what good did it do them? None at all! The fathers ate manna — and are **dead**. Against death no treasures, no wealth, no money, and though it were millions, will afford any aid. Often enough it has been true of a man: He had millions, but he is **dead**. His earthly possessions, his gifts, his pleasures were no aid against death; nor against its bitterness. On the contrary: The more treasures there are during this life, so much more bitter will be death; the more pleasures, the more bitter the dying. This is certain beyond all doubt.

But this truth is just as certain: None of the things we may be able to do will help us against death and its bitterness. All the world may think that it is able to do something. But we are able to do nothing. That was the case with Israel in the desert. Our dear Savior said, "Your fathers ate manna in the wilderness, and are dead." With that, naturally, He reminded them of the guidance they enjoyed throughout their desert journeyings, of the covenant they had with God, and of the man who led them, Moses. But, you will say, with that He also reminded them of their wickedness and stubbornness, for which they were condemned. Well said. But what if they had been as obedient as at all possible, even then the result would have been the same: they are dead, lost, rejected. Jesus Himself said as much in this chapter: "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven." — No, Moses never did that, and he does not do it now. Moses brings us the Law. But that is not bread from heaven, that is death unto hell. For we are not able to fulfill it. All the things we may do in an effort to fulfill it are nothing but dead, sin-stained works, in reality nothing but sins. Therefore the Law is purely a proclamation of our doom. It condemns us to death, pronounces all the works we do accursed, and sets down as the greatest of all lies the conceit that we are able to do something with our works against death and its terrors. — No, we are able to do nothing. To sum it all up: In everything that we possess and in everything that we are able to do, we have no remedy against the bitter need of death..

How sadly we need bread from heaven, since we with all our

powers and possessions, with all that we have and do are helpless against death and its bitterness and terrors. We have a picture of ourselves in the fate of the rich man who by reason of his wealth wielded great power and influence. To safeguard his treasures he had a vault with massive doors built for himself. All at once he disappeared. Finally, days after, he was found in his treasure-vault, surrounded by millions, this influential man — dead. Bread would have kept him alive, but as it was, he fell prey to death, even with all his money, with all his wisdom and cunning devices. That's a picture of ourselves. Thus we, surrounded with the treasures of earth, with all our own powers and ability are the helpless prey of death. We can do nothing against it, either with our treasures or with our works. Of what avail are they against death? We need bread that will give us aid against death, an aid we do not possess with all our treasures, ability, and deeds. Bread we need, a bread from heaven, a bread of grace, given to us in compassion to preserve us against death.

Bear that in mind! **What good is your foolish course of setting the greatest value on earthly goods all through life, of chasing after them?** Yes, if they would provide a way out of death, if they would at least make death a gain for us, then we all ought to chase after them with bated breath. As it is, we gather in, and what have we? Nothing but the treasures of earth, in the possession of which we die and perish. **What is the good of our foolish relying on our supposed good works, of strutting with them, of feeling secure because of them?** Bear in mind, our works will never be of any avail. In spite of them we are doomed to despair in the hour of death. Moses with the Law, according to which we do our works, can give us no bread from heaven, a bread that avails against death. — Thank God! That which we so sadly need, bread from heaven, is not something for which we send up our hungering cry in vain.

II.

It is ready at hand.

The free mercy of God has provided it for us all. We repeat: the free mercy of God the Father saw to it that bread came down from heaven. It is as our Lord said: "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die." And: "My Father giveth you bread from heaven." Do you understand what that means: free mercy? You often read about it in sermon-books. You hear it in sermons. We call upon it as our final comfort. We turn to the free mercy of God as the ever-open door. Rightly we do all this. Why is it called free, or autonomous? We answer: Because God is not bound to it by anything that is in us, in you, in me. There is nothing in you, nor in me, nor in our whole race that could impel God to make you or me the object of His mercy. There is, to be sure, the curse and blight of death resting, now and forever, upon you, and me, and us all as we are by nature. But there is nothing

in us, not in me, and not in you, that God would have to regard and say: Surely, **that** compels me to favor this man with my mercy, **that** entitles him to share my mercy, or at least makes him worthy of my mercy. Do you not join in singing:

Behold! To me has come great mercy,
Though mercy I had never earned?

(Tr. by W. H. F.)

That is the refrain that should come from our lips. God has had compassion on all of us. Now is there one among us of whom God could say: This man, so dear to me, was a noble soul even before his conversion; to him sin was an abomination even in his natural unconverted state? There is not one of whom God can say that. We all were by nature nothing but lovers of sin. Is this not true? Do we not say even today with Paul: **In me**, that is, in my flesh, in my Old Adam, dwelleth no good thing? According to our flesh are we not today very much in love with sin? We **all** were by nature the children of wrath, that is, not worthy of mercy. Moreover, when God was moved to mercy by the fall of mankind, was the situation such that God had to say to Himself: I have made a mistake? My first-created men **could not** remain steadfast and obedient; it was to be expected that they would fall. Therefore I **must** have mercy. Now I am bound to let mercy reign and help them out of the misery of death for which I myself am partly responsible. No! By no means! There is nothing in us binding God, **in the interests of justice**, to lift from us our misery under death. If someone, trusting to that, would set himself stubbornly against God, verily, then the misery under death **here** must be followed by the misery under death in **eternity**. — Now that is what we mean when we call God's mercy **free and spontaneous**. There is nothing in us that binds God to exercise mercy. If we only would fully understand **this truth!** But how many really understand it? How many talk about mercy, and yet their hearts are stirred but little or not at all; with callous hearts they always look upon divine mercy as a sort of duty or obligation on God's part. How many are there, really, who say in humble admiration:

Behold! To me has come great mercy,
Though mercy I had never earned,
Though I — Oh, this my wondrous story! —
In pride had mercy ever spurned.

With a correct knowledge of himself a man can not help saying: If I were God, I would not have mercy upon such a creature as I am. I can see nothing that would move me to it; I see only a **fully-deserved** perdition. Mercy is boundless. God has mercy, simply because He is merciful. We can not explain it; we can only sing in praise of it. God has mercy upon us — with that everything is said that we can say.

This I confess, my God, before Thee
 And this before all men extol:
 All, all is mercy, and this story
 Sums up all thoughts within my soul.

(Tr. by W. H. F.)

The boundless mercy of the Son saw to it that bread from heaven is ready at hand for all. The Lord extolled this truth: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

Jesus, the Son of God, is the **living bread**. In Him we have, ready at hand and fully prepared, that which we all sorely need — bread from heaven. He came from heaven to be bread for us. Did He owe us that? Oh, no! It was mercy! But was the bread of life, availing against death, already prepared for us when the Son of God left heaven and came down to earth? By no means. Something more was done to bring that about. The Word was made flesh. The Son of God became man, took upon Himself our humanity, became our Brother. — Did He owe us that? No! It was boundless mercy! But was the path taking Him from heaven to earth, into the lowliness of our humanity — was that in itself enough to effect this, that Jesus, the Son Divine, became living bread? No! That He might become the bread of life, it was necessary — hear it and marvel — that He give His flesh, give it, to be crucified, to be sacrificed, to be slain; that He give it into our **death**, into the most shameful death, a malefactor's death; that He be deeply humbled, numbered among the transgressors. That had to be.

But was He under any necessity or compulsion to do that? Oh no! It was **free mercy**. — And once again we ask: Was the course that led from heaven down to the shameful death on the cross everything through which Jesus was prepared for us as the bread from heaven availing against temporal, nay more, eternal death? No, and again, No! In order to be that for which He came down from heaven's heights, **bread from heaven**, bread that gives heavenly life, His path led — and here is the miracle of miracles — it led down into the deepest depths of hell, for He became a curse for us, when He hung on the tree of the cross. Did He owe that to us? Oh, no! It was boundless mercy, boundless but fervent love.

Here the true Paschal Lamb we see,
 Whom God so freely gave us;
 He died on the accursed tree, —
 So strong His love! — to save us.
 See, His blood doth mark our door,
 Faith points to it, Death passes o'er,
 And Satan can not harm us.
 Hallelujah!

By His enduring of death and hell for us in fervent love — thus Jesus, the Son of God, was prepared for that which He was **ordained**, yes, **desired** to be: the bread from heaven which is to deliver us from death and transplant us into a heavenly life. — Boundless mercy!

By grace God's Son, our only Savior,
 Came down to earth to bear our sin.
 Was it because of thine own merit
 That Jesus died thy soul to win?
 Nay, it was grace, and grace alone,
 That brought Him from His heav'nly throne.

Blessed are we that **everyone** of us can thus praise Him in **personal** gratitude. For give ear and rejoice, as Jesus tells us for **whom** the heavenly bread has been prepared in fervent love: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the **world**." But what is the world in its natural make-up? We know. It lieth in wickedness; it is the devil's dominion, full of willing subjects; it is worthy of nothing but to be accursed. For that world heavenly bread has been prepared. That world is to live. That world is even to inherit heaven. Who can despair when the message goes out: "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

What now is left to be done is also being done. This heavenly bread is not only ready at hand, because it has been **prepared**, but through **preventive** grace it is also distributed to all. No one is passed by in this **distribution** of the heavenly bread. Just as mercy has prepared the bread of life for the world, just so it wishes all the world to share it. Even those who finally die yet will have to admit that they were not forgotten. We have people of that kind in our text. "The Jews therefore strove among themselves saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" You see, they themselves testify: Jesus really gave them the bread from heaven, so that they might eat of it. When they, nevertheless, wasted away into the death of hell, it was not because they had been passed by. No one is passed by. The Lord Himself extols that truth: "God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

But no one will come to **partake** of the heavenly bread in any other way than that of **preventive** grace. "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" the Jews asked. — We too ask: How can Jesus give us His flesh to eat? They were not really asking for enlightenment; we see that they were angered by His offer. They still had no praise for this bread, but ridiculed it. — Let us, however, ask at once: How could Jesus give us the bread from heaven which we now enjoy? How was it possible for Him to do that? For we, even now, have little gratitude for it. Even now we have but a faint desire for it. Even now we do not value it very highly. How could Jesus do that? The

answer is: His prevenient grace. If it were not for that, we still would not be among those blessed people who, as they famish under the misery of death, refresh themselves with the bread of heaven. If it were not for that, we would not remain thus blessed. Recognize that and sing your praises! — Do not join the ranks of those who, when they describe their life as Christians, always speak of themselves as though they, even as babes-in-arms, had brought with them into this world a heart so godly that they simply could not help asking for the bread of heaven. That is revolting arrogance. Know it as such and condemn it. That is the pride which goeth before the fall. May you remain one of those who confess of themselves:

Behold! To me has come great mercy,
 Though mercy I had never earned,
 Though I — Oh, this my wondrous story —
 In pride had mercy ever spurned.
 Now knowing this I must rejoice
 And mercy praise with heart and voice.

Then you will remain a blessed guest at Jesus' banquet-table, satisfied with the bread of heaven and finding that to be true which we now, in conclusion, shall say of the bread from heaven:

III.

It has miracle-working power.

There are **two great miracles** to which our Lord points in our text. He says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Man, the miserable slave and prey of death, dust and ashes, is to have **eternal life**. Eternal life — that, according to divine revelation, means a **body radiant** with beauty, splendor, and glory; a **state** in which the body is full of energy, strength, and health, and in which all these are present in the most marvelous fullness, undergoing neither decline nor decay; it means a **body rich** in wonderful gifts and powers, so that it can be wholly the agent of the soul in glory, aiding it in enjoying the bliss of eternal life to the full. This state of glory, moreover, is to endure for all eternity without any interruption. Such is the glory to which this our present body shall attain. This transformation, which transcends our power of comprehension, shall take place in our body, this feeble body which barely reaches maturity before it is already on the wane, growing weaker, wasting away, until it finally becomes cold and dead, and its ultimate end is a little heap of mold, of dust and ashes. Thus the words come true: Out of the dust was thou taken, and unto dust shalt thou return. **That body** is to achieve such glory, yea, it is to arise from the dust and is to come forth to such glory! It is a miracle before our eyes.

However, **eternal** life is above all a glory of the soul: freedom from fear; a rest in perfect **peace**; freedom from all woe, an exulting in pure joy; freedom from all pain, a soaring aloft on wings of pure bliss. It means being lifted up above everything earthly, finding delight only in God and Christ, a living in God and resting your soul on Him, so that He is your all in all. What a glory of the soul! This, again, is to be for all eternity. To that glory this our soul is to come, our soul which is often distressed and smitten by fear, which, the older we get, grows more and more weary and feeble, and which in the hour of death becomes so weak, that it seems to be nothing more than a flickering light. This our soul is to attain to such indescribable glory of eternal life. — What a miracle our eyes are granted to behold! Is it possible that we poor grave-bound wretches are to undergo this indescribably great change in body and soul? One would think that the feat till now ridiculed as folly, the changing of iron into gold and pebbles into diamonds, could sooner be accomplished than that we, loathsome worms, are to shine forth in the supreme glory of eternal life.

The other miracle? The Lord points to it when He says: "Raise him up." Does life follow immediately after that? Does not something else follow that? To be sure. That which follows immediately is the judgment. Now the wonder which takes place then is this that men, flesh born of the flesh, stand acquitted in that judgment. They stand acquitted as holy, righteous men. They stand as saints before those eyes which search out all things. That poor sinners, who had nothing of their own but sins, who were unclean, unholy creatures, should nevertheless in the last searching judgment be found perfect saints, in whom there is nothing to censure — what a miracle! And that actually does happen. If it did not happen, then there would not be a single victim of corruption upon whom the wonder could be worked, that he shine forth in the glory of eternal life. Only the righteous shall live eternally.

It is these two great miracles to which our Lord **points**. It is He Himself, the bread from heaven, Who **brings about** these great miracles. He promises that as an assured thing: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life." Jesus is the Way, the Truth, and the **Life**. Whosoever eats His flesh and drinks His blood, or, to use the expression which Jesus puts on a level with that: Whosoever eats Him, the Lord, i. e. apprehends Him, the Lord, by faith, accepts Him as His Lord and appropriates Him, He **apprehends** life, enters upon life, and is in possession of life. If he remains in Christ, he will remain in possession of life. Just as an army occupying an impregnable fortress is safe against the enemy, so Christians, when they are in Christ, their mighty fortress, are safe and secure against death, though otherwise they are the certain prey of death. As death does not reign over Christ, so it does not reign over those in Christ.

Therefore Paul exults: O death, where is thy sting? O hell, where is thy victory? What miracle-working power the bread from heaven has! It transforms us **slaves of death** into **lords of life**.

And he that eateth my flesh dwelleth in me, and I in him. He has the righteousness which shall triumph in the final judgment. For Jesus is our Righteousness. If a man but is in Christ and is found in Him, he can confidently allow God's eyes to judge him. For they will find in the poor sinner only that which pleases Him, namely the merit and righteousness of His Son, of Whom He says: This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. Thus Jesus, the bread from heaven, brings about this great miracle, that we human beings, the prey of death, bask in life eternal, and that poor sinners can shine forth in perfect righteousness. Truly, it has wonder-working power, this bread from heaven. Therefore His flesh is meat indeed, and His blood is drink indeed, and He, the Lord, with all that He is, is the true bread from heaven. God **gives** it to men in mercy.

What, do you think, ought we to do? We will, God granting it, hear about that next Sunday. But today already I call out to you what we ought to do, namely: **Seek** the bread from heaven! May God help us all in that. Amen.

— From Hoenecke. "Wenn ich nur dich habe." Translated by Prof. Werner Franzmann.

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

The Lutheran Academy for Scholarship (*Academia Lutherana Philosophiae — Alpha Lambda Phi*) is an organization in our Synodical Conference of quite recent date. It was launched on March 6-7, 1942, in Chicago. A constitution was adopted, of which paragraphs II and III read as follows: "The objects of this organization shall be — 1. To bring together into one group Lutheran scholars in various fields of knowledge; 2. To encourage its members to carry on independent research in their respective fields; 3. To provide a center for depositing and making accessible the results of the research done by individual members; 4. To publish a journal for the purpose of affording the members of the Academy an opportunity to present their findings in a formal manner; 5. To arrange for an annual meeting at some convenient place and time. Membership in the Academy, which shall be by invitation, shall be limited to such members of the Synodical Conference of the Lutheran Church as have a university training or its equivalent." At present the organization has about sixty members and the first issue of its journal *The Lutheran Scholar* went to press in March of 1943. In future it is going to come out on a regular basis in quarterly issues, the size of the journal depending primarily on the number of subscribers.

In the introductory article of the March issue of 1943 we read the following: "Therefore the greatest need in our world today is a leavening influence of sound scholarship and orthodox theology . . . , of the influences of the Reformation and the Renaissance. . . . If the Academy can assist our Church in seeing the proper balance between these elements and if our contribution in the field of scholarship can be used to further God's kingdom on earth and act as a leaven and a salt, then the Lutheran Academy for Scholarship will not have been conceived and born in vain." Indeed "the proper balance" between "sound scholarship and orthodox theology" is a prerequisite and a goal for a journal of this nature, and one can but wish the editors and contributors God's blessings in their undertaking and endeavors. May this Lutheran journal ever remain true to its Lutheran heritage and be guided by Luther in his judgment on sound scholarship and orthodox theology. He has this to say on the subject: "Ohne Wissenschaft wird in Zukunft keine Theologie bestehen". However "es ist besser, dass die Wissenschaft zusammenbricht, als die Religion, wenn sie nicht Christus dienen will". Therefore "die Wissenschaft in Ehren, aber wichtig ist allein, dass die Bibel recht behält".

P. Peters.

A Statement — Propositions Concerning Some Essentials for Lutheran Unity Submitted for Discussion at Intersynodical Conferences — by the Missouri Synod Committee for Doctrinal Unity.

It is the aim in the following paragraphs to mention the issues which we believe confront our dear Lutheran Church here in America at present and to indicate briefly where in our opinion all who wish to be conservative Lutherans should stand. The paragraphs are not intended to enumerate all subjects in controversy, but merely to draw attention to some great essentials.

1. The inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is apparently the most important issue today. While all Lutherans, as far as we know, are willing to say that the Scriptures are inspired, a number deny that this inspiration is plenary and implies full inerrancy of the Scriptures. We hold that every word of the Scriptures as they were originally written by the prophets and apostles is definitely inspired (verbal inspiration, however, not mechanical) and that coming from God they are free from all error. This we believe on account of the testimony of the Scriptures themselves, John 10:35; 2 Tim. 3:16; 1 Cor. 2:13.

2. Another issue is the subscription to the symbolical writings of the Lutheran Church. We are not aware that a *bona fide* subscription of the confessional writings, a subscription of them *because (quia)* they set forth correctly the teachings of the Word of God, and not merely *inasmuch as (quatenus)* they do so, is officially opposed anywhere in the Lutheran Church in our country today. We mention this issue because of its vital importance.

3. A third issue pertains to unity in doctrine. In some circles the opinion prevails that unity in doctrine need not to be striven for, that latitude should be permitted, that merely in fundamental matters unity in doctrine must be worked for. Against such a view we urge the sacredness of every teaching contained in the Scriptures and the duty of God's children to cling to everything He has taught them, Matt. 28:20; John 8:31, 32. The conservative Lutheran Church dare not write indifference in doctrine on its flag.

4. Another issue has to do with the question whether absolute uniformity in all doctrines, fundamental and non-fundamental, must be a condition of church fellowship. While full unanimity in all matters of doctrine, be they important or apparently unimportant, must be sought, and while not a single statement of the Bible can be to us a matter of indifference, we should not say that there can be no fellowship unless uniformity also in all non-fundamental doctrines has been attained. Non-fundamental doctrines (that is, doctrines such as those of the Antichrist and the conversion of all Israel) may not be reduced to the level of open questions. If a position on non-fundamental doctrines militates against a clear text of the Scriptures, it cannot be sanctioned, whereas weakness and temporary inability to understand and agree on non-fundamental doctrines may be borne if no divisions and offenses are created and if the authority of the divine Word is fully accepted and recognized.

5. The fifth issue pertains to unionism. False teaching is a poison, and church fellowship with those who divide the Church through false doctrine must be avoided, Gal. 5:9; Rom. 16:17, 18.

6. The sixth issue is the lodge problem. It is quite generally recognized in the Lutheran Church of America that the anti-Christian lodge must be opposed by us, that membership in it must be shown to be sinful, and that our church practice must include disciplinary measures against those who refuse to listen to God's Word on this point. The method of combating the lodge must, of course, be evangelical and have the aim to win the sinner.

NOTE. These propositions are submitted by the Missouri Synod Committee for Doctrinal Unity. We cherish the hope that similar committees in other Lutheran bodies will likewise favor a wide discussion of these matters. Conference secretaries belonging to the Missouri Synod are requested to be so kind as to send us reports on the meetings here visualized.

So far the "Statement."

Although no official copy of the foregoing *Statement* was received by the editors of the *Theologische Quartalschrift*, and the text came to us only through our exchanges, yet we are of the opinion that the readers of our magazine should have access to a pronouncement of this kind. Being submitted for "discussion at intersynodical conferences" it may easily become of the most far-reaching consequences. We therefore decided to copy it from our exchanges.

We do not intend to enter into a detailed discussion of the six paragraphs at this time. We call attention, however, to the close relation between numbers 3, 4, and 5; of which #3 and #5 might well be considered together, while #4 treats of a special point. As we see it, #3 and #5 present the Scriptural view of the importance of doctrine and of the danger of false doctrine, but #4 injects the practical question of the proper attitude to be maintained over against people who hold erroneous views. Assigning to this question the place the Committee did does not make for clarity.

We also deplore that the question concerning justification was omitted altogether. Justification is the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, and many of the statements and declarations on this matter during the recent union movement were not very satisfactory. The mere adoption by any one of the term *objective justification* is no guarantee that his doctrine is not tainted with misconception, while, on the other hand, the rejection of this term is in itself not proof positive of error. The history of the controversy about this doctrine among American Lutherans makes it imperative that the relation of faith to objective justification and its function in subjective justification be clarified.

M.

An Overture for Lutheran Unity. — Under this heading the Executive Committee of the American Lutheran Conference has published a proposal for church fellowship among all Lutheran Synods of America. Because of the importance of this document we print it in its entirety as it is given in the January number of the *Lutheran Outlook*, the official organ of the American Lutheran Conference.

Our churches, with common consent, do teach . . .

Article I, Augsburg Confession

1. Our Lutheran Church is rightly jealous of the integrity of its doctrine and practice, rightly wary of indifferentism or latitudinarianism, no matter what emergencies may arise.
2. Therefore our Lutheran Church has set up great historic standards for its doctrine and practice, and has always insisted upon genuine and wholehearted acceptance of these standards by all who would share its name and fellowship.
3. Since some important points of doctrine and practice which were not issues in the sixteenth century and therefore were not included in the confessional writings of that period have more recently become issues affecting inner unity, our Lutheran Church bodies have rightly required and provided supplementary statements or theses on occasion in order to testify to their unity and to reassure one another thereby.
4. We believe that the Minneapolis Theses, the Brief Statement and Declaration, and the Pittsburgh Agreement, all of which we believe to be in essential accord with one another, have made sufficiently clear the position of the three major groups within American Lutheranism:

we believe that no additional theses, statements, or agreements are at this time necessary for the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship among Lutherans.

5. We acknowledge the holy earnestness in confession of faith and the high-minded purpose in declarations as to church practice in the Lutheran pronouncements indicated above. We, the constituent synods of the American Lutheran Conference, severally and collectively reaffirm our sincere and wholehearted adherence to our mutual pledge as to doctrine and practice in the Minneapolis Theses. We as earnestly expect of those with whom we seek complete fellowship that their doctrine and practice shall conform to their respective declarations.
6. We submit the above statements to other Lutheran bodies with a view to the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship. We append for examination a copy of the Minneapolis Theses as an enunciation of our position in doctrine and practice. (The Chicago Theses as hereinafter quoted, originally adopted on March 11, 1919, by representatives of the Augustana Synod, the Buffalo Synod, the Iowa Synod, the Joint Synod of Ohio, the Lutheran Free Church, the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, the United Danish Church, and the United Lutheran Church in America, were reexamined and incorporated as Sec. IV of the Minneapolis Theses.)

A. THE MINNEAPOLIS THESES

I

The Scriptures

The synods signatory to these Articles of Agreement accept without exception all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as a whole, and in all their parts, as the divinely inspired, revealed, and inerrant Word of God, and submit to this as the only infallible authority in all matters of faith and life.

II

The Lutheran Symbols

1. These synods also, without reservation, accept the symbolical books of the evangelical Lutheran Church, not insofar as, but because they are the presentation and explanation of the pure doctrine of the Word of God and a summary of the faith of the Lutheran Church, as this has found expression in response to the exigencies arising from time to time. (The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, in agreement with the position of the Lutheran Church of Norway and Denmark, has officially accepted only the three Ecumenical Creeds, the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and Luther's Small Catechism. This position does not imply that the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America in any way whatsoever rejects the remaining symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, as the constant reference to them in her theological literature amply testifies, but since the other symbolical books are not known to her constituency generally, it has not been deemed necessary to require formal subscription to the entire Book of Concord.)

2. Adherence to our confessions pertains only to their doctrinal content, (*i. e.*, the doctrines declared to be the divine truth and the rejection of opposite doctrines), but to these without exception or limitation in all articles and parts, no matter whether a doctrine is specifically cited as a confession or incidentally introduced for the purpose of elucidating or proving some other doctrine. All that pertains to the form of presentation (historical comments, questions purely exegetical, etc.) is not binding.

III

Church Fellowship

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 in 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.

IV

Points of Doctrine

In 1920 all synods with the exception of the Buffalo Synod (to which they had not been submitted) adopted theses on:

1. The Work of Christ
2. The Gospel
3. Absolution
4. Holy Baptism
5. Justification
6. Faith
7. Conversion
8. Election

(See Chicago Theses)

After discussion of these theses the representatives present came to the conclusion that we are in full agreement in all essentials pertaining to these doctrines.

V

The Lodge Question

1. These synods agree that all such organizations or societies, secret or open, as are either avowedly religious or practice the form of religion without confessing as a matter of principle the Triune God or Jesus Christ as the Son of God, come into the flesh, and our Savior from sin, or teach instead of the Gospel, salvation by human works or morality, are anti-Christian and destructive of the best interests of the Church, and the individual soul, and that, therefore, the Church of Christ and its congregations can have no fellowship with them.
2. They agree that a Lutheran synod should not tolerate pastors who have affiliated themselves with any anti-Christian society. And they admonish their pastors and congregations to testify against the sin of lodgery and to put forth earnest efforts publicly and privately to enlighten and persuade persons who are members of anti-Christian societies, to sever their connection with such organizations.

VI

Recognition

The representatives of the synods here present agree that the synods accepting these articles are one in doctrine and practice, recognize each other as truly Lutheran and may enter into pulpit and altar fellowship.

B. THE CHICAGO THESES

(The parts included by reference in the Minneapolis Theses)

1. *In Regard to the Work of Christ, Redemption, and Reconciliation:*
 Jesus Christ, God and Man, has not only for the benefit of, but in the place of the human race, taken upon Himself the sins of the world with the just penalties for them. In the place of the world and for its benefit, He has by His holy life fulfilled the law, and by His suffering and death, by His blood, paid the penalty for the whole world, truly and completely satisfied the divine justice, redeemed the world from guilt and punishment of sin, and brought about the reconciliation of God, whose wrath had come upon mankind on account of sin and whose justice required satisfaction.
2. *In Regard to the Gospel:*
 The Gospel is not only a story, a narrative of what Jesus Christ has done, but at the same time it offers and gives the result of the work of Christ — above all, forgiveness of sin. Yea, it even at the same time gives the power to accept what it offers.
3. *In Regard to Absolution:*
 Absolution does not essentially differ from the forgiveness of sin offered by the Gospel. The only difference is that absolution is the direct application of forgiveness of sin to the individual desiring the consolation of the Gospel. Absolution is not a judgment passed by the pastor on those being absolved, declaring that they now have forgiveness.

4. *In Regard to Holy Baptism and the Gospel:*

The Holy Ghost works regeneration of the sinner both through Baptism and the Gospel. Both are therefore justly called the means of regeneration.

5. *In Regard to Justification:*

Justification is not an act in man but an act by God in heaven, declaring the repentant and believing just, or stating that he is regarded as such on account of imputation of the righteousness of Christ by faith.

6. *In Regard to Faith:*

Faith is not in any measure a human effort. Faith is an act of man insofar as it is man who believes. But both the power to believe and the act of believing are God's work and gift in the human soul or heart.

7. *In Regard to Conversion:*

Conversion as the word is commonly used in our Lutheran confession comprises contrition and faith, produced by the Law and the Gospel. If man is not converted, the responsibility and guilt fall on him because he in spite of God's all sufficient grace through the call, "would not" according to the Word of Christ, Matt. 23:37: "How often would I have gathered thy children even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."

If a man is converted the glory belongs to God alone, whose work it is throughout. Before conversion or in conversion, there is no cooperation of man, but at the very moment man is converted, cooperation begins through the new powers given in conversion; though this cooperation is never independent of the Holy Spirit, but always "to such an extent and so long as God by His Holy Spirit rules, guides, and leads him." Form. Concord.

8. *In Regard to Election:*

The causes of election to salvation are the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ; nothing in us on account of which God has elected us to eternal life. On the one hand we reject all forms of synergism which in any way would deprive God of His glory as the only Savior. On the other hand we reject all forms of Calvinism which directly or indirectly would conflict with the order of salvation, and would not give to all a full and equally great opportunity of salvation, or which in any manner would violate the Word of God which says that God will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. 1 Timothy 2:4.

Here ends the *Overture*.

According to an accompanying editorial this document is to be "submitted to the presidents of all Lutheran bodies not members of the (A. L.) Conference, in the hope that it may be given consideration at the 1944 conventions of their respective bodies." At the same time the presidents of the constituent bodies of the American Lutheran Conference are being requested to place the document before their respective bodies.

Since this *Overture* is to come before the various synods on such an important mission, it is surely deserving of closest study. But that the non-member synods shall be asked to pass on the merits of this proposal at the same time when it is being submitted to the constituent bodies of the A. L. Conference "for proper action" strikes us as premature, to say the least. After all, it is only fair to those who are being asked to accept this proposal to know whether or not it has advanced beyond the status of a committee report in those circles from which it issues. Nor is the matter less important because President Yochum of the A. L. Conference says, "We do not mean organic union." It proposes a union of an infinitely higher order than even organic union — "the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship."

In judging this present overture on its merits one fact must be kept in mind. Its doctrinal parts are simply a restatement of the Minneapolis Theses of the year 1925, and the Chicago Theses of 1919 (not to be confused with the Intersynodical Chicago Theses of 1928). Both have therefore been before the Lutheran public for quite some time. Yet grave instances of laxity in doctrine and practice have nevertheless occurred in the very circles which signed these theses then, and are again advancing them now. We gladly recognize Article I of the Minneapolis Theses as an excellent statement on Inspiration: "The synods . . . accept without exception all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as a whole, and *in all their parts*, as the divinely inspired, revealed, and *inerrant* Word of God, and submit to this as the only *infallible* authority in all matters of faith and life." If in spite of this the doctrine of the Verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures could nevertheless be boldly challenged in official organs of the A. L. Conference, and this by men teaching at some of its Seminaries (as it has been the case), then what assurance do these articles give that they shall mean more in the future than they have in the past? If these proposals are to mean anything now, should they not at least contain a specific disavowal of such flagrant departures from the true doctrine? Or are these concessions to modernism simply to be ignored?

If this is to be the policy, we hold that these proposals stand condemned by the last sentence of Section I, Article III, of their own Minneapolis Theses: "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."

According to points 4 and 5 of the preamble three documents (really four) are to provide the basis for the proposed altar and pulpit fellowship, *viz.*, the Minneapolis Theses, the Brief Statement and Declaration, and the Pittsburgh Agreement. This is a far cry from the "one document of agreement" which was considered "advisable" by the Synodical Conference in 1940, and "not only desirable but necessary" by the Missouri Synod at its Fort Wayne Convention. But the disquieting feature of the *Overture* appears when one observes that the authors pledge their wholehearted and sincere adherence, *not to all* of these doctrinal statements,

but only "to our mutual pledge as to doctrine and practice in the Minneapolis Theses," and that from the other bodies nothing more is expected than that "their doctrine and practice shall conform to their respective declarations." These reservations would hardly be necessary if the several doctrinal statements represented an actual and complete agreement. As matters stand the Overture rather seems to propose an agreement to disagree, under which no participating synod need change its present position in any way.

Under these circumstances and in view of these grave uncertainties it will be well for all concerned to guard against hasty action. Certainly, a matter of such moment calls for most careful scrutiny and deliberation.

E. R.

Did Missouri Once Teach "Election in View of Faith"?* A rather significant reaction to a recent book, "*Toward Lutheran Union*," written jointly by Dr. Theo. Graebner and Dr. Paul E. Kretzmann, both of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, appears in an editorial in the *Lutheran Herald* (Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, member of the American Lutheran Conference). After agreeing with the authors on many points, the editor continues:

"The co-authors refer directly to our church in illustrating their point, taking the doctrine of election as their illustration. As our readers presumably know, there are two statements of this doctrine in the Lutheran Church. Those holding each believe that their statement is based on the Word of God. The co-authors admit that 'there was a time when the Missouri Synod could teach the doctrine of *election in view of faith*, as it did in Dietrich's *Catechism*. . . . But this does not mean that after the church has had the full benefit of years of discussion, it may still regard the *intuitu fidei* as a mode of presenting the doctrine of election which should have equal standing with the presentation of the *Formula of Concord* (as is done in the Madison Agreement of 1912)."

After explaining that "the Madison Agreement is the document drawn up by the Union Committee representing the Norwegian Synod and United Norwegian Lutheran Church out of which came the union agreement upon which the N. L. C. A. was founded" the editor proceeds to analyze the quoted statement:

"Now notice what the co-authors are saying. Admittedly the doctrine of election is so great a mystery of God that *there was a time* when Missouri Synod theologians recognized two statements of the doctrine as being correct interpretations of Scripture. Later, however, having had 'the full

* This item was written for the January number of the *Quartalschrift*, but withheld because we did not wish to precipitate a discussion on a matter where the evidence may seem to be inconclusive. Since then, however, we have seen articles on this question in the *Lutheran Sentinel*, *Concordia Theological Monthly*, and the *Confessional Lutheran*. As none of these emphasizes the point which seems essential to us, namely that Dietrich himself calls his phrase a *descriptio* electorum, and also in order to bring a statement on the positive teaching of Walther, we are herewith printing our remarks without change.

E. R.

benefit of years of discussion,' other theologians of the Missouri Synod concluded that only the one form of statement of the doctrine is biblical. Therefore, as a result of these 'years of discussion,' every one must now accept that one form of stating the doctrine and none other!"

"Unless we misunderstand the co-authors completely (and we do not think that we do), it would be necessary for the N. L. C. A., if we desired union with Missouri, to throw overboard the Madison Agreement and accept an interpretation of Scripture which it took 'years of discussion' for Missouri to arrive at! That, we contend, is not insisting upon adherence to the clear teaching of Scripture (upon which we insist as vehemently as they); it is insisting upon our accepting a certain statement of a Scriptural doctrine which a certain group of theologians have agreed is the *only possible* statement of that doctrine; and it took them 'years of discussion' to arrive at this conclusion."

It will be difficult to challenge this reasoning if the premises are correct, *if* Missouri really did teach election in view of faith, in the sense that such foreseen faith is the explanation for God's choice of the believer. Since the co-authors concede that in Dietrich's *Catechism* their synod did teach the doctrine of *election in view of faith*, there would seem to be no room for further argument.

But did Missouri really teach this? Just for the sake of keeping the record straight it should be said that the second statement (tropus) of the doctrine was occasionally employed — and tolerated — in the Missouri Synod *before the question became an issue*. But there is emphatic evidence that this was not the "voice of the Synod" (Walther, in Report of "Allgemeine Pastoralkonferenz", Chicago; p. 88f.). The Synod never *taught* this form of the doctrine of election, either in its Seminary, its publications, or in Dietrich. For in this *Catechism* the passage in question reads as follows: "Was ist daher die *Gnadenwahl* Gottes? — Sie ist diejenige Handlung Gottes, da er nach dem Vorsatz seines Willens allein aus seiner Gnade und Barmherzigkeit in Christo alle diejenigen selig zu machen beschlossen hat, die beharrlich an Christum glauben werden, zu Lob seiner herrlichen Gnade." (Question 321.) In the original Latin of Dietrich's *Institutiones Catecheticae* this is given as "salvos facere constituit omnes perseveranter in Christum credituros," a simple statement of future fact, without any causal implication. This also appears from the Latin notes of Dietrich, where he calls this participial phrase a "*descriptio electorum*" and stresses the "perseveranter" in the original statement.

It is difficult to see what, either in this presentation of Dietrich or in the general teaching of their synod at that time, could have moved the authors to make such a major concession, especially since Walther, long before the Election Controversy broke, had set forth the Missouri position in unmistakable terms: "Gott hat die Auserwählten nicht darum erwählt, weil er wußte, daß sie im Glauben verharren würden, sondern daß sie erwählt sind, das ist die Ursache, daß sie beharrlich glauben. Gott hat sie nicht darum erwählt, weil er wußte, daß sie selig würden, sondern weil

sie erwählt sind, darum *werden* sie selig." (*Ev. Postille*, p. 94; published 1870)

It has been claimed for the St. Louis Agreement of 1938 that it cleared the decks of the *intuitu fidei* issue as far as the American Lutheran Church is concerned. In view of these needless concessions by Missouri theologians the members of the A. L. C. may well ask why they should spend time and effort to bring their sister synods in the American Lutheran Conference to share their position. They may even regret having disavowed the term in 1938. We fear that the cause of true Lutheran Union has received a serious setback.

E. R.

Büchertisch

Our Bible. A Guide to the Study of the Holy Scriptures. By J. M. Weidenschilling, M. A., S. T. D. Second Printing. Paper covers. X plus 95 pages. Price, 35 cents. — Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri.

Although the undersigned did not have time to examine the pamphlet thoroughly, a mere paging through it convinced him of its great value in leading young people, especially after confirmation, to a systematic and edifying study of their Bible. The information given is reliable, and the suggestions for study are stimulating. That part of each chapter entitled "My Daily Companion" should prove a strong incentive and a practical guide to search the Scriptures. — While the book proceeds on the assumption that the Scriptures should be read because in them we have eternal life, it was the reviewer's impression that this truth might well be made a little more prominent and emphatic for our young students of the Bible. — A few minor flaws were noticed, but they need not be pointed out; yet, why is Gen. 4, 23, listed as the "first specimen of poetry in the Bible"? (p. 25). Why overlook Adam's song of praise at the creation of Eve (Gen. 2, 23) or the highly poetic protevangelium (chap. 3, 15)?

M.

The Annotated Pocket New Testament, Authorized Version, With Notes By Theodore Graebner. Parts VIII and IX. — Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Yearly Subscription Price \$1.00. Single Copy 25c.

Two new booklets of the series, containing Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, the three Pastoral Epistles and Philemon, have come to our desk. As has been our wont we again bring the issue of this series of the books of the New Testament to the attention of our readers.

We have nothing but words of commendation for this and similar efforts to make the Bible, and especially the New Testament, ever more

easily accessible to our church people. However that is not all we wish to say. Sometime, somewhere the question should be raised — why not here and now? — what the underlying reason for a publication of this kind may be. Does the need for it arise from a clamor on the part of our Christians for such handy pocket-size volumes? May we consider it as proof of a widely felt urge to have the Word of Life in easy reach at any and all times and occasions? Would to God it were so! Or has not rather such an undertaking its origin in the realization of people who have the welfare of our Church at heart that the church members of this generation show a deplorable lack of acquaintance with their Bible, that the indifference in matters spiritual is on the increase in our Church, which came into being as a separate church body through the insistence of Luther and his friends on *sola scriptura* in matters of faith and life?

Whatever may be said in extenuation and explanation, we must face the sober fact that our people are in sore danger of losing their inheritance, of drifting away from the safe anchorage which our fathers found for their faith and hope in the Word of God. Here lies the reason for irregular church attendance and the many empty pews, of which so much complaint is heard. What has become of the good old custom of regular daily devotions conducted by the head of the house, when families gathered for a few minutes of Scripture reading and prayer? Every experienced pastor knows the answer, and it is a sad one.

While we are, indeed rejoicing in this new manner — the publication of these little volumes — of facilitating the communing of our people with their God in His revealed Word let us not stop there. Let us not merely deplore the growing lack of appreciation in our Church for the Means of Grace. And, above all, let us not look about for new ways of making our church and its services more attractive by catering to the perverted taste of natural man. We must not change our churches into concert halls or places of amusement to draw the crowds. What can we gain thereby? Shall we despair of the efficacy of the Word of God or, in plain words, admit we do not trust in the promises of the Lord our God? No, a thousand times no! But let us valiantly strive for a change of attitude and a new zeal in matters of our salvation. How that may be done? There is one answer, and one only: With all boldness we will continue, publicly and privately, to preach Christ Crucified, who gave His life-blood to save the sinners from eternal death, *i. e.*, the Gospel which is the savour of life unto life in them that are saved, and the savour of death unto death in them that perish.

L.

* * *

Alle hier angegebenen Sachen können durch unser Northwestern Publishing House, 935-937 North Fourth Street, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin, bezogen werden.

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben von der Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Synode von
Wisconsin und anderen Staaten.

Jahrgang 41

Juli, 1944

Nummer 3

ADDRESS

Delivered in the Seminary Chapel to the
Graduating Class on May 26, 1944

Dear Friends, Particularly Dear Members of the Graduating Class:

You are the first class to be graduated from our Seminary after this chapel hall has been decorated. What does the chapel mean to you? In a way it may be said that the chapel symbolizes the spirit of the Seminary and the work that is being done in it. In this hall the new students are received in a solemn service. Here those that have completed their course are dismissed, again in a special service. Here we assemble daily in our morning devotions to gather strength for our work.

The meaning of this chapel, and the meaning of the Seminary, yes, the meaning of the work for which you are being prepared here, is summed up in the inscription over this platform: *Keryxate to Euaggelion, Preach the Gospel.*

Let me, on your graduation day, point to a few thoughts in connection with that general commission to preach the Gospel.

I.

Remember that Jesus wants you to preach the Gospel

As His witnesses, as men who have tasted its blessed truth.

So He said to His disciples as He was about to ascend into heaven: Ye shall be My witnesses. Jesus promised them that He would give them a taste of the Gospel, so that they could proclaim the glad tidings as witnesses from personal experience.

In this way then the apostles also performed their task. In the house of Cornelius Peter emphasized the fact: "We are witnesses of all things which He did"; yes, witnesses "who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead." In a similar

vein John wrote in his first epistle: "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." Their experience was of such a nature that they simply could not keep silent. Peter and John stressed before the high court in Jerusalem: "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

When Jesus says to you, Preach the Gospel, He does not want you to repeat, parrot-like, something which you have learned by rote, from scientific books: He wants you to testify as His witnesses. Paul, in instructing Timothy, expresses the same thought in this way: "The husbandman that laboreth must be first partaker of the fruits. Consider what I say" (2 Tim. 2, 6).

If you wish to be faithful preachers of the Gospel, then always remember these instructions. Apply the Gospel which you are to preach first to your own hearts, so that you experience its comforting and strengthening truth. You will be enriched personally and become better equipped to carry out your ministry.

Look at Paul. Look at his afflictions which came upon him because he preached the Gospel. Do not make the mistake that you expect to be spared. All true ministers of the Gospel must deny themselves. Pride and arrogance and shying away from the cross disqualify a man for the ministry. Did Paul's sufferings hinder him in his work? He may have thought so. He prayed the Lord to relieve him of the buffeting by the messenger of Satan. But he learned that his very afflictions served to prepare him all the better. In them he experienced the grace of God which is sufficient. He learned that wherein he had been troubled and comforted he could now comfort others in their troubles.

In the same way Jesus wants you to preach His Gospel, as men who can from personal experience testify to its efficacy.

II.

This leads directly to another thought. Jesus wants you to preach the Gospel

As a word filled with divine power.

Such it is. Jesus said so at the very time when He gave orders to preach it. He added: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."

Damned? Why? — All men are under the curse by nature. They are the children of wrath. You know that since the fall

of Adam all men are conceived and born in sin, without fear of God, without love of God, having a heart from which spring all manner of evil thoughts and desires. And the wages of sin is death, temporal death and eternal damnation. All men are doomed, no one can save himself.

They that reject the Gospel in unbelief remain in their damnation. The Gospel would have been powerful to save them, as is witnessed in those that believe. What a powerful instrument, then, the Gospel must be, if it can lift men out of their doom, can rescue them from hell, and secure to them the blessedness of heaven! This is exactly what Jesus promised.

This is what all those who preached the Gospel found it to be. Take Paul as an example. He preached the Gospel to a world that was not only filled with sneering Pilates ("What is truth?"), but who also bitterly opposed him and persecuted him. His only weapon of defense and of attack was at all times nothing but the Gospel. But the Gospel proved superior both to the callousness and to the enmity of the world. Paul compares his mission journeys — which for him often meant to be thrown from one prison into another — with one grand triumphal procession, because the weapon which he wielded proved mighty to the pulling down of every stronghold. He could sum up his experience in the well-known words: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is a power of God unto salvation."

In this conviction Paul determined not to know anything save Christ, and Him crucified. Paul did not add anything to the Gospel to make it strong and more attractive. He knew that if he tried anything of that kind he would thereby become guilty of adulterating the Gospel, he would be bringing disgrace on it.

Paul's is precisely the way Jesus wants you to preach the Gospel.

Today you can frequently hear the suggestion that the Gospel itself is not strong enough to combat the evil forces in the world. In order to achieve results, we must give our preaching the backing of a united front, of impressive numbers, of imposing titles, of strong organization, of abundant financial resources. But while the promoters of such methods appear to be very much concerned about the Gospel, they may be ready even to drop parts of it, which they declare to be non-essential. — Others will suggest that we

must offer the people some inducements in order to attract them to our church. What a disgrace for the Gospel! As though the salvation which it offers to lost sinners were not the greatest, in fact, the only inducement to win the hearts.

People who try to reenforce the Gospel with inducements or with outward management thereby confess that they really do not believe that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation.

Do you then always preach it as a word filled with divine power.

III.

When Jesus says, Preach the Gospel, He does not thereby abrogate the ethical principles of love and order which God has set up for this world. He wants you to preach the Gospel

In accordance with a call by His church.

When Christ gave His order to preach the Gospel He authorized every Christian to be His witness and to testify of Him. Christians do this individually and jointly. When they do it jointly as bodies of Christians, they appoint some one to speak and act in their stead. They cannot all speak at once, nor can they all act at once, *e. g.*, in administering the sacraments. They therefore, in accordance with the will of their Lord, call some one to exercise publicly the functions which are really the proper rights of all. The one so called then acts in the name of the whole group that called him. Through the call he does not acquire any new powers which he did not formerly possess as a private Christian, but he does receive the right to exercise them in the name of his fellow-Christians.

Naturally church bodies who call a man may specify the work they expect him to do. They may call some one as a pastor of a congregation, or as an assistant pastor, or as a teacher for a parochial school, or as a leader for the adolescent youth, or as an itinerant preacher, or as a missionary among heathen, or as a trainer of future pastors and teachers, and so on. And when the church thus calls some one, it is really Christ who calls, because all authority to preach the Gospel comes from Him, from His death and resurrection.

Now when Christ says to you through a church body, Preach the Gospel, He wants you to preach it faithfully according to the specifications of the call, and within the limitations of the call.

Look at Paul, not only how bitterly he resented it when the Judaizers and others broke into the churches which he had founded, but also how careful he was not to work in another man's field. The Lord had called him to do pioneer work for the Gospel. Then, although he was always ready to share his gifts with any church — note, *e. g.*, his epistle to the Romans, a church not founded by him — yet he was very careful never to trespass.

Learn from Paul. And let me direct your special attention to his meticulous care in avoiding the sin of becoming a “busy-body in other men's matters.” The danger is acute.

We know how we resent it when other church bodies with unctious phrases work among members of our churches. We denounce it as “sheep-stealing.” Rightly so. But then we on our part must be doubly careful to avoid the same sin.

We may, we must, condemn the errors of other churches. Yet as long as they have the real Gospel — though not in its purity, but adulterated with false doctrine or practice — they have as Christians the privilege from Jesus to call their own preachers. And we must respect this authority. When Jesus says to you, Preach the Gospel, He wants you to observe carefully all rules of decency and order.

Hence preach the Gospel to the full extent of your call to those Christians that have called you and to those unchurched to which you may be sent, carefully avoiding every appearance of proselyting.

Then, though the progress of your work may be slow outwardly, you have the promise of your Lord's promise and blessing.

Preach the Gospel. Amen.

M.

Der Antichrist

Das Papsttum, die Erfüllung der Weissagung 2 Thessal. 2, 1–12.

„Der sich über alles setzt, das göttlich genannt wird, oder Gegenstand göttlicher Verehrung ist, so daß er sich in den Tempel Gottes setzt, sich erweisend, daß er Gott ist.“

Es mag sein, daß mancher in diesen Aufsätzen über den Antichristen einen ausführlichen Hinweis auf die von vielen Päpsten

begangenen Greuel vermiffen wird: Sabgier, Unzucht, Brechen von Bündniffen, Eidbrechen, Rauben, Morden, Folter, Simonie ufm. Das alles ift ja gefchichtlich zur Genüge bezeugt und war vor Luther oft der Grund, weshalb viele eine Kirchenreformation forderten, die fich leider nur in fittlicher Richtung bewegen, auf die Reinigung von den offenbaren Werken des Fleifches befchränken follte, aber das Grundübel im ganzen Papfttum, das unerfättliche Trachten nach Alleinherrfchaft als Gott über Himmel und Erde und die damit verbundene Verfehrung der göttlichen Wahrheit in Irrtum und Lüge zum Verderben vieler unangetastet laffen wollte. Luthers Reformation war die, die diefes Grundübel im Papfttum erkannte und ihm den Todesftreich verfezte.

Der Grund, weshalb hier nur vorübergehend auf jene von vielen Päpften begangenen Greuel hingewiefen wird, ift der folgende: Paulus, wenn er in feiner Theffalonicher Weiffagung vom Menschen der Sünde redet, hat eigentlich jene Greuel nicht im Sinn, fondern, wie ja B. 4 klar zeigt, dies, daß er fich der Sünde im Menschen gemäß mit unerfättlicher Gier über alles, das Gott ift, fezt, fo daß er fich zum Gott macht. In dem Bestreben, Pauli Worten genau zu folgen, blieben jene Greuel mehr unbeachtet, dagegen wurde diefe Seite hervorgekehrt, die Paulus felbft als das Greuliche am „Menschen der Sünde“ hervortreten läßt und das in Wahrheit weit verdammlicher ift als jener allerdings im höchften Grade zu verwerfende unmoralifche Lebenswandel vieler Päpste.

Nebenbei fei dies gefagt: Wenn Paulus unter dem „Menschen der Sünde“ einen gemeint hätte, der fich in allerlei Verbrechen und Laftern ergeht, dann könnte nur der oder eine Sukzeffion von Männern eine Erfüllung der Weiffagung Pauli fein, die ohne Unterschied Laftermenschen und Verbrecher wären. Das aber würde ohne weiteres die Päpste als Erfüllung der paulinifchen Weiffagung ausfchließen, da ja bekanntermaßen nicht wenige Päpste, z. B. Gregor VII., ein äußerlich fittlich strenges Leben geführt haben.

Der Papst fezt fich in den Tempel Gottes.

Der Tempel Gottes. Was unter dem Tempel Gottes zu verstehen ift, wurde bereits im ersten Teil diefer Arbeit, dem eyegetifchen, ausgeführt. Es fei nur kurz folgendes wiederholt: Nach Pauli Ausführungen find diejenigen der Tempel Gottes, in denen der Heilige Geift wohnt und fein feligmachendes Werk, den Glauben an Jefum

Christum, ausgerichtet hat. Da nun dies vor Menschengenossen verborgen ist, können Pauli Worte, mit denen er öfter seine Gemeinden anredet: Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes, nur so verstanden werden, daß er auf Grund gewisser Fakta dies von ihnen glaubt. Sie haben das Evangelium unter ihnen lauter und rein, sie hören es mit Lust, sie bekennen sich dazu, tun Früchte des Glaubens; da ist besonders auch Gottes Verheißung, daß sein Wort ausrichten soll, dazu er es gesandt hat. Das alles bewegt den Apostel trotz mancher vorhandenen Mängel fest zu glauben, daß hier Gottes Tempel ist. Diesem Vorbild des großen Apostels folgen wir auch.

Wiewohl wir darum die katholische Kirche als solche natürlich nicht für den Tempel des Heiligen Geistes halten können, sind wir doch, wie auch Luther war, überzeugt, daß auch innerhalb der katholischen Kirche wegen der Taufe und des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses, die noch dort sind, solche vorhanden sind, die man den Tempel Gottes im Geist nennen darf. Dieselbe Ueberzeugung haben wir in bezug auf die vielen Sekten. Besonders halten wir unsere lutherische Kirche auf Grund der in ihr lauter vorhandenen Gnadenmittel, auf Grund ihres Bekenntnisses und ihrer Früchte und auf Grund der göttlichen Verheißung für den Tempel Gottes.

In ihre Mitte setzt sich der Papst, auton kathisai. Zweierlei sagt Paulus mit diesen Worten vom „Menschen der Sünde“ aus, erstens, daß er im Tempel Gottes sitzt; zweitens, wie er hinein kommt. Wie? Er setzt sich selber. Nicht der Tempel Gottes setzt ihn; er tut das selber. Ohne Beruf, eigenmächtig, wie es freilich dem „Menschen der Sünde“ eigen ist, setzt er sich in den Tempel Gottes und sagt: Ich bin euer Herr, nach göttlichem Recht, dem ihr zu gehorchen habt.

Wie sind doch die römischen Bischöfe von der allerersten Zeit an auch hierin eine Erfüllung jener paulinischen Weissagung! Es kann freilich nicht geleugnet werden, daß bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts den Königen, dem Adel, dem Volk und dem niederen Klerus eine gewisse Beteiligung an einer jeweiligen Papstwahl zuerkannt war. Die Investitur, die Wahl von Bischöfen und Aebten durch Könige und Kaiser, schaffte Gregor VII. ab, was den bekann- ten Investiturstreit zur Folge hatte. Jene Beteiligung seitens der Könige, des Adels und Volkes an einer Papstwahl war freilich mehr formell und bestand eigentlich nur in einer einseitigen Zustimmung zu einer vollzogenen Wahl, einseitig, insofern die eigentliche Wahl

von der hohen Klerisei vollzogen wurde und das Volk nur dazu berechtigt war, zu dem Wahlergebnis ja und amen zu sagen. Auch dieses Recht wurde aufgehoben, als Nikolaus II., 1058-1061, ein Wahlgesetz erließ, dem zufolge nur die Kardinalbischöfe eine Papstwahl vollziehen sollten. Dieses Gesetz wurde auf der Lateransynode im Jahre 1059 angenommen. Diesem Gesetz zufolge versammeln sich die Kardinäle am elften Tage nach dem Tode eines Papstes, um einen neuen Papst zu wählen.*

So erfüllt sich hierin das *auton kathisai* im Papsttum. Ohne Beruf seitens der Kirche setzt der Papst sich selber zum Haupt der Kirche, die ihn stillschweigend annimmt.

So sitzt er nun in dem Tempel Gottes und zwar in dem ganzen Tempel Gottes auf Erden. Er sitzt nicht nur mit seiner Herrschsucht und lügenhaften Irrlehren im Tempel Gottes, soweit dieser noch in der katholischen Kirche zu finden ist, sondern auch in unserer lutherischen Kirche als Gottes Tempel, indem er einerseits uns fort und fort vorhält, daß wir zu ihm zurückkehren müssen, wenn wir wollen selig werden, andererseits uns mit seinem Bann und Anathema belegt, solange wir nicht zu ihm zurückkehren. Er betrachtet uns als ihm unterworfenen Gebiet, das er verflucht als der Richter über die ganze Welt, der er zu sein vorgibt. So sitzt er im ganzen Tempel Gottes auf Erden, hier als Hirte, dort als Richter und erfüllt auch damit 2 Thessal. 2, 1-12.

Er erweist sich im Tempel Gottes als Gott

Das sagt Paulus vom „Menschen der Sünde“: *apodeiknynta heauton hoti estin theos*. Hiermit kommt die Sünde im Menschen zu ihrem vollen Ausbruch. Dahin muß es bei dem „Menschen der Sünde“, der ja mit seinem ganzen Vermögen völlig ein Sklave der Sünde in ihm ist, die in ihm brennt, ihn so umschlingt, daß er nichts anderes will als ihre teuflische Lust ausüben, kommen; denn die vom Satan seit Adam dem Menschen eingepflanzte Sünde ist die Sucht zu sein, wie Gott ist.

* Karl Mirbt, *Realenzklop.* für protestant. Theologie und Kirche, sagt in seinem Aufsatz über Nikolaus II. dieses zu dessen Wahlgesetz: „Daß das Wahlrecht dem Klerus und dem Volk entzogen, daß den Kardinälen die Wahlbefugnis zugesprochen, daß der bisherige Anteil des Kaisers bei der Besetzung des päpstlichen Stuhles beiseite geschoben wird, waren offenbare Abweichungen von der geltenden Praxis und wurden die Grundlage für ein neues Papstwahlrecht.“

Daß der Papst ganz besonders auch hierin die volle Erfüllung jener Weisagung Pauli ist, soll in dem Folgenden ausgeführt werden.

— In dem apodeiknynta heauton hoti estin theos liegt zuerst dies, daß sich der Papst wirklich für **Gott hält**, daß jeder, sobald er den päpstlichen Thron bestiegen hat, fest überzeugt ist davon, daß er nun Gott ist. Sonst würde er sich ja nicht im Tempel Gottes als Gott zu erweisen suchen. Wie hat ihn die Sünde verblindet!

Daraus folgt zum andern, daß er nun sich als Gott, für den er sich hält, **erweist**. Im Tempel Gottes tritt er auf als Gott, umgibt sich mit allem Pomp und Prunk, wie es einer Gottheit zusteht. Er übt seine eingebildete, frech angemessene Gottheit aus; das, wofür er sich in seiner Verblindung hält, setzt er ins Werk und führt sich auf, als sei er Gott.

Woran wird das offenbar, daß der Papst sich für Gott hält und sich im Tempel Gottes als Gott aufführt? Indem wir diese Frage beantworten, wollen wir unserm Katechismus folgen, nämlich der Frage: Wie bezeugt uns die Schrift, daß Christus wahrer Gott ist? Die Antwort lautet: „Indem sie ihm **göttliche Namen, Eigenschaften, Werke und Ehre beilegt.**“

Genau diese vier göttlichen Dinge sind es, die sich der Papst annahmt. Daran wird über alle Zweifel offenbar, wofür er sich hält, als wer er im Tempel Gottes auftritt und sich benimmt, — nämlich, daß er Gott ist.

Er legt sich selbst und anderen göttliche Namen bei. Das geht schon hervor aus dem **offiziellen, persönlichen Namen**, die jeder Papst bei seinem Amtsantritt sich beilegt und mit dem er in den Katalog der Päpste eingetragen wird. Er legt bei seinem Amtsantritt seinen vorigen Namen, den seiner Eltern, ab und ersetzt diesen durch einen neuen. Die Mönche und Nonnen in den Klöstern tun übrigens dasselbe. Daß der Papst dies tut, ist gewiß bezeichnend. Er bringt damit jedenfalls zum Ausdruck, daß er mit seiner Erhebung auf den „Stuhl Petri“ von allen früheren irdischen Verbindungen, verwandtschaftlichen und anderen, für immer herausgerissen und in ein ganz neues, viel höheres Dasein eingetreten ist. Will er damit sich Christo gleichstellen, der mit seinem Amtsantritt in seinem 30. Jahre sein Elternhaus in Nazareth verließ und dort nicht länger weilte? Wer die Päpste und ihre Anmaßungen kennt, wird kaum daran zweifeln.

Seit der angeblichen Erhebung Petri zum Bischof von Rom im Jahre 41 — die Kirche der apostolischen Zeit kannte kein Bischofsamt im späteren Sinne; der monarchische Episkopat ist aus nachapostolischer Zeit, trat zuerst in den kleinasiatischen Gemeinden auf und kam gegen 160 nach Christo nach Rom — hat es 261 Päpste gegeben. Aus der Liste der Namen, die diese Päpste sich beigelegt haben, seien folgende erwähnt: Pius zwölfmal; Benediktus fünfzehnmal; Gregor sechzehnmal; Clemens vierzehnmal; Innocenz dreizehnmal; Leo dreizehnmal; Bonifazius neunmal; Coelestin fünfmal; Anastasius viermal.

Von allen Päpsten sind 77 heilig gesprochen worden. Von diesen fallen 75 in die Zeit vor Gregor VII., 1073–1085. Dieser selbst ist der 76. Nach ihm wurde der Liste zufolge nur noch ein Papst beatifiziert und dann kanonisiert, St. Pius V., 1566–1572. Daß von denen im 14., 15. Jahrhundert usw. keiner kanonisiert wurde, erklärt uns die Geschichte der Päpste. Von vielen derselben gilt das Wort: „Euer Ruhm ist nicht fein“. Ihre Kanonisierung hätte selbst in römischen Kreisen den größten Aufruhr erregt.

Wenn sich jemand einen Namen beilegt, dann darf man nicht übersehen, wer es ist, der dies tut. Ein einfacher Mann mag den Namen Benedikt tragen. Das hat nichts zu sagen. Wenn man aber in Betracht zieht, wer die Päpste sind mit ihrer unbändigen Herrschsucht und daß sie sich Namen wie die genannten beilegen, dann reden diese Namen und zeugen von dem Geist, der in den Päpsten herrscht. Wir dürfen nicht vergessen, daß diese Namen auf keinen unter den Menschen passen, keinem andern mit mehr Recht, recht eigentlich angehören als Christo, dem Sohne Gottes. Mit der Beilegung dieser Namen bringen die Päpste zum Ausdruck, daß sie sich für die Neumenschwerdung Christi halten. Die Weise, wie Leo I., der Große, 440–461, den päpstlichen Titel „Nachfolger Petri“, davon noch später geredet werden wird, gedeutet hat, beweist das zur Genüge.

Der Name Leo, der Löwe. Philippi weist darauf hin, daß eben Leo I. und die zwölf andern Päpste, die sich diesen Namen beilegen, diesen aus Offenbarung 5, 5 genommen haben. Dort steht: „Siehe, es hat überwunden der Löwe, der da ist vom Geschlecht Judas“. Christus ist gemeint; dreizehn Päpste legen sich diesen Namen bei. Zeigt das nicht, wofür sie sich halten? „Er setzt sich in den Tempel Gottes, sich erweisend, daß er Gott ist.“

Weitere Namen: Anastasius, der Auferstandene; Benediktus, der Gesegnete; Pius, der Tugendhafte; Bonifazius, der Wohltäter; Gregor, der die Herde weidet und bewacht; Innozens, der Unschuldige; Cölestin, der Himmlische; Eugenius, der Wohlgeborene, der Edle; Clemens, der Gnädige; Adeodatus, der von Gott Gegebene. Welch hohe Namen! Wem kommen sie allein zu? Unserm Herrn Christo. Die Päpste haben sich geüffentlich solche Namen zugelegt. Dazu trieb sie ihre furchtbare Selbsterhöhung. Schon durch diese Namen tun sie kund, was sie nach ihrer Meinung sind: Gott.

Noch mehr bringen dies zum Ausdruck die **päpstlichen Titel**, die die Päpste im Laufe der Zeit sich zugelegt haben.

Pontifex Maximus. Dieser Titel erscheint seit dem 5. Jahrhundert in Verbindung mit den Päpsten. In Uebersetzung heißt dieser Titel wahrscheinlich Brückenbauer. Ursprünglich stammt dieser Titel aus dem römischen Heidentum. Der Pontifex Maximus stand an der Spitze eines Priesterkollegiums, Pontifices genannt. Er hatte eine große Gewalt. Jedenfalls haben die Päpste aus diesem Grunde ihn sich beigelegt, um damit zum Ausdruck zu bringen, daß sich alle Gewalt im Himmel und auf Erden in ihrer Person vereinigt.

Der heilige Vater. Im Volksmund ist wohl kein päpstlicher Titel so geläufig wie dieser. Man muß hier Matth. 23, 9 hinzuziehen: „Nicht sollt ihr einen euren Vater nennen auf Erden; denn **einer**, der Vater, der himmlische, ist euer Vater“. Vater ist der, der Kinder zeugt. In diesem Vers ist selbstverständlich nicht die Rede von denen, die **leiblich** Kinder zeugen, sondern von dem geistlichen Zeugen **geistlicher** Kinder. Das bedarf weiter keiner Auslegung. Es ist nur einer, der geistlich zeugen kann, nur der Vater im Himmel, der uns gezeugt hat durch das Wort der Wahrheit. Nur einem gebührt darum der Titel Vater, wie Christus sagt, im geistlichen Sinn: Gott, der der rechte Vater ist über alles, das da Kinder heißt im Himmel und auf Erden. Kein Mensch auf Erden hat darum irgendein Anrecht auf diesen göttlichen Titel, denn kein Mensch kann noch hat je einen Menschen auf Erden geistlich gezeugt; er mag das Werkzeug gewesen sein, aber Gott der Zeuger. Wer aber legt sich trotz des Verbotes Christi, der dies selbst seinen inspirierten Zeugen auf Erden untersagte, diesen ausschließlich göttlichen Titel zu? Der Papst. Damit erweist er sich wahrhaftig als Gott. Er hebt sich zur Höhe unseres Vaters im Himmel, daß er allein kann

geistliche Kinder zeugen und alle Menschen zu ihm kommen müssen, wenn sie wollen Kinder Gottes und selig werden.

Der Nachfolger Petri. Auf diesen Titel legen die Päpste den allergrößten Nachdruck. Was dieser Titel eigentlich bedeutet und besagen soll, wird erst dann klar, wenn man in Betracht zieht das Verhältnis, in das nach römischer Lehre Christus den Petrus soll gesetzt haben. Dazu muß man hören, was Leo I., der Große, 440—461, darüber gesagt hat; Realencyklop. für Protestant. Theologie und Kirche, Band 11, zu Leo I. Leo in seinen Briefen: „Die Kirche ist auf Petrus erbaut, den Christus in Wahrheit zu einem Felsen gemacht, auf dem seine Kirche gründen soll. In ihm gipfelt derart das apostolische Amt, er ist so in die **unteilbare Einheit Christi** aufgenommen, daß sich von ihm als dem Haupt aus alle Gaben in den Leib ergießen und sich von Christi Gemeinschaft ausschließt, wer sich von Petrus trennt (ep. 10, 1). Den Schriftbeweis liefert ihm Matth. 16, 16—19. Ist zwar Christus der Eck- und Grundstein, so doch auch Petrus der Fels der Kirche, **denn er hat teil an allem, was Christi ist** (tu quoque petra es, quia mea virtute solidaris (fest gemacht bist), ut quae mihi potestate sunt propria, sint tibi mecum participatione communia). Daher ist der eine Petrus allen Aposteln vorangestellt, damit auch er beteiligt sei an der Leistung aller Priester und Hirten durch Christus. Was die andern Apostel mit Petrus gemeinsam haben, haben sie nur durch Petri Vermittlung, auch die Binde- und Lösegewalt. **Was aber von Petrus gilt, gilt auch von seinem Nachfolger**“.

Es scheint, daß Leo sich doch etwas scheute, mit runden Worten zu sagen, was er dachte, nämlich: Petrus ist derartig mit Christus verschmolzen, daß er vollständig in die Einheit Christi aufgenommen ist und am Wesen, Majestät und Macht alles hat, das Christus hat. **Petrus und Christus sind eins.**

Diese Auffassung bestätigt zur Genüge E. Commer, Professor der Theologie an der Universität Wien, in seiner Rede zu Ehren des 25jähr. Jubiläums Leos XIII. Er sagte, Realencyklop. für Protest. Theol. und Kirche, B. 20, S. 474, „De majestate pontificis romani: „Wir bekräftigen, daß die Kirche **ein Haupt** hat in zwei bestimmten Personen, Christus und Petrus. Wie die Menschheit Christi gleichsam das belebte Instrument und mit der Göttlichkeit, die dem Sohne eigen, auf gleiche Weise kann der pontifex m. das vorzügliche menschliche und belebte Instrument dieser mensche-

wordenen Göttlichkeit bezeichnet werden. **Mit Recht** wird daher der Papst von der „heiligen“ Katharina von Siena, geb. 1347, **der andere Christus**, alter Christus, genannt.“

Hier wird der Papst mit der Menschheit Christi auf die gleiche Stufe gestellt und ist so unzertrennbar mit Christo als Petri Nachfolger vereinigt wie Christi Menschheit mit seiner Gottheit. Das ist die eigentliche Bedeutung des Titels „Nachfolger Petri“. Was bedürfen wir weiter Zeugnis? Er erweist sich, daß er Gott ist.

Der Papst wird geradezu **Gott genannt**.

Matthew Henry zu 2 Thessal. 2, 1–12: “Showing himself that he is God. He claims divine honors and to whom can this better apply than to the bishops of Rome, to whom the most blasphemous titles have been given as: Dominus Deus noster Papa; Deus alter in terra; idem est dominium Dei et Papae.

Philippi bemerkt, daß das Volk in Italien den Papst den Gott auf Erden nennt.

Balthasar Menzer in De praecipuis quibusdam Controversiis Christianae Doctrinae, Disputatio XIV, De Antichristo, pag. 668f: Se ostendit tanquam sit Deus, nempe Christi vicarius, Deus in terris, juxta Balduin, numen quoddam visibile et secundum Gomezium, quae facit, facit ut Deus, non ut homo. Habet idem cum Deo consistorium et coeleste arbitrium. Ejus potestas est suprema immo absoluta, quae se extendit ad coelestia, terrestria et infernalialia. Habet omnem potestatem in coelo et in terra. Summa: Divinos titulos, honores et potestatem sibi arrogat. Pag. 679: Papam se gerere pro Deo, quia a suis Deum se appellari patitur. Er zeigt sich gleichsam, daß er Gott sei, nämlich Christi Stellvertreter, Gott auf Erden, wie Balduin sagt, eine gewisse sichtbare Gottheit nach Gomez, die, was sie tut, tut sie als Gott, nicht als Mensch. Der Papst hat mit Gott denselben Rat und freie Gewalt. Seine Gewalt ist die höchste, ja, eine absolute, die sich bis in den Himmel, über die Erde und in die Hölle erstreckt. Er hat alle Gewalt im Himmel und auf Erden. Summa: Göttliche Titel, Ehren und Gewalt maßt er sich an. Der Papst benimmt sich wie Gott, weil er sich gefallen läßt, daß er von den Seinen Gott genannt wird.

Sagenbach: Der Dominikaner Johann Turrecremata um die Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts: Die päpstliche Würde sei so hoch, daß kein Mensch sie begreifen oder nur ahnend in Gedanken erreichen

könne. Der Papst ist ein Herr über die Engel, ein Richter über Lebende und Tote! Man wagte es, Stellen der Heiligen Schrift Alten Testaments, welche die Kirche auf den Messias bezog, auf den Papst und dessen Herrschaft zu beziehen. Christophorus Marcellus redet 1512 Papst Julius II. so an: Du bist Hirte, Arzt, Regent und Pfleger der Kirche, ja, ein zweiter Gott auf Erden.“

Apologie der Confessio Augustana, Müller, S. 157: „Derhalben der Papst ein irdischer Gott, ein oberste Majestät und allein der großmächtigste Herr in aller Welt ist, über alle Königreiche, über alle Lande und Leute, über alle Güter, geistlich und weltlich, und also in seiner Hand hat alles, beide geistliche und weltliche Schwert.“

Es ist freilich wahr, daß die eben gegebenen Zitate nicht direkt von Päpsten stammen. Doch haben viele derselben dem Sinne nach dasselbe von sich behauptet. Wir weisen nur noch einmal auf das oben gebrachte Zitat von Leo I. über das Verhältnis Petri zu Christo. Was die Päpste übrigens nicht mit so vielen Worten gesagt, haben sie mit ihren maßlosen Ansprüchen durchleuchten lassen. Und was Menzger oben sagt, stimmt: Quia a suis Deum se appellari patitur. Wenn ihre Bewunderer sie ausdrücklich Gott nannten, wiesen sie das nicht als Gotteslästerung von sich, sondern ließen es sich gerne gefallen, glücklich darüber, Gott genannt zu werden.

Der Papst sucht sich zum andern auch dadurch als Gott im Tempel Gottes zu erweisen, daß er sich göttliche Eigenschaften beilegt.

Er läßt sich den Heiligen nennen, den heiligen Vater. Daß er dieses göttliche Attribut sich anmaßt, muß mit Konsequenz aus mancherlei folgen, das der Papst von sich behauptet. Behauptet er, daß er Gott auf Erden sei, dann wäre es ja ein grober Widerspruch, wollte er sich nicht auch die göttlichen Attribute, unter diesen Heiligkeit, zuschreiben. Ist er, wie Leo I. ausführt, als Petri Nachfolger in die Einheit mit Christo aufgenommen, dann muß er ja doch auch heilig sein. Da ihm, wie einige seiner Lobredner gesagt haben, größere Ehren zukommen als den Engeln im Himmel, muß er doch auch an Charakter und innerer Art höher stehen als die Engel, die heilig sind. Alle Päpste haben von sich beansprucht, daß sie allein Macht haben, jeden zu richten, aber von niemandem können gerichtet werden. Der so viele Heilige macht, wird doch nicht selbst unheilig sein wollen? Es liegt in der Sünde im Menschen,

deren Knecht der Papst in solchem Maße ist, daß er geradezu der „Mensch der Sünde“ ist, daß er sich zur Gottgleichheit erhebt. „Ihr werdet sein wie Gott.“ Wie Gott sein ist das innere Bestreben der Sünde im Menschen. Wie das den Menschen beherrscht, erfahren wir an uns täglich: Keiner will gesündigt haben; jeder will gut, rein und heilig sein. Der Papst, der sich der Sünde im Menschen restlos verschrieben hat, wird und muß darum auch von sich die Meinung hegen, daß er wie Gott ist, nämlich heilig. Wie gesagt, würde der Papst sich nicht für heilig erklären, das stände im Widerspruch mit all der Majestät, die er sich anmaßt. Es sei noch einmal daran erinnert, daß zwölf Päpste sich den Namen Pius, dreizehn den Namen Innozenz beigelegt haben, letztere jedenfalls, um anzudeuten, daß sie wie Christus sind, von dem selbst Pilatus bekannte: „Ich finde keine Schuld an ihm.“ Sie behaupten ja, sie seien seit Petrus in die volle Einheit mit Christo aufgenommen.

Der Papst legt sich auch **göttliche Macht** bei. Das deutet er schon an mit der dreifachen Krone, der Tiara, die der Papst trägt. Die Krone ist Symbol der Macht; so auch hier. Diese Krone in der Form eines Zuckerhutes besteht aus drei übereinandergesetzten Teilen. Der erste Teil soll von Nikolaus I., 858–867, stammen, der zweite von Alexander II. gegen 1065, der dritte Teil von Urban V., 1362–1370. Durch diese Krone mit ihren drei Keilen soll die Macht der Päpste bildlich dargestellt werden als eine, die sich über die ganze Kirche auf Erden, über alle Reiche der Welt und über Himmel, Fegfeuer und Hölle erstreckt.*

In bezug auf die Macht, die die Päpste sich anmaßen, sagen die *Articuli Smalcaldici* (Müller) folgendes: „Er, der Papst, soll jure divino der oberst über die christliche Kirche heißen. Darum hat er sich müssen Christo gleich und über Christum setzen, sich das Haupt, hernach einen Herrn der Kirchen, zuletzt auch der ganzen Welt und schlecht einen irdischen Gott rühmen lassen, bis er auch den Engeln im Himmel zu gebieten sich unterstund;“ S. 308, 13. Ferner: „Nu ist am ersten dies wahr, daß der Papst in der Kirchen regieret und unter dem Schein geistlicher Gewalt solche Herrschaft hat an sich bracht, denn er gründet sich auf diese Worte: Ich will

* Luther, Erl. Ausg., B. 31, S. 158: „Und das ist und heißt recht der Papst mit seiner dreifältigen Krone, ein Kaiser im Himmel, ein Kaiser auf Erden, ein Kaiser unter der Erden.“

dir die Schlüssel des Himmelreichs geben. Zum andern ist je des Papsts Lehre in alle Wege wider das Evangelium. Zum dritten, daß er fürgibt, er sei Gott, ist in dreien Stücken zu merken. Zum ersten, daß er sich des anmaßt, er möge die Lehre Christi und rechte Gottesdienst, von Gott selbst eingesetzt, ändern, und will seine Lehre und eigene erdichte Gottesdienst gehalten haben, als hätte sie Gott selbst geboten. Zum andern, daß er sich der Gewalt anmaßet zu binden und zu entbinden nicht allein in diesem zeitlichen Leben hie, sondern auch in jenem Leben. Zum dritten, daß der Papst nicht will leiden, daß die Kirche oder sonst jemand ihn richte, sondern sein Gewalt soll über alle Concilia und die ganze Kirche gehen. Das heißt aber sich selbst zum Gott machen"; S. 336, 40.

Augustin Triumphus von Ancona, ein Augustiner: „Kann man vom Papst an Gott appellieren? Antwort: Nur der Papst ist der Stellvertreter Gottes, weil nur, was er löst oder bindet, von Gott als gebunden und gelöst angesehen werden kann. Gottes und des Papstes Urteil ist darum eins. Man kann nicht vom Papst zu Gott appellieren, weil der Rat des Papstes der Gottes ist, der Papst hat die Schlüssel und öffnet die Thür zu Gottes Ratkammer.“ Benzellinus: „Der muß für einen Häretiker geachtet werden, der da meint, unser Herr Gott, der Papst, habe nicht die Macht zu dekretieren, wie er dekretiert hat.“ Ein anderer Lobredner behauptete, der Papst könne das ganze Fegefeuer leeren, wenn er nur wolle. Der Papst spricht selig, beatifiziert, spricht heilig, kanonisiert, welche er will, wenn nur die nötigen Bedingungen erfüllt werden, an die die Päpste beide Akte binden.

Es ist keine Frage, daß die Päpste sich die Macht Christi anmaßen: „Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt im Himmel und auf Erden.“ Man achte nur noch einmal auf das Zitat Leo I., wie dieser behauptet, Petrus sei in die ungeteilte Einheit Christi aufgenommen, der menschlichen Natur Christi gleich. Und wie die göttliche Natur Christi ihre göttlichen Eigenschaften der menschlichen Natur mitteile, so gleicherweise dem Petrus, nach ihm seinen Nachfolgern, den Päpsten. Darum habe der Papst Macht wie Christus über alle Reiche der Welt, über die ganze Kirche, könne aus eigener Macht lösen und binden, selig sprechen und verdammen, welchen er will. Der Papst maßt sich göttliche Macht an.

Der Papst legt sich göttliche Unfehlbarkeit bei. Die Forderung der Unfehlbarkeit wurde von den Päpsten schon Jahrhunderte vor

dem Vatikanischen Konzil erhoben und praktisch geübt, denn schon seit vielen Jahrhunderten vor diesem Konzil behaupteten alle Päpste, ihre Entscheidung stehe über allen Vätern, Konzilien, ja, der ganzen Kirche, so daß jeder bei seiner Seelen Seligkeit verpflichtet sei, restlos sich unter des Papstes Urteil zu beugen. Das Vatikanische Konzil, 1869–1870, hat nur die päpstliche Infallibilität definiert und zum kirchlichen Dogma erhoben. Mit dieser Infallibilität schreibt sich der Papst auch göttliche Allwissenheit zu, ohne die ja Unfehlbarkeit nicht denkbar ist.

Es wird nötig sein, hier noch einmal die vom Vatikanischen Konzil am 18. Juli 1870 angenommene Definition der päpstlichen Infallibilität, schon in einem früheren Aufsatz gebracht, zu wiederholen. Kapitel 4, übersetzt aus dem lateinischen Original: „Mit Zustimmung des heiligen Konzils und daß es ein göttlich geoffenbartes Dogma sei, definieren wir: Der römische Pontifex, wenn er ex cathedra redet, das ist, wenn er im Amt als Hirte und Lehrer aller Christen fungierend, gemäß seiner höchsten apostolischen Autorität eine Lehre über Glauben und Moral, von der unversen Kirche zu bewahren, definiert, unter göttlichem Beistand, ihm im seligen Petrus verheißen, mit solcher Unfehlbarkeit ausrichten kann, mit welcher der göttliche Erlöser will, daß seine Kirche im Definieren einer Lehre über Glauben oder Moral ausgerüstet werden soll; und daher sind die Definitionen ebendesselben römischen Pontifex an sich, nicht aber aus der Zustimmung der Kirche unveränderlich. Wenn aber jemand wagen sollte, das Gott verhüten wolle, dieser unserer Definition zu widersprechen, der sei verflucht.“ Darum sagt Triumphus in einem schon gebrachten Zitat, es könne niemand vom Papst an Gott appellieren. Und: Was der Papst dekretiert, bindet Gott.

Wie kann es eine größere Gotteslästerung geben! Wem sollten nicht die Augen aufgehen! Wie hat doch Petrus, 2 Petrus, Kap. 2, seine angebliehen Nachfolger im Geiste vorausgesehen, in ihrer Bosheit beschrieben und ihnen das ewige Gericht prophezeit!

Beachtet man jene Definition, dann wird wieder klar, wie sich der Papst, dem ja diese Definition höchst willkommen war, zur Höhe Christi erhebt und sich ihm gleichstellt. In der ganzen Kirche, in der ganzen Welt, im Himmel und auf Erden ist nur sein Wort irrtumslos, wie das Wort Christi, der von sich sagte: „Ich bin der Weg, die Wahrheit und das Leben“. In der ganzen Kirche ist er

der einzige, der den Heiligen Geist empfangen hat und darum unfehlbar ist. Wie Christus von sich sagte: „Der Geist des Herrn ist über mir“; er empfing ihn nach seiner Taufe. Ja, der Papst erweist sich als Gott im Tempel Gottes, als in absoluter Einheit mit dem ewigen Sohne Gottes, auch dadurch, daß er sich göttliche Eigenschaften beilegt.

Ebenso legt er sich göttliche Werke bei.

Eigentliche Schöpferakte hat wohl kein Papst je für sich beansprucht, aus guten Gründen. Das „es werde“ steht keinem Menschen zu, nur dem allmächtigen Gott.

Dagegen haben die Päpste es verstanden, sich mit einer Unzahl von Zeichen und Wundern zu umgeben und zu schmücken. Ob jeder Papst für sich die Kraft, Wunder zu tun, beansprucht hat, ist fraglich. Soweit bekannt ist, hat nur ein Papst diesen Anspruch für sich erhoben. Daß vor Gregor VII. allein 75 Päpste sind heilig gesprochen worden, nach ihm nur einer, ist noch kein ausschlaggebender Beweis dafür, daß sie hätten Wunder getan. Der heute übliche Prozeß der Beatifizierung besteht eigentlich erst seit dem Jahre 1170. In diesem Jahre bestimmte Alexander III., daß das Recht der Selig- und Heiligsprechung allein den Päpsten vorzubehalten sei. Vordem wurde es von den Bischöfen geübt. Alexander III. machte dann folgende Bestimmungen in bezug auf das ausschließliche Recht der Beatifizierung und Kanonisation seitens der Päpste: „Nehmet euch nicht heraus, einen Menschen vor einem andern zu verehren, auch wenn durch ihn viele Wunder sollten geschehen sein, denn es ist euch nicht erlaubt, daß derselbe als ein Heiliger verehrt werde ohne die Autorität der römischen Kirche.“ Der Prozeß ist folgender: Eine Person wird beatifiziert, wenn nachgewiesen werden kann, daß sie bei Lebzeiten Wunder getan hat. Wenn von dieser Person 50 Jahre nach ihrem Tode weitere Wunder bezeugt werden können, wird sie kanonisiert. Die Bestimmung Alexanders III. scheint freilich anzudeuten, daß auch in der Zeit, als die Bischöfe noch dieses Recht ausübten, man schon etwaige Wunder zur Seligsprechung für nötig erachtet und daß man solche jenen 75 Päpsten vor Gregor VII. zugeschrieben habe. In bezug aber auf die 186 Päpste nach Gregor dem Großen würde sie beweisen, daß diese keine Wunder getan hatten, es sei denn, daß andere Ursachen ihre Kanonisation verhin- derten.

Dennoch, wenn auch nicht von ihnen selbst getan, haben die Päpste nicht veräußert, einen sehr umfangreichen Katalog angeblicher Wunder seitens Glieder ihrer Kirche aufzustellen. Auf mancherlei Weise haben sie diese entstehen lassen. Einmal durch Personen, Mönche, Nonnen, besonders durch Missionare. Sagenbach: „Wunder werden allen ersten Sendlingen zugeschrieben: Columban vom Kloster Bangor in Island, Gallus in der Schweiz. Letzterer soll einen Teufel aus einer Königstochter ausgetrieben haben. Aman- dus, der erste Apostel Belgiens, soll einen Gehentken ins Leben zurückgerufen haben. Wunder soll auch Winfried aus England, dem Papst Gregor II. den Namen Bonifazius gab, der Apostel der Deutschen, getan haben. So viele andere. Zum andern durch Reliquien. Das Concil Trid., sessio XXV, § 469, sagt über Reliquien: „Durch welche viele Wohlthaten den Menschen von Gott erwiesen werden.“ Unzählig sind die Reliquien: Ueberreste der Märtyrer, Splitter vom Kreuze Christi, der ungenährte Rock Christi, Gegenstände, die von Maria und anderen Heiligen gebraucht wurden usw. Endlich durch Heiligenbilder, Statuen, besonders der Maria.

Die Bewertung dieser angeblichen Wunder wird später folgen.

Aus dieser ganzen Wunderthatigkeit ragt wieder dieselbe Absicht hervor, die Gleichstellung mit Christo, dem Sohne Gottes, seitens der Päpste. Wie Christus sein Wort bezeugte durch mitfolgende Zeichen, so suchen die Päpste, die ja infallibel sein wollen, auch ihr Wort durch viele Zeichen und Wunder zu bezeugen. Und wie Christus nach seiner Himmelfahrt nicht mehr selber unmittelbar Wunder verrichtete, sondern mittelbar durch seine Boten, so tun auch die Päpste nicht selber Wunder, sondern lassen solche geschehen durch andere und durch allerlei von ihnen ersommene Gegenstände. Ueber- all steht das im Vordergrund, was Paulus 2 Thessal. 2 voraus sagt: Er erweist sich, daß er Gott ist. Durch den Papst kommt alles in die Kirche; er ist ihre Tür. Durch ihn allein, den Unfehlbaren, kommt jeder Lehrsatz in bezug auf Glauben und Leben in die Kirche. Warum sollten sich nicht auch durch ihn, der sich für so mächtig hält wie Christus, da er ja wie Petrus in die Einheit mit Christo will aufgenommen sein, allerlei Wunderkräfte in die Kirche ergießen und sich erweisen in Heiligen, Reliquien, Statuen, Bildern usw.? Leo I. sagte: „Petrus ist so in die unteilbare Einheit Christi aufgenommen, daß sich von ihm als dem Haupt aus alle Gaben in den Leib ergießen. Tu quoque petra es, quia mea virtute solidarior, ut quae

mihi potestate sunt propria, sint tibi mecum participatione communia. Was die andern mit Petrus gemeinsam haben, haben sie nur durch seine Vermittlung. Was aber von Petrus gilt, gilt auch von seinem Nachfolger.“

Vor allem legt sich der Papst **das allerhöchste Werk Gottes, die Seligmachung eines Sünders, bei.**

Die Seligmachung eines Sünders ist **ausschließlich** das Werk Gottes. Als die Jünger den Herrn fragten: „Wer kann denn selig werden?“, antwortet Jesus: „Bei den Menschen ist's unmöglich, aber bei Gott sind alle Dinge möglich.“ „Israel, du stürzest dich ins Unglück, denn dein Heil steht **allein** bei mir.“ Die Schrift ist ja voller Sprüche, die das Werk der Seligmachung **ausschließlich** Gott zuschreiben. Er tut das durch sein Wort und Heiligen Geist; Menschen sind dabei nichts als Handlanger und ihr Mitwirken an dem Seligmachen eines Sünders ändert in keiner Weise etwas daran, daß Gott allein selig macht. Der Weg aber, auf dem Gott Sünder selig macht, ist **nur einer**, nämlich durch den Glauben an Jesum Christum, durch den ein Sünder die ihm zugerechnete Gerechtigkeit Christi ergreift, annimmt, und so vor Gott gerecht ist. „Glaube an den Herrn Jesum, so wirst du und dein Haus selig.“

Dieses göttliche Werk maßt sich der Papst an. Bonifazius VIII., 1294–1308, erklärte in seiner Bulle Unam Sanctam: „Wir erklären, beschließen und bestimmen, daß zum Seligwerden es absolut nötig ist, daß jeder Mensch sich dem römischen Pontifex unterwirft.“ Ferner: „Um ewige Glückseligkeit zu erlangen, muß sich jeder dem Papst unterwerfen“. Diese Erklärung steht durchaus nicht vereinzelt da; sie wurde von Papst Pius IX. im Jahre 1864 wiederholt und gilt als kanonisches Recht. Kein Papst hat je anders geredet. Wir weisen noch einmal auf die bereits zitierte Erklärung Leo I., des Großen.

Ganz im Einklang mit der Sünde im Menschen, deren Knecht der Papst ist, maßt dieser sich dieses allerhöchste Werk Gottes an nicht als ein ihm anvertrautes, sondern als ein ihm ohne weiteres zukommendes Recht, als eine ihm unmittelbar inhärierende Macht kraft seiner Stellung als Haupt der ganzen Welt. Zwar wird bei jeder Gelegenheit das *jure divino* betont. Aber so gewiß es ist, daß Gott allein das Werk des Seligmachens eines Sünders in die Hand seines lieben Sohnes Jesu Christi, dem alle Gewalt im Himmel und auf Erden gegeben ist, gelegt hat, ihm, dem Erhöhten zu seiner

Rechten, alles übertragen, ebenso gewiß ist, daß keine Stelle der Schrift das jus divinum der Päpste rechtfertigt. Die Päpste wissen das auch recht wohl, daß die von ihnen angeführten Schriftstellen, besonders die von Petrus handelnden, ihnen nichts zuweisen. Ihr Schriftbeweis ist nur zur Blendung Unerfahrener, wird von ihnen selbst ebensowenig geglaubt als für nötig zur Stütze ihrer Annahmen gehalten. Auch ohne Schriftbeweis stellen sie dieselben Forderungen als etwas ihnen ohne weiteres Zukommendes. Ihr ganzer Schriftbeweis wurde von ihnen erdichtet, um Kaiser, Könige und Fürsten samt ihrem Volke einzuschüchtern und unter ihre herrschsüchtige Faust zu bringen. Luther, der größte Kenner des Papsttums, sagt in seiner Schrift „Wider das Papsttum zu Rom, vom Teufel gestiftet“, Erl. Ausg., B. 26, S. 150: „Er (der Papst) ist nicht, will auch nicht sein aus der Konzilien- oder Kirchenordnung; so weiß man auch gewiß, daß kein Buchstabe göttlichen Worts in der Schrift von ihm funden wird, sondern hat sich **aus eigener Hoffart, Durst und Frevel in solche Höhe gesetzt.**“ Seite 139: „Nun wußten sie sehr wohl, die schändlichen Lasterer göttlichen Worts und wissen's auch noch sehr wohl, daß dieser Spruch, Joh. 21, 16. 17, nichts zu ihrer Sache dienet noch sich daher reimet, der in allen Buchstaben wider sie ist und das Papsttum zu Grund stürzt und zunicht macht. Aber es hat den Päpsten im Herzen sanft getan, daß sich die Welt, beide Bischöfe und Kaiser, mit diesem Spruch haben lassen schrecken und eintreiben, als die nicht gern wider Gott und sein Wort handeln wollten.“

Diese Ausführung ist darum gebracht worden, um zu zeigen, daß die Päpste, wenn sie die Seligmachung eines Sünders für sich und dazu für sich allein beanspruchen, sie dies tun als etwas, das sie ohne Recht an sich gerissen haben, als etwas nach ihrer Meinung ihnen ohne weiteres Zustehendes, im Einklang mit der Sünde im Menschen. Damit eben erweisen sie sich wieder, daß sie Gott sind, im Tempel Gottes sitzend.

Angeichts der eben gebrachten Ausführungen läßt sich erwarten, daß die Päpste nun auch ihren eigenen Weg des Seligmachens eines Sünders ersinnen, womit sie freilich den von Gott verordneten Weg in Christo verwerfen, trotzdem sie vor Augen sich mit mehr Kreuzen, Stationen und Festen zieren als irgendjemand anders. Das ist aber nur eine täuschende Verkleidung als ein Engel des Lichts, Tünche auf der Oberfläche, dahinter aber Moder und Totengeruch. Luther

sagt, der Papst habe Christus aus der Kirche gestoßen. Das ist wieder ganz Erfüllung der Weissagung Pauli: „Der allem widerstrebt, sich über alles setzt, das göttlich und Gegenstand der Ehrfurcht ist.“

Daß der Papst in seiner greulichen Selbstvergötterung auch als Seligmacher nicht Gottes Weg treibt, sondern seinen eigenen Weg erfunden hat, dafür gibt es ja einen unwiderlegbaren Beweis, nämlich den, daß er gerade den Weg treibt, den Gott in seinem Wort entschieden verwirft. Somit kann sein Weg nicht von Gott, sondern muß aus ihm sein.

Dieser Weg des Seligmachens seitens der Päpste ist aber durchaus nichts Neues, sondern von Natur in allen Menschen, solange sie nicht vom Evangelium erfaßt werden. In hartnäckiger Verstockung verharret der Papst bei seinem Wege trotz des hellen Lichtes des Evangeliums seit Luther. Das Tridentiner Konzilium, 1545–1563, war die Antwort der Päpste auf Luthers Reformation. In blinder Verstockung verwarf dieses Konzil Luthers Lehre und wiederholte die von den Scholastikern ausgebaute Lehre als die der katholischen Kirche für alle Zeiten. Von neuem bekannte sich der Papst zu den Dekreten und Kanones des Tridentinums im Vatikanischen Konzil 1869 bis 1870. Die Päpste in ihrer greulichen Selbstüberhebung beharren hartnäckig bei dem einmal erfundenen Weg des Seligmachens und werden diesen zum Verderben vieler treiben, bis ihnen der Herr ein Ende macht. Wenn irgend etwas den Papst offenbart als den geweissagten Menschen der Sünde, der sich im Tempel Gottes auführt, als sei er Gott, so ist es dies, daß er behauptet, er allein könne selig machen, und dabei eigenmächtig, boshaftig den von Gott verordneten Weg verwirft und dafür einen andern setzt, der freilich vergeblich ist.

Wie will der Papst die Leute selig machen? Das führt uns in die Theologie der römischen Kirche hinein. Um der gebotenen Kürze willen kann freilich hier keine erschöpfende Darlegung der römischen Heilslehre gebracht werden. Das ganze System der römischen Theologie baut sich um einen Gedanken, den der Werkgerechtigkeit, die den Glauben völlig ausschließt. Diesem Gedanken sind die einzelnen Dogmata von unten auf angepaßt.

Daß die Rechtfertigung eines Sünders der einzige Weg zum Seligwerden ist, dieser unbestreitbare Gedanke wird auch von der römischen Theologie anerkannt. Aber die Antwort der Päpste auf

diesen allerwichtigsten Gedanken ist schlechtthin im Gegensatz zur Schrift.

Um dies klarzustellen folgen wir den Ausführungen des Tridentiner Konzils, das Luthers Schriftlehre in seinen Kanones mit dem üblichen Anathema belegte und in seinen Dekreten die Lehre der römischen Kirche von neuem festlegte. Dieses Konzil stand völlig unter dem Druck der Päpste Paul III. und Julius II. Nichts wurde von Wichtigkeit beschlossen ohne die Begutachtung dieser Päpste.

Als erstes verwarf dieses Konzil Luthers Grundprinzip, die Schrift die einzige Quelle aller Erkenntnis in bezug auf Glauben und Wandel, und fügte die Tradition hinzu als in gleicher Weise verehrungswürdig wie die Schrift, *pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia*. Dazu stellte man die Apokryphen auf die gleiche Stufe mit dem Kanon. Das geschah in der vierten Sitzung. Hier sei zugleich festgestellt, daß in der römischen Kirche nicht einmal diese Gleichstellung praktisch besteht. Die Schrift gilt nur, soweit es den Päpsten gefällt und wie sie dieselbe auslegen. Die Tradition, die sogenannte mündliche Offenbarung, die sich auch heute noch dank der Infallibilität der Päpste mehrt, ist Grund und Quelle römischer Lehre. In einem Pamphlet der Catholic Literature Society, Los Angeles, California, vom 1. Mai 1935 heißt es Seite 2: What is the means God has given us whereby we shall learn what he has taught? The Bible, says our Protestant Friend, and nothing but the Bible. But we Catholics say **No**, not the Bible but the Church of God. Seite 4: So our Divine Saviour established his supreme court, his supreme judge (pope) to give us the meaning of the scriptures and the Son of the Living God has pledged his word that the supreme court is infallible in matters of faith and morals. Gliedern der katholischen Kirche ist streng verboten, irgendeine Bibelübersetzung anders als von der katholischen Kirche sanktioniert zu besitzen und zu lesen. Kardinal Manning sagte in seiner Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost: We neither derive our religion from the Scriptures, nor does it depend upon them; Seite 176. English Roman Catholic Journal: It is strange that any reasonable man in the present day can imagine for a moment that Almighty God intended the Bible as a text-book of Christian Doctrine; Dezember 1888. Gibbons: The Catholic Church existed before the Bible; it is

possible for the Catholic Church to exist without the Bible, for the Catholic Church is **altogether independent of the Bible.**

Diese eben gebrachten Zitate stellen über alle Zweifel fest, welche ganz untergeordnete Stellung die Bibel einnimmt in der katholischen Kirche; die Tradition, in Wahrheit die Dekrete der unfehlbaren Päpste, sind Quelle und Norm derselben; siehe Definition des Vatikanischen Konzils der päpstlichen Unfehlbarkeit. Mit dieser Erklärung wollte das Konzilium Tridentinum mit einem Streich die allein aus der Schrift geschöpfte Lehre Luthers fällen und die Lehre der katholischen Kirche retten.

Der nächste Schritt des Tridentiner Konzils war nun der, Luthers Schriftlehre von der Rechtfertigung eines Sünders durch den Glauben allein als grundlos und falsch zu verwerfen, dagegen die römische Werklehre zu rechtfertigen. Luthers Lehre wurde in fünf Kanones der 6. Sitzung verdammt. Kanon 9: „Wenn jemand sagt, daß der Gottlose allein durch den Glauben gerechtfertigt wird in einer solchen Weise, daß es meint, nichts anderes sei nötig, um die Gnade der Rechtfertigung zu erlangen und daß es in keiner Weise nötig ist, daß er durch die Regung seines Willens dazu vorbereitet und disponiert ist, der sei verflucht.“ Kanon 11: „Wenn jemand sagt, daß ein Mensch allein durch die Zurechnung der Gerechtigkeit Christi oder allein durch die Vergebung der Sünden gerechtfertigt sei mit Ausschluß der Gnade und der Liebe (was damit gemeint ist, folgt unten), die durch den Heiligen Geist in ihre Herzen ausgegossen wird (gratia infusa), oder daß die Gnade, durch die wir gerechtfertigt werden, allein Gottes freies Erbarmen sei, der sei verflucht.“ Kanon 12: „Wenn jemand sagt, daß der rechtfertigende Glaube nichts sei als Vertrauen zur göttlichen Gnade, die die Sünde um Christi willen vergibt, und daß dieses Vertrauen allein das sei, wodurch wir gerechtfertigt werden, der sei verflucht.“

Ebenso stellte das Konzilium Tridentinum die römische Lehre von der Rechtfertigung durch gute Werke fest. Die Rechtfertigung ist da nicht Gerechtpredung, sondern Gerechtmachung. Dieser Rechtfertigung geht ein vorbereitender Akt voraus, der in sieben Stufen besteht, den freien Willen anregt und dessen Mitwirkung fordert. Diese sind: Glaube (nicht als Zuberficht zu fassen), Furcht, Hoffnung, Liebe, Buße, Vorsatz der Taufe und Vorsatz des neuen Lebens. Nun folgt die Rechtfertigung selbst, die in der Mitteilung des Verdienstes Christi besteht, womit nicht Christi Gerechtigkeit ge-

meint ist, sondern dies, daß um Christi willen die Liebe Gottes in die Herzen ausgegossen wird, die nun mit dem natürlichen Willen zusammenwirkend gute Werke ermöglicht, durch die der Mensch gerecht wird: *Charitas Dei diffunditur in cordibus eorum, qui justificantur, atque ipsis inhaeret*; Heiligung ist also die römische Rechtfertigung. *Per eam vere justi nominamur et sumus* (Konzilium Tridentinum).

Was nun die guten Werke, die rechtfertigen sollen, betrifft, hat die Papstkirche allerlei neue erfunden, die einen weit größeren Glanz und Heiligkeitschein haben sollen als irgendein Werk nach Gottes Gebot, das von vielen Päpsten durch greuliche Uebertretung ist besudelt worden: Mord, Geiz, Eidbrechung, Gier, Unzucht, Brechung von Verträgen usw. Solche sogenannten Werke der Vollkommenheit sind: Ehelosigkeit, Klostersgelübde, Fasten, Enthaltung von Fleisch, Wallfahrten, fromme Stiftungen, Gebete zu den Heiligen, Zaubelfahrten nach Rom, Almosen usw.

Aus dieser Rechtfertigungslehre folgt nun ganz konsequent die römische Lehre von der Erbsünde. Diese besteht nämlich nicht der Schrift gemäß in völliger Verderbnis, sondern ist nur eine Schwächung. Sie ist nicht etwas Positives, sondern Negatives, ist nur eine Schwächung der sittlichen Natur im Menschen, wobei der freie Wille bleibt, der sich für das Gute wie auch das Böse entscheiden und unter Mitwirkung der Gnade zur wahren Heiligung fortschreiten kann. Konz. Trid., Sess. VI., Kanon V: „Wenn jemand sagt, daß durch Adams Fall des Menschen freier Wille verloren gegangen oder vertilgt sei, der sei verflucht.“ Sess. VI, Kap. I: „Wiewohl alle Menschen durch den Fall Adams ihre Unschuld verloren haben und unrein geworden sind, ist doch ihr freier Wille nicht zerstört, sondern nur geschwächt und verlegt worden.“

Die dem freien Willen zur Heiligung nötige *charitas infusa* wird durch die Sakramente mitgeteilt. Das Konz. Trid., Sess. VII, sagt: „Durch dieselben wird alle wahre Gerechtigkeit entweder angefangen oder angefangen vermehrt und gestört wieder erneuert.“

Das Konz. Trid. stellte dazu die Siebenzahl der Sakramente fest und widmete alle Sitzungen, von der 7. bis zur 24., 1547 bis 1563, den Sakramenten. Sess. VII, Kanon I: „Wenn jemand sagt, die Sakramente des neuen Gesetzes seien nicht alle von Christo gestiftet, oder daß ihre Zahl weniger oder mehr als sieben sei, der sei verflucht.“ Kanon 8: „Wenn jemand sagt, daß durch die Sakra-

mente des neuen Gesetzes allein schon dadurch, daß sie geschehen, ex opere operato, nicht werde Gnade übermittelt, sondern daß allein der Glaube an die göttliche Verheißung zur Aneignung der Gnade genüge, der sei verflucht.“ Daß die römische Kirche die beiden von Christo eingesetzten Sacramente, Taufe und Abendmahl, verstümmelt hat, ist ja bekannt. Die Taufe soll ex opere operato wirken, ohne Rücksicht auf den Glauben des Empfängers. Durch dieselbe werden zwar alle Sünden vergeben, hauptsächlich aber wird in das Herz des Getauften die rechtfertigende Gnade, die charitas infusa, eingegossen, vermöge welcher ein Mensch sich durch gute Werke gerecht machen kann. Fällt ein Mensch nach der Taufe in eine Todssünde, kann diese nur getilgt werden durch das Bußsacrament, in dem der Glaube keine Stätte hat, sondern das aus Reue, Bekenntnis und Genugthuung durch gute Werke, contritio cordis, confessio oris und satisfactio operis besteht. Das Abendmahl haben sie ganz verstümmelt. Aus demselben haben sie ein Opfer gemacht, das Messopfer, wobei der Priester den Leib und das Blut Christi von neuem opfert, in einer unblutigen Weise, in die Brot und Wein durch die Konsekration verwandelt wurden; Sess. XIII, Kap 4.

Aus der römischen Rechtfertigungslehre folgt endlich wieder ganz konsequent, daß in diesem Leben kein Mensch vollkommen heilig wird, nie ganz ohne Sünde lebt. So muß irgendwo nach dem Tode die unvollkommene Heiligkeit ergänzt und die noch nicht durch Genugthuung getilgte Sünde getilgt werden. Dazu ist das Fegfeuer da, in dem die, die dort sind, wirkliche Plagen, von Gott auferlegte zeitliche Strafen, leiden. Diese können gemindert werden durch Messen und Opfer der Lebenden, durch fromme Stiftungen. Der Mangel an guten Werken kann ersetzt werden durch den Schatz der Kirche, der aus Millionen guter Werke solcher besteht, die mehr getan haben, als sie für sich bedurften.

So viel über die Seligmachung der römischen Kirche. Es sind nicht alle Irrlehren der römischen Kirche, wie Indulgenzen usw., behandelt worden. Es war hier nur die Absicht zu zeigen, daß der Weg der Seligmachung seitens der Päpste nicht die Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben allein ist, sondern die durch die guten Werke, die einer tut. Hauptabsicht dabei war die, zu zeigen, wie die Päpste sich selbst in greulicher Ueberhebung zu Seligmachern gemacht, über Gott gesetzt und eine dem Seligmachen Gottes ganz widerstrebende Seligmachung erdichtet haben, womit sie Gottes Selig-

machung aufheben zum Verderben vieler Seelen. Da sieht man doch wahrhaftig, wie die Päpste sich als Gott erweisen, aufführen und darum voll und ganz Erfüllung der paulinischen Weissagung vom „Menschen der Sünde“ sind.

Endlich erweist sich der Papst auch dadurch als

Gott, daß er sich göttliche Ehren beilegt.

Daß er das tut und von jedem fordert, beweist die Geschichte zur Genüge. Kaiser und Könige mußten vor ihm knien, ihm den Steigbügel halten. Wenn sie in ihren Briefen an den Papst dessen Namen nicht voranstellten, wurden sie dafür bitter gerügt. Alles sollte sich vor ihm in den Staub werfen.

In bezug auf die Bräuche, die bei päpstlichen Empfängen und Ausflügen beobachtet werden mußten, sagt Luther: „Daß das Fußküssen des Papstes auch nit mehr geschehe. Es ist ein unchristlich Exempel, daß ein armer sundiger Mensch ihm lässit seine Füße küssen von dem, der hundertmal besser ist denn er. Hält sie gegen ander, Christum und den Papst. Christus wusch seinen Jüngern die Fuß und trocknete sie, und die Jüngern wuschen sie ihm noch nie. Der Papst, als hoher denn Christus, kehret das um und lässet es ein groß Gnad sein, ihm seine Füße zu küssen; der doch das billig, so es jemand von ihm begehret, mit allem Vermügen wehren sollt, wie St. Paul und Barnabas, die sich nit wollten ehren lassen als Gott von den zu Lissris, sondern sprachen: Wir sein Menschen gleich als ihr. Aber unfere Schmeichler haben's so hoch gebracht, und uns einen Abgott gemacht, daß niemand sich so furcht vor Gott, niemand ihn mit solchen Geberden ehret als den Papst.“

„Der selben groß ärgerlichen Hoffart ist auch das ein häßlich Stück, daß der Papst ihm nit lässit begnügen, daß er reiten und fahren muge; sondern, ob er wohl stark und gesund ist, sich von Menschen als ein Abgott mit unerhorter Pracht tragen lässit. Sieber, wie reimet sich doch solch Lucifersche Hoffart mit Christo, der zu Fußten gangen ist und alle sein Aposteln? Wo ist ein weltlicher Kunig gewesen, der so weltlich und prächtig je gefahren hat, als der fährt, der ein Haupt sein will aller der, die weltlich Pracht verschmähen und fliehen sollen, das ist, der Christen?“

„Dann wilch Christenherz mag oder soll das mit Lust sehen, wenn der Papst, wenn er sich will lassen communiciern, stille sitzt als ein Gnadenjungherr und lässet ihm das Sacrament von einem

knien den gebeugten Cardinal mit einem gulden Rohr reichen; gerad als wäre das heilig Sakrament nit würdig, daß ein Papst, ein armer Sunder, aufftund, seinem Gott ein Ehr tät. Also geht es auch, wenn er das Sakrament in der Proceßion umbträgt. Ihn muß man tragen, aber das Sakrament steht fur ihm wie ein Kandel Weins auf dem Tisch. Helf nu Gott einem freien Concilio, daß es den Papst lehre, wie er auch ein Mensch sei, und nit mehr dann Gott, wie er sich unterstehet zu sein.“ Erl. Ausg., B. 21, S. 315f.

Sagenbach, indem er den Dominikaner Johann Turrecremota zitiert: „Die päpstliche Würde ist so hoch, daß kein Mensch sie begreifen oder auch nur ahnend in Gedanken erreichen kann. Der Papst ist ein Herr über die Engel, ein Richter über Lebende und Tote.“ Marcellus redet 1512 Papst Julius II. so an: „Du bist Hirte, Arzt, Regent und Pfleger der Kirche, ja ein zweiter Gott auf Erden.“

Triumphus: „Gebührt dem Papst solche Ehre wie Christo angeichts seiner Göttlichkeit? Weil diese Ehre der Autorität schuldig ist und die Autorität Christi als Gott und des Papstes eins ist, was dadurch bewiesen ist, daß Christus nach Markus 2 die Macht hat, Sünden zu vergeben, der Papst auch, die Ehre, die Gott schuldig, **muß auch dem Papst gegeben werden.**“

Dies alles zeigt zur Genüge, daß der Papst sich göttliche Ehren anmaßt und damit wieder sich im Tempel Gottes auführt, daß er Gott ist. Damit ist doch klar, daß der Papst die Erfüllung der Weissagung Pauli ist: „Der sich setzt in den Tempel Gottes und sich erweist, daß er Gott ist.“

Daß der Papst die Erfüllung dieser Weissagung ist, sieht man auch daran, daß der Weissagung gemäß der Herr ihn durch den Geist seines Mundes zermürbt, anelei, hat. Der Geist des Mundes Jesu Christi, wie in der Auslegung dieser Stelle gezeigt wurde, ist sein Evangelium. Kein anderer als Luther ist es, durch den unser Herr nach langer Nacht sein teures Evangelium wieder in voller Klarheit hat laut werden lassen, nämlich durch Luthers Predigten, Schriften und durch seine deutsche Bibel. Der Papst hat es auch wohl gefühlt, daß Luther die Art an die Wurzel gelegt und er, der Baum, fallen müsse, nicht untergehen, aber abnehmen. Er hat deshalb Luther nach dem Leben getrachtet, durch Herrscher ihn unterdrücken wollen, in Schriften ihn bekämpft, im Konz. Trid. seine Lehre verdammt, Luther und die Seinen mit dem Bann belegt, eine Gegenreformation angeregt und in dem Jesuitenorden sich eine Waffe geschmiedet.

Alles umsonst. Ihr Schall ist seit Luther in alle Welt ausgegangen, in über tausend Uebersetzungen, und hat den Papst geschwächt.

Sein **geistlicher** Einfluß ist dahin. Wohl hängen ihm noch viele an, aber unter diesen glauben lange nicht alle, was der Papst lehrt. Ungezählte wollen sich vom Papst nicht selig machen lassen. Er lockt sie wohl, aber sie folgen nicht. Er mag seine Arme ausbreiten, aber sie gehen nicht hinein.

So ist auch seine **politische Autorität und sein Ansehen** dahin. Sie hören nicht mehr auf ihn. Besonders offenbar ist das im gegenwärtigen Krieg geworden. Wiederholt hat Pius XII. sich als Friedensstifter angeboten, aber sie hören nicht auf ihn. Er möchte auch am kommenden Friedensstisch sitzen, aber da wird einer, Stalin, sitzen, der sich nicht mit dem Papst an einen Tisch setzen wird. Wie ganz anders als im Mittelalter! Heute muß der Papst **bitten**, man möchte doch die Stadt Rom verschonen. Eins seiner berühmtesten Klöster und seine Sommerresidenz hat man nicht geschont.

Wohl ist es wahr, daß die Jesuiten alle Anstrengungen machen, sich in die Politik zu drängen. Sie, die Jesuiten, wollen nur eins, nämlich die Weltherrschaft des Papstes, wie sie im Mittelalter war, wieder aufrichten. Das macht manchen besorgt. Aber keine Furcht! Was auch der Papst versuchen mag, ist umsonst. Seine politische Größe ist dahin und kehrt nie wieder. Woher diese Gewißheit? Weil Paulus geweissagt hat: Den wird der Herr zermürben durch den Geist seines Mundes. Das ist göttliche Weissagung; die wird und muß erfüllt werden. Der Lauf des Evangeliums wird ungehindert weitergehen, denn Christus hat geweissagt: Das Evangelium **wird** zu allen Völkern gebracht werden. Das aber greift dem Papst ans Leben.

Endlich ist auch die **richterliche Gewalt** des Papstes dahin. Er kann Kezer nicht mehr, wie noch Paul IV., 1555–1559, in Italien tat, verfolgen und foltern. Das kann er nicht mehr. Der Herr Christus hat ihn zermürbt, geschwächt durch den Geist seines Mundes. Auch das zeigt, daß der Papst die Erfüllung von 2 Theß. 2, 1–12 ist.

Weiter zeigt sich der Papst auch darin als Erfüllung dieser Weissagung, **daß er sich trotz des Evangeliums nicht im geringsten geändert hat**. Die Weissagung Pauli besagt, daß der „Mensch der Sünde“ sich nicht ändern werde. Wie könnte ihm sonst der Herr ein Ende machen am Tage seiner Wiederkunft, wenn er sich vordem ge-

ändert hätte? Bis ans Ende der Tage bleibt er der, der er immer war.

Im Konz. Trid. hat man durch die Kanones Luthers Lehre verdammt und durch die Dekrete die alten Irrlehren aufs neue bekannt. Das Konz. Vatic. hat das Konz. Trid. bestätigt. - Da wird nichts geändert an dem, das die unfehlbaren Päpste dekretiert und der Tradition hinzugefügt haben.

Endlich ist der Papst auch darin die Erfüllung von 2 Theff. 2, 1-12, daß er mit allerlei Kräften und Zeichen und Wundern und kräftigen Irrtümern sein Werk treibt und viele in Irrtum verführt.

Kräfte, Zeichen und Wunder. Man könnte hier so unterscheiden: Kräfte, übernatürliche, gehen von leblosen Dingen aus; Zeichen und Wunder werden von Personen gewirkt.

Ungeheuer groß ist die Zahl lebloser Dinge, Reliquien im Papsttum, denen übernatürliche Kräfte zugeschrieben werden: der heilige Rock, Splitter und Nägel vom Kreuz Christi, Marias Sandalen, Stroh von der Krippe zu Bethlehem, Knochen von Märtyrern und Heiligen usw. Wer kann sie alle nennen? Ihnen werden übernatürliche Kräfte zugeschrieben: Heilungen, Beschützungen usw.

Ebenso groß ist die Zahl von Wundern, die Heilige sollen getan haben. Ueber ihre Wunderkraft haben besonders die Mönche zahlreiche Legenden verbreitet.

Am wundertätigsten ist natürlich Maria. Alle ihre Statuen üben große Wunder aus. Die Kranken, Lahmen, Blinden und Krüppel, die zu ihnen eine Wallfahrt machen, werden geheilt.

Alle diese Kräfte, Zeichen und Wunder sind lügenhaft; sie existieren in Wahrheit nicht, sie sind klug erfommene Fabeln. Luther, Erl. Ausg., B. 43, S. 339: „Welcher kommt mit allerlei lügenhaften Kräften und Zeichen und Wundern; 2 Theff. 2. Das ist nun sonderlich im Papsttum mit Gewalt gegangen. Davon lese man nur ihre Bücher und Legenden, sonderlich was die Mönche geschrieben haben, welsch ein Geschwürm es ist voll, voll eitel Wunderzeichen, das doch alles lauter Lügen und Wüberei ist gewesen. Wie hat man bei unsern Zeiten die Leute geäffet mit so viel Wallfahrten, zum Grimthal, zur Eichen, zu Trier usw., und ich selbst habe etliche Mönche gesehen, schändliche, böse Buben und wilde Menschen, die doch den Teufel austrieben und mit ihm spielten gerade als mit einem Kind.“

Kräftige Irrtümer. Des Papstes Lehre ist voll davon. Das römische System von der Rechtfertigung durch gute Werke ist eine

Lüge, Fegfeuer, Heilige, des Papstes Stellung und Macht, Petrus als der erste Bischof von Rom mit außerordentlichen Privilegien, Indulgenzen, die Infallibilität des Papstes usw., alles ist erdichtet und erlogen, denn es hat keinen Rückhalt am Worte Gottes. Was nicht aus Gottes Wort, der Wahrheit, ist, das ist Lüge. Des Papstes Irrlehren sind kräftige. Was sie zu kräftigen, wirksamen Irrtümern macht, ist hauptsächlich dies, daß der Papst bei seinen Irrtümern die Schrift zitiert und so zu beweisen sucht, sie seien Schriftlehre.

Mit diesem allem zeigt der Papst, daß er eine Wirkung Satans, der der Vater der Lüge heißt, ist.

Der **Erfolg**, den der Papst hat, ist groß. Von der nachapostolischen Zeit an bis zur Reformation beherrschte er schier alles. Heute zwar nicht mehr so, aber doch hängen ihm noch Millionen in allen Teilen der Welt an. Sein Erfolg besteht darin, daß sie ihm glauben, seine Lehre sei Wahrheit, sein Weg der Seligmachung der richtige; sie folgen ihm und leben der Hoffnung, ihre Seele sei in guten Händen.

Sein Erfolg **beschränkt sich** aber auf die, die die Liebe der Wahrheit, die in der Schrift geoffenbarte Liebe Gottes, der durch Christum den Gottlosen gerecht macht, ohne Werke, allein durch den Glauben, nicht mehr hochschätzen. Von diesen befinden sich in der Welt zu allen Zeiten ungezählte Mengen. Das Wort vom Kreuz, diese selige Botschaft Gottes an die Sünderwelt, verachten sie. Unter ihnen hat der Papst Erfolg. Die von ganzem Herzen dem Evangelium anhängen, die lockt der Papst vergeblich. Sie lassen sich lieber foltern, als daß sie seine Irrlehren würden annehmen.

Mit dem allen zeigt der Papst noch einmal, daß er der ist, von dem Paulus 2 Theff. 2 geweißsagt hat.

Daß der Papst unter denen, die die Liebe der Wahrheit nicht achten zu ihrer Rettung, viel Anhang hat, ist ein Gottesgericht: „Darum wird ihnen Gott kräftige Irrtümer senden, daß sie glauben der Lüge, auf daß gerichtet werden alle, die der Wahrheit nicht glauben, sondern haben Lust an der Ungerechtigkeit.“ Es ist Verstockungsgericht, das furchtbarste Gottesgericht; es schneidet den Weg zum Leben ab. Damit steht der Papst auch allezeit vor uns als Warnung, daß wir ja nicht die uns geoffenbarte seligmachende Wahrheit in Christo gering achten.

Damit kommt diese Arbeit zuende. Ihr Zweck war zu zeigen,

wie genau Pauli Weissagung und der Papst aufeinander passen. Der Papst ist der „Mensch der Sünde“, von dem Paulus geweissagt hat. Nichts ist greulicher als der Papst, der sich zu Gott macht im Tempel Gottes, besonders dadurch, daß er will alleine selig machen und das auf einem Wege, der Christum verwirft, darum auf einem Wege, der Ungezählte in das ewige Verderben stürzt.

W. S o e n e c k e.

Study on 1 Corinthians 15

(Continued)

V. 12-19. Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? (13) But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. (14) And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. (15) Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. (16) For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. (17) And if Christ be not raised, then your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. (18) Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. (19) If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.

With a bold, demolishing thrust Paul here attacks the error that was threatening the spiritual life of the Corinthian church: Christ is preached as being alive from the dead, *egēgertai* (Note the Perfect tense!). His resuscitation after a state of death which lasted for three days and which was emphatically attested by His burial as a real death is not only a past event, it is an event that produced permanent results, the fruits continuing to the present time. Christ won the victory over death, and He is now living as the triumphant conqueror. Death lies vanquished at His feet, “a powerless form, howe'er he rave and storm.”

As such Christ is being preached by all whom God appointed to proclaim the Gospel message to the world. The victorious resurrection of Christ, everlasting in its results, is the clinching climax of their message, *kērýssetai*.

Since this fact is undisputed, not questioned in the least even by the doubters in Corinth, Paul has gained a firm footing from which to launch his devastating attack. With telling force he

strikes a blow which simply cannot be parried: "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" *How*, on what grounds, with what show of reason, do some say, *legousin*, persist in saying. Their doubt was not a momentary wavering in their faith, as it may happen to all of us, their doubt was threatening to become chronic with them, and to infest the spiritual life of the congregation. Whenever the Christians comforted themselves, or others, in their afflictions and encouraged themselves in their life of sanctification with the hope of resurrection, these doubters poured cold water on their enthusiasm: "There is no resurrection of the dead."

We are not told how they explained their position or how they tried to harmonize their denial with their faith in the Gospel message. Hope in the resurrection of the body was an unheard-of thing among the Gentiles. When Paul mentioned the resurrection in Athens the people imagined that he was speaking of a new goddess, and desired to hear more about her and her male counterpart, Jesus (Acts 17, 18). But when he in concrete terms told them that God raised Jesus from the dead, they began to jeer (*l. c. v. 32*). When Paul, some years later, addressed the assembly of notables, invited by Festus in Caesarea, he had reason to ask the pointed question, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" (Acts 26, 8). We can easily imagine how with such a background many of the new converts to Christianity found it difficult to accept at face value the promise of a resurrection of the body. How the doubters in Corinth endeavored to reconcile their denial with their Gospel faith, we are not told.

Paul had occasion to refer to the same matter in the last epistle we have from his pen, his farewell letter to Timothy. This letter was written probably eight years later than First Corinthians, and deals with conditions in Asia, Ephesus in particular. There Paul complains about men, against whom he had been obliged to take disciplinary action, because they "concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already" (2 Tim. 2, 18). These men evidently denied the future resurrection of the body by confusing it with the spiritual resurrection which we experienced in our regeneration, maintaining that that is the only resurrection

the Gospel invites us to expect. Paul says of men upholding this view that they "overthrow the faith" (*l. c.*).

Whether the Corinthian doubters used similar subterfuges we do not know; but they did, persistently, deny the hope of the resurrection which we confess in our Third Article. Paul meets their denial head-on with the question, How dare any among you say so, in view of the unassailable fact of Christ's resurrection?

The full force of this argument is lost if we take the resurrection of Christ merely as an example, as a case in point. What actually happened in a given case must be conceded as possible in similar cases. At least, it would be logically unreasonable to deny the possibility. But Christ's resurrection is not merely one of a kind.

To be sure, the establishment of a single case is sufficient logically to puncture the sweeping statement that there is no resurrection of the dead. At least one case is on record, and that is sufficient to establish the possibility of the matter. But Paul is not interested in deflating the opponents from the logical standpoint. He is out to win their hearts.

In order to evaluate the resurrection of Christ properly in Paul's argument, we must bear in mind what he had said about it in the beginning. In verses 3 and 4 he closely linked the resurrection to the death of Christ. The resurrection of Christ, if its real significance is to be understood, must be viewed in the light of His death. He died *for our sins*. Personally there was no cause for death in Christ. Death came into the world by sin. Death reigns wherever sin is found, and only there, for death is the wages of sin. Christ was without sin. His nature was not contaminated by original sin, nor had He committed any actual sin in thought, or word, or deed. He had ever practiced a perfect love toward His heavenly Father and toward His fellow men. No matter how difficult the situation, how severe the provocation, He had not yielded to the fiercest temptation, no, not for a moment. Never had He wavered nor deviated a hair's breadth from the path of love and truth. There was no cause for death in Him personally.

Yet He died. His death was necessary. He *must* die, as He showed His disciples before it happened (Mt. 16, 21), and after the event He declared that the Scriptures *must* be fulfilled which spoke of His death (Lk. 24, 46). Although He had no sin of

His own, the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all, and made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin. He was delivered for our offenses.

What then, on this background, does the resurrection of Christ mean? It is too weak by far to say merely that He is one of many, that thus His resurrection shows conclusively that the thesis of the doubters in Corinth is untenable.

In His resurrection He was justified of sin — but they were *our* sins of which He was pronounced free. Our sins are no more. Our guilt was wiped out. The whole world, every individual member of the world, was given a clean bill in the resurrection of Christ.

If our sins are gone, what hold then has death on us? Where sin has been removed, death has lost its sting, it can kill no longer. Grim death is nothing but a powerless form, however he rave and storm. Christ's victory over death is our victory. His resurrection is ours.

To assume, in the face of Christ's resurrection, that there is no resurrection for us, that our bodies when returned to the dust must remain dust and ashes for ever, is denying, not some minor point of doctrine somewhere way out on the periphery, it is denying the very heart of the Gospel — and of the Law. If after Christ has made full atonement for our sins we still must remain in the state of death forever, then there must be some other cause of death besides sin. The verdict of the Law, In the day that thou sinnest thou shalt surely die, no longer is true. Death has other causes besides sin. And the glad tidings that the blood of Christ cleanses us from all sin is only a negligible half-truth. Though death is the wages of sin, this tyrant apparently has also another hold on us which is not lessened in the least by the fact that our guilt has been completely removed.

Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?

After having pointed out in one sweeping, unanswerable charge what a denial of the resurrection of the body implies, Paul takes up the matter in detail, finishing off the error with repeated demolishing blows.

At first blush the next verse might appear like a mere repetition of v. 12, only reversing the order of protasis and apodosis,

and expressing the result in the form of a negative statement, instead of a rhetorical question. "But if there be (is) no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen." Yet this is more than a repetition. Paul is taking up one particular point, and by determining it is laying the groundwork for further detailed attack. If there really is no resurrection of the dead — note how Paul assumes a condition of reality — we might paraphrase: *Argumenti causa* let us assume that there is no such thing as a resurrection of the dead; once a man is dead he must remain in the power of death forever — such a state of affairs is possibly only if Christ is not alive from death. Christ took it upon Himself to rescue us out of the dominion of death by making atonement for our sins. The effort cost Him His life. Now, if the dead still remain under the control of death, that would indicate that Christ failed in His effort, that He was defeated, that, far from being alive out of death, He is still held in its bonds. A dead Christ, a defeated Christ! An eventuality too horrible to contemplate, but unescapable if the resurrection of the dead is denied.

From this stunning blow Paul proceeds at once to another no less stunning. "And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain." This is the second link of the chain, the second of a series of blows. The conclusion is bifurcal, taking into consideration both the content of the Gospel preaching and of the corresponding faith engendered by it. Of both Paul uses the word "empty." *Empty!* What a crushing verdict! Think only of what super-human effort, combined with incessant toil and bitter persecution, did not Paul alone put into the work of proclaiming the Gospel. Was the message worth the effort? Empty — empty — nothing in it. All the effort wasted and worse than wasted. *Empty!* A terrible word. — But think also of the other side. The Corinthians accepted the message of Paul. That was not an easy matter. Think of what they had to give up, and think of the enmity and hatred they incurred from their former friends. In a full measure they experienced the truth of Jesus' word: "Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division. For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three" (Lk. 12, 51. 52). Was their faith worth the sacrifice?

What did they get in return? If there is no resurrection of the dead, if Christ does not live victorious over death, there is but one answer, summed up in that terrible and devastating word: *empty!* Paul expresses this bifurcate judgment without the use of a verb in a bald juxtaposition of subject and predicate with the word *empty* in the most emphatic place of the statement: Empty indeed our message, empty also your faith.

Yes empty, hollow, indeed. For what is there left of the Gospel, and what is left of our faith, if Christ alive from the dead is taken out of it? Paul will speak of this a few verses farther down. For the present he wants the Christians at Corinth to stagger under the realization, coming upon them like a flash of lightning, that all of Christianity is a hollow, empty thing without the hope of the resurrection.

And what a personal affront to Paul and to the other zealous witnesses of the resurrection of Christ! The Corinthian church was troubled with factionalism. Some tried to make of Paul a party leader, others of Apollos, others of Peter. They thought very highly of all three, only for some external reason certain groups estimated the one above the others. But what if there is no resurrection of the dead? if, accordingly, also Christ did not arise? There is then but one possibility: these men are false witnesses. They all based their Gospel message on the resurrection of Christ and aimed to create the hope of resurrection in the hearts of their hearers. The denial of the resurrection makes them out to be false witnesses. Paul says, We are *founded*. Luther here substituted the subjunctive mood (*wir würden erfunden*), thereby stressing the irreality of the assumption. Paul, however, uses the indicative, by the denial of the resurrection, if that can be upheld, we are being convicted of perjury, *heuriskometha pseudomartyres*.

Not ordinary perjury, but "false witnesses of God," who "testified of God." Here the King James translation is too weak; Luther is right, *dass wir wider Gott gezeugt*. The Greek is *kata*, down on, against. What a serious charge! Satan may be capable of such an offence. He may sneeringly ask, "Yea, hath God said?" or may boldly contradict God, "Ye shall not surely die." But to assume that men who posed as God's messengers should testify against Him who sent them, that is hardly conceivable. And if in theory it might be granted, would the Corinthians be ready to

burden their highly esteemed and loved apostles with such a heinous charge, Paul and Peter and Apollos? If they accept the denial of the resurrection, they must drop their reverence for their apostles, they must despise and disavow them. The Corinthians evidently had not considered these implications of the error.

Paul once more points out the weightiness of the matter. The testimony of the apostles does not concern some insignificant, trifling question, not a matter of genealogies or chronology, on which some men like to waste much time, but it concerns a question which is basic to the Gospel. "We have testified of (against) God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not." The apostles maintained that Christ had fully met all the demands of the Law, by His suffering and death He had made satisfactory atonement for all the sins of the world, and had completely wiped out the guilt of every individual sinner; that God Himself had so declared by raising Jesus from the dead. What a slanderous testimony if the violated majesty of God had not been fully restored by the efforts of Jesus! so that He could not proclaim justification to the condemned sinners! Yet the apostles testified in the name of God that He had raised Christ. If God cannot tolerate to have His name taken in vain in trifling matters, how shall He acquiesce in perverting the truth in a case of such supreme importance!

With a repetition of the statement made in v. 13 Paul now closes this sub-part of his argument: "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised."

This repetition, at the same time, serves as a starting point for a second chain of deductions, the opening link of which is: "And if Christ is not raised, your faith is vain." This is not the same word *vain* that Paul used in v. 14 concerning preaching and faith. There he used *kenos*, here he says *mataios*. While the former means empty and hollow, the latter means ineffective, producing no fruits, a dud. Fruitlessness, of course, is a result of emptiness. If the message which faith accepts is nothing but hollow pretense, how can it be expected to produce substantial results? No, in that case faith will be as useless for the possessor as it is empty in itself.

The chief fruit that we expect of our faith, or the chief blessing that we reach out for in faith, is justification. Our sins are

at the bottom of all evil. No blessings can accrue to us as long as our sins are not atoned for. They very effectively separate between us and our God, the only source of light and life. But if Christ is not alive from death, then our faith in Him must be a fruitless thing because it fails us in this very matter of our sins. It does not obtain for us justification, simply because Christ did not succeed in procuring it for us. Then our faith leaves us exactly where we were before: "Ye are yet in your sins." The word *yet* or *still* has the emphasis. No change has taken place in our status before God. We were laden with guilt before Christ assumed to substitute for us. If Christ is not alive from death, then He dismally failed in His grand undertaking. Nothing was changed. Our relation to God, and God's relation to us, is precisely what it was before Christ's venture. We are still in our sins.

What does that imply? Death is the wages of sin. Forgiveness of our sins was a pleasant dream. In our faith we imagined that we were rid of our guilt. In the joy over our justification we found the courage and apparently the strength to battle against our former sins, to lead a new life of sanctification, even to bear the cross and to face death and judgment bravely. It was only a dream, and there will be a rude awakening, because no change in our real condition has taken place. In spite of all, we are still where we were before, still in our sins.

The awaking may come in this life; the fond dream may continue till death overtakes us. Many fall asleep in Jesus. There were such in Corinth. The survivors may remember how cheerfully they met their death confessing to the end their reliance on Jesus. How terrible Paul's words must have sounded in their ears when concerning these departed loved ones he said: "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Cold shudders must have run down their spine. But that was not Paul's fault, it is the inescapable result of the error to which they were lending an ear: The dead rise not — then also is Christ not risen — then also they which fall asleep in Christ are lost.

Lost! A terrible verdict. The Corinthians had not thought of it in that light. We do not know what they may have thought. But *lost!* that thought had not entered their mind. That verdict shocked them like a bolt from the blue. But there is no escape.

If Christ is not alive from death, if Christ is still held in the clutches of death, then it is clear that sin and guilt have not been removed, for it is only through sin that death has a hold on any one. The fact that death has any power left proves overwhelmingly the presence of sin, in which his power rests. A dead Christ, unable to break death's strong bands, proves that we are still in our sin, and no matter how sincerely and how firmly we may believe in Christ, such faith will be fruitless. When we fall asleep we are lost. — Terrible! Yet this is not an unwarranted appeal to the emotions, it is the cold logic of stubborn facts.

By this time the reader should have become accustomed to startling but inescapable conclusions. Yet Paul confronts us with another, even more startling than all previous ones: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

We need not spend much time on the grammatical construction of the apodosis, whether the genitive is the partitive genitive or the genitive of comparison; nor what the exact function of the comparative degree is; nor need we worry about the meaning of the adjective, whether we say "miserable" with the King James version, or use some other word like "pitiable": it does not change the situation which Paul describes. And whether we say "more pitiable than all men" or "of all men most pitiable" does not affect the sense.

To the protasis, however, we must give some attention. Paul very fittingly describes Christians as people who "hope in Christ." He does this in very strong terms. He uses the participle of the Perfect: we are *ēlpikotes* in Christ, people who have set their hope on Christ, and there it rests. We are no longer looking about for a foundation on which to base our hope, we have found one that satisfies us. That is Christ. This is a true and striking description of Christians. — Paul, however, adds two modifiers: "in this life" and "only." He places them into the two most emphatic positions of the sentence, the one in the beginning, the other at the end. What do they modify? That the phrase "in this life" modifies "hope" may be generally conceded; but what does "only" modify?

Menge translates, and many agree with him, as though it referred to the whole statement: *Wenn wir weiter nichts sind als solche, die in diesem Leben ihre Hoffnung auf Christum gesetzt*

haben. The King James version combines "only" with "in this life," a very easy combination in spite of the distance from the beginning of the statement to the end. To your essayist this combination appears as the most likely and intended by Paul. Whether we combine in one way or the other, will merely shift the emphasis, but it will not affect the meaning as such.

Paul confronts his readers with this dilemma: If there is no resurrection, then our hope in Christ is limited to this life. We may draw some consolation, some courage, some strength from our faith in Christ, but this does not reach a hair's breadth beyond the grave. Once we die, this hope will come to a sudden end. It will not carry us beyond death, it cannot, if there is no resurrection. These are the only two possibilities which Paul considers: Either there is a resurrection, and then our hope in Christ extends to all eternity; or there is no resurrection, and then our hope in Christ is limited, absolutely limited to this life. *Tertium non datur*.

But what a terrible thing to limit our Christian hope to this life! "Of all men most miserable," is Paul's correct verdict. In that case the advice of the Epicureans, even in its coarsest and most vulgar form, would be preferable to the Christian delusion: "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." Get as much joy out of this life as possible, for death ends it all, and there is no resurrection.

Thus Paul has with the irresistible logic of the facts relentlessly pushed the deniers of the resurrection to the brink of the abyss from which nothing can save them — except the whole-hearted acceptance of the resurrection. If there is no resurrection, then Christ's resurrection is a myth; Christ's work was a failure; our faith is baseless; our sins still condemn us; and any one departing this life in Christ is doomed. And all of this with the added realization that even this life was wasted and its opportunities for enjoyment dissipated for a phantom, a delusion. Most miserable!

Paul is certainly stirring up strong emotions, although he is not playing on the emotions. He is presenting hard, cold facts in logically unassailable deductions. But by these he strives to arouse his readers to a realization of the far-reaching consequences of their error, to arrest their headlong rush before it is too late.

In the next part he turns to a positive building up of their faith.

Verses 20-22

(20) But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept. (21) For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. (22) For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

In the previous section Paul had relentlessly exposed the terrible implication of the theology of doubt advocated by some in Corinth. It would ultimately mean nothing less than that our hope in Christ is absolutely limited to this life. If there is to be no resurrection, then the only other alternative is this life. An intermediate state between death and the full realization of the eternal bliss in heaven by a resurrected person does not enter into consideration for Paul. It is either — or, either a resurrection, or a limitation to the life on earth. — A gloomy prospect, indeed, for all doubters of the resurrection.

With the jubilant *nyini de* Paul flashes the light of the truth on this dark scene. *But now*, there is a factor which at one stroke changes the situation into its very opposite. The fact, overlooked by the doubters and not grasped in its full significance by the perplexed Corinthians, is that Christ is alive from death. He did die as a sacrificial lamb for our sins. His sacrifice was sufficient to cover our guilt. His resurrection attests our justification, the favorable verdict of acquittal for every sinner, as an uncontrovertible fact. Jesus not only arose from the dead, He is alive as the victor, as the undisputed master over all His and our foes.

Instead of applying this great truth to all the elements of distress which he had mentioned in the foregoing, and of unfolding its splendor in detail, Paul at once turns its light on the error that caused all the trouble in Corinth. He calls Christ *the first-fruits of them that slept*.

The English Bible uses the past tense *slept*, apparently referring to the moment when death set in; hardly to a past condition of being asleep, because that condition had not yet ended, they were still asleep. Luther translates with the present of condition, *die da schlafen*. A modern translation (Goodspeed) has *who have fallen asleep*; while Menge simply speaks of the *Entschlafenen*. Paul uses the perfect participle *tōn kekoimēmenōn*, stressing the lasting condition resulting from a completed past

action: they once upon a time fell asleep, and are now in the condition of sleep. He is therewith not referring to any specific group of people, he is rather using the term in a general, indefinite or unlimited way, to include all those that are in this condition whether present or past, or even future. All people are meant whom this description may fit at any time.

Among *them that slept* Christ was also found at one time. But He belongs to their number no longer. He arose from the dead. He is no longer subject to the condition of death, He is not even exposed to the danger of death. He is immune. Yes, He is absolute Master of death. For of Him it can be said, *egēgertai*. He is alive from death.

Very significantly Paul calls Christ in His resurrection the *firstfruits* of them that slept. The noun appears without the definite article in the Greek. This stresses its quality. The meaning of firstfruits in Israel is evident from the ordinance of God concerning it, as recorded in Lev. 23, 10–14. At the beginning of every harvest, before any of the grain was used, a sheaf had to be presented before the Lord. An elaborate sacrifice was required, consisting of a lamb, a yearling without blemish, together with a meat offering of fine flour and a drink offering of wine. Only then, after God had thus been duly acknowledged as the Giver of the harvest, were the people permitted to use any of it in any form for their regular food. The sheaf waved before the Lord represented, as it were, the entire harvest which had been graciously granted.

Christ is firstfruits of them that slept. A wonderful harvest is presented and begun by His resurrection. All those that sleep are considered by God as His precious sheaves which He will gather into His barns (cf. Mt. 13, 30). That these sheaves will be absolutely free from chaff and tares is not the point in Paul's argument, as it is in John the Baptist's call to repentance (Mt. 3, 12) and in Jesus' parables. Paul is speaking about the certainty of the resurrection and its blessings for them that believe. It would be a digression, and would weaken his argument, if he at all introduced at this point the return to life of those who reject the redemption of Christ and who will suffer eternal damnation. He limits himself strictly to the difficulties of the Corinthians, and

he meets their doubts by calling Christ the firstfruits of a glorious harvest.

Firstfruits carries a deeper meaning than just a sample. It implies a certain guarantee of success. Compare particularly Paul's use of the word in Rom. 11, 16: "For if the firstfruits be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches." The resurrection of Christ carries the assurance that we who are His shall also arise unto life everlasting. "Could the Head rise and leave His members dead?"

By using the figure of firstfruits Paul sums up all that he had briefly stated when he mentioned the solid foundation of his doctrine, that Christ died for our sins and that He rose again on the third day, and which he had developed negatively in his devastating attack on the doubters. Christ is firstfruits, He is a sample of real resurrection and a sure guarantee of our resurrection unto life eternal.

A big question now presents itself. Paul applied the wonderful figure of firstfruits to Christ's resurrection: has he solid ground under his feet to stand on should any one challenge the propriety of the figure? By what right does he call Christ's resurrection a firstfruit? How does he know that it is not an isolated case, as was, *e. g.*, the peculiar departure of the prophet Elijah from this life, an exception, confirming rather than canceling the general rule?

Paul is ready for the question. He introduces his next statement with an emphatic *gar, for*. The position of Christ as firstfruits in this matter is assured by the principle that, "since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." The force of this statement is somewhat obscured in our English Bible by the insertion of the verb *came*. Paul used no verb at all in the sentence. Goodspeed's translation is cumbersome, but it brings out the point: "For since it was through a man that we have death, it is through a man also that we have the raising of the dead." Menge uses two different verbs to present the thought: *Denn weil der Tod durch einen Menschen gekommen ist, erfolgt auch die Auferstehung der Toten durch einen Menschen*. Moreover, he indicates the special emphasis to be placed on the word *man* (not so indicated in our reprint). Paul tersely says: For because through (a) man death, also through (a)

man resurrection of (the) dead. — This is the great principle on the strength of which Paul calls Jesus the firstfruits of the resurrection.

Paul treats this principle as axiomatic. It certainly is not an axiom of human philosophy, nor can one say that it is an axiom of the natural sciences, nor of history. Where, then, did Paul get it? It is the basic idea of God's plan of salvation.

In our passage Paul gives this principle a very terse formulation; he elaborates it more fully, *e. g.*, in Rom. 5, 12ff., where he draws a great parallel between Christ and Adam. This is not the place for detailed study of that passage, a brief summary must suffice. After introducing the comparison in v. 12, and then pointing out in v. 15–17 two important differences in the cases of Christ and Adam, v. 18 and 19 state the result in a summary: "Therefore, as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

God's great truth is imputation. Adam was considered by Him as the representative of the human race. When he sinned, his sin was imputed to all his descendants. They all were declared sinners and treated as sinners, although they "had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." —Then God himself appointed another representative man, a man to stand in the stead of the sin-laden human race, Christ. When He was obedient under the most trying circumstances, even unto death, His righteousness was credited to the whole human race without any merit or worthiness of their own.

This principle of imputation violates the human sense of fairness and propriety. How can God burden the human race with the guilt of Adam and maintain His claim to unimpeachable justice? How can He, in the name of fairness, charge the innocent Christ with the guilt of the human race? Or how can He in truth credit sinners with the obedience which Christ achieved in bitter agony? It simply is not fair according to human standards. It is foolish. It is offensive.

Yet it is God's principle. By the application of this principle

He was in a position to announce to all the world their justification from sin in the resurrection of Christ. And by virtue of the same principle, by the victory of Christ over death our resurrection is vouchsafed unto us. Christ became the firstfruits of them that slept. By (a) man death, by (a) man the resurrection from death.

Just in passing we refer to the difficulty of translating *anastasis nekrōn* into idiomatic English. In German we can form a compound noun to express the idea adequately, *Totenauf-
stehung*. In English we are just forced to say either "the resur-
rection of the dead" — inserting the definite article where the
Greek has none — or "the resurrection from death" — substitut-
ing an abstract concept for the concrete of the Greek. But in
understanding Paul's sentence we must regard *anastasis nekrōn*
as the corresponding counterpart to *death*. The simplest way
would be to drop the term "dead" altogether — it is self-under-
stood — and to say: "by a man death, and by a man resurrection."

We know who those two representative men are: the one is Adam, the other is Christ. For this reason Paul, in the following verse, provides both with the definite article "*the* Adam," "*the* Christ", meaning, the well-known Adam and the well-known Christ of history.

In the statement containing the name of Adam and Christ, Paul elucidates further (*gar*) by pointing to the complete parallel between the two cases. There is a perfect correspondence: *hōsper* — *houtōs*. The principle of imputation is applied exactly alike in both cases, in connection with Adam, death, in connection with Christ, resurrection.

The tense which Paul employs demands our attention. There is a striking similarity with Rom. 5, 19, and also a slight difference. The similarity is in the main statement, the difference in the subordinate clause. For convenient comparison we print both, italicising the respective verbs.

1 Cor. 15, 22: For as in Adam all *die*,
even so in Christ *shall* all *be made* alive.

Rom. 5, 19: For as by one man's disobedience many *were made*
sinners,
so by the obedience of one *shall* many *be made*
righteous.

It is in the protasis of these two statements that the tense of the verb is different, Rom. 5 using the Aorist, *katestathēsan*, thereby declaring the act of imputation to have taken place in the past, once for all; while 1 Cor. 15 uses the present, *apothnēskousin*. The difference is not as great as might appear at first glance. The Romans verb is in the passive; the agent, not expressed, is God, and He, when Adam fell into sin, definitely and irrevocably set down all men as belonging to the class of sinners. The verb in First Corinthians is in the active, the subject are all men; as they are born into this world one by one, so we also see them dying one after the other. The process is still going on before our eyes. The present tense is the verb form suited to the situation. In other words, Romans states God's decree, First Corinthians the resulting action.

The tense in the apodosis is the same in both cases, the future, *zōopoiēthēsontai* and *katastathēsontai*. What is the meaning of the future? In the Romans passage there is nothing to suggest a temporal idea, the question, When will they so be set down as righteous? is foreign to the context. Paul is constructing a great parallel, in which he points out the correspondence between Adam and Christ in certain respects. His whole elaboration is, not strictly in the field of history, or of prophecy, but in the field of logic: as it is on the one side, so, correspondingly, it must be on the other. This relation is conveniently expressed in the Greek by the future tense.

Does a similar situation prevail in 1 Cor.? To your essayist that seems to be the case. The parallel is much shorter, yet not less pronounced, and the argument, though condensed very much, follows similar lines; the difference in the protasis is more apparent than real. The thought is briefly this: God's rule is, by man is death, also by man shall be the resurrection, *for* just as in Adam all men are dying, just so in Christ all must be made alive. This specific statement about Adam and Christ, thus, elucidates the general principle of the previous verse, and applies it as a clinching argument to the concrete case in hand. Whether all will enjoy the justification ready for them in Christ, is not the question in Rom. 5; similarly, whether all individuals will enjoy the blessed resurrection gained for them by Christ, belongs into a different chapter; however, it is in Christ an established thing.

If we thus understand the resurrection spoken of in v. 20-22 as something positively secured by Christ, without any reference to the question, whether all will avail themselves of the blessing, we obviate a difficulty which no proponent of the temporal future has solved satisfactorily so far. It pertains to the double *pantes*: As in Adam *all* die, so in Christ shall *all* be made alive. It may be granted that *pantes* does not hold an emphatic position in the sentence, and thus carries no special stress; yet it would seem that *all* must be *all*, the same in both members of the parallel. The first *all* causes no trouble, but for the second, limiting modifiers would have to be found, as *e. g.*, all believers, or all that are in Christ, or words to that effect. But such tampering with the clear concept *all* is not admissible. Both *all's* must be kept in their original sense and applied to the same group of people: By Adam death came upon all men, for whom thereupon, all of them, none excepted, life was restored by Christ.

By briefly pointing to the great parallel between Adam and Christ, and by invoking God's principle of vicariousness and imputation — He regards Adam as the representative of the human race, and because of Adam's sin subjects every individual of the human race to death; and He regards Christ as the representative of the human race, and credits every individual of the human race with His victory over death and His recovery of life from death — thus Paul has vividly explained the meaning of his term firstfruits. Christ's successful encounter with death was not a personal victory only, His resurrection from the grave was not a mere personal triumph: it is the victory and triumph of all of us, in whose stead He undertook the battle. As the sheaf of firstfruits may have very little material value in itself, but is of immense importance as an omen and a guarantee of the coming harvest, so the inestimable excellence of the resurrection of Christ lies in this that it assures to us our final triumph over death.

Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the firstfruits of them that slept.

Paul might rest his case here; but since he is interested in fortifying the hearts of his readers in Corinth against the threatening error, he proceeds to present the vicariousness of Christ's resurrection from another angle.

Verses 23–24a

(23) But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. (24) Then cometh the end.

Very much is made of this short passage by some in the interest of their chiliastic views. They say, though Paul does not teach a millennium here in express terms, he clearly points to one in unmistakable words. They point to two things, to Paul's enumeration of events, some of them future, and particularly to the *parousia*, which they understand to refer to a visible return of Christ for the purpose of inaugurating the millennium.

These two points we shall have to take up for special consideration, always keeping clear in our minds, however, that Paul's aim here, as in the whole chapter, is to strengthen the faith of the Corinthians in the article of the resurrection and to fortify them against the encroaching error. This does not affect the doctrine as such, but it will have an influence on the manner of presentation and on the stress on certain points.

The great doctrine Paul introduces in connection with the resurrection is that of Christ's *parousia*. What is the *parousia*? Paul discusses it at some length, again in connection with the resurrection, in 1 Thess. 4, 13–18. His aim there is to stir up the hope which the Thessalonians had in connection with their faith in the Gospel. This hope should dispel all grief that might beset them when thinking of their departed loved ones. He does so by calling their attention to certain truths of the Gospel which they were in danger of overlooking. The great all-embracing fact is our union with Christ mediated through faith. We are bound closely, inseparably to Him. Our faith rests on the death and resurrection of Christ. Our fate is bound up with His. Even those that have fallen asleep (*koimēthentas*) are not separated from Him; God will at the appointed hour bring (*axei*) them with Him.

At this point Paul introduces the great event of the *parousia*. Some Christians will live to see the day, while others will have fallen asleep a shorter or a longer, perhaps a very long period before. Will any, whether living or dead, have any advantage on that occasion, and in what will it consist? The Thessalonians feared that those fallen asleep would be at a disadvantage because

of that very fact, they would lose out on some things. But what does Paul say? Does he urge that their disembodied souls even now are fully enjoying companionship with Jesus? He says nothing of the kind. He emphatically points to one factor, which he considers as decisive, namely that the first thing to happen on that supreme day will be the resurrection of the dead to put them in condition for enjoying their redemption which is drawing nigh. Then, and not till then, when those dead shall have been restored, shall the surviving Christians together with their resurrected brethren be received into heaven together with their Lord.

This is Paul's picture of the *parousia*: it is the event of a moment, bringing the history of the church on earth to an abrupt end and inaugurating the life of the church triumphant in heaven, in which no believer, be he dead or alive, shall be overlooked. Paul's presentation in 1 Th. 4 leaves no room for a millennium. The events are not spread out over a long period of a thousand years, as Chiliasts fancy: first the visible return of Christ, then the resurrection of a selected group (martyrs), then a long flourishing period of earthly church history, then the general resurrection of the remaining believers and of all unbelievers, then the judgment, and then heaven for all believers together with Christ. If such a thing had been contemplated by God for His church, here, in 1 Th. 4, would have been the place to mention it: else Paul's comfort would seem to serve only as an opiate, glossing over real facts, some not very pleasant to contemplate. If Christ's *parousia* were to introduce a millennium in which only the resurrected martyrs would share, what comfort would this contain for such as did not die a martyr's death? But Paul presents his comfort as something that applies to all believers alike.

Paul's description of Christ's *parousia* agrees completely with the one Jesus himself gave to His disciples. In their question they linked the end of the world with the *parousia*. Jesus, in His answer, first warned them of the great tribulation which must precede, and then described His *parousia* in these words: "As the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." It will take the corrupt world by surprise, as did the flood in Noe's days (Mt. 24, 3. 27. 37. 39).

On the basis of Jesus' announcement St. James encouraged his

readers to be patient in view of the approaching *parousia* (Jas. 5, 7. 8). — St. Peter warned the scoffers that the *parousia* was surely to be expected and that on that day “the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved and the elements shall melt with fervent heat,” whereupon “new heavens and a new earth” shall appear, the home of righteousness (2 Pet. 3, 4. 12. 13). — Also St. John encouraged his “little children” to remain faithful, lest they be put to shame at their Savior’s *parousia* (1 Jh. 2, 28).

But to return to Paul. Besides the passage we have considered (1 Th. 4, 15) he mentions the *parousia* by name in 1 Th. 2, 19; 3, 13; 5, 23, in every case identifying it with the day of judgment. Just as Jesus had warned His disciples against the tribulations that must precede His glorious return, so Paul in 2 Th. 2 tells his readers that the *parousia* of our Lord may not be expected until after Antichrist, the opponent *kat’ exochēn, ho antikeimenos*, has staged his own *parousia*, and has run his full course from secret beginnings in Paul’s own day through open display and a deadly setback to the end. Then Jesus “shall destroy (him) with the brightness of his coming” (v. 1–8).

This concept of the *parousia*, which Paul unfolds at length in 1 Th. 4, and simply presupposes in other places where he mentions the event; which concept is in agreement with that used by other New Testament writers, and which can be traced to the instructions given by Christ Himself in answer to a direct question by His disciples: must not be dropped lightly in trying to arrive at the correct understanding of the passage we are studying this moment, rather it must dominate our interpretation; unless — and only then — unless it leads to impossible absurdities. Particularly the second *then* (“then cometh the end”) must be viewed in the light of this concept. Millennialists stretch this *then* to cover their 1,000 years.

In itself this would not be impossible. *Then* simply indicates succession, but does not define the length of the intervening time. The event introduced by *then* may follow directly upon the foregoing one, it may follow after the lapse of a long period of time. We have an illustration of this in the very text before us, although the first *then* is expressed in our English Bible with *afterward* (Luther has *danach* in both instances). Paul is speaking about an order observed in the resurrection: “Christ the firstfruits; *after-*

ward (*then*) they that are Christ's at his coming." This little *then* reaches from the resurrection of Christ on Easter morning to the end of time on Judgment Day; and we do not know how many years it will embrace. But from this it does not follow that the second *then* must also be expanded to make room for the millennium.

The fact that Paul uses two slightly different forms of this adverb of time, first the compound *epeita*, then the simple *eita*, is worthy of notice, although it may not be decisive in establishing his precise meaning as to duration. In an enumeration both indicate no more than succession. The question may, however, very properly be raised, whether the second *then* actually introduces a third member of an enumeration. That point can be determined only by considering the subject matter itself and the constituent parts to be enumerated. Paul is speaking about the resurrection, and about the order in which each man is to be made alive. Christ, being the firstfruits, naturally comes first, and they that are Christ's follow afterwards. Then what? Since Paul is enumerating the various steps in the history of the resurrection, he will now, provided he continues the enumeration, mention a third group of such as rise from the dead. That would then conclude the enumeration properly. But he does not name a third group. Instead, he says: *Then* (cometh) *the end*. It would be a rather peculiar way of naming a third group of risers by calling them *the end* (*to telos*).

What is the end? In this same epistle to the Corinthians Paul uses the term in a very special way, as a sort of technical term. In chap. 1, 8, he identifies it with the "day of our Lord Jesus Christ": "who shall also confirm you *unto the end* (that ye may be) blameless *in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ*." Again in chap. 10, 11, he speaks of us as people "upon whom the ends of the world (*ta telē tōn aiōnōn*, the last of the several world periods) are come." Peter also speaks of "the end of all things" (1 Pet. 4, 7). Jesus himself gave us the promise that He would be with us "alway (even) unto the end of the world" (Mt. 28, 20), however, using a different word, *synteleia*. Compare furthermore 2 Cor. 1, 13 coll. 14; Heb. 3, 6. 14; Rev. 2, 26. — Since this word is also used in the common sense of termination or limit, the

context will have to show in a given case what is the intended meaning.

In our passage Paul does not leave us in doubt what is on his mind. He vividly paints before our eyes what he expects the end to bring: "when he shall have delivered up the kingdom" etc. We cannot enter upon a detailed study of these things now, but so much is clear, Paul is not speaking of a third group of risers from death. The thing introduced by the second *then* evidently is not a third member in the announced enumeration, but something entirely new. The enumeration consists of two members, Christ and they that are His, each one participating in the resurrection in his own proper order.

Now what about the second *then*? Here Paul's change of words may be of some help. If he had again used *epeita*, the impression of a continued enumeration could hardly be avoided, at least, the event introduced by *epeita* would have to be assigned to a later date than the previous one. But by dropping the *epi*, the *upon* of our English *there-upon*, the way is cleared for laying the greater stress on the demonstrative nature of *eita*: *then*, that is, in connection with the last named event, the resurrection of them that are Christ's, at that time and with that event, the complete end has been reached. We may transcribe: the resurrection of them that are Christ's that event will usher in the end, will be the beginning of the end; yes, with their resurrection the end of all things has come.

We bear in mind that Paul has firmly founded the hope of our resurrection on Christ's victory over death. In order to confirm our faith, he here is showing the place which this event has in God's general plan of salvation. — The next words will demand very close study.

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

Is this the Way toward Unity? — In the last issue of the *Quartalschrift* we printed in full the "Overture for Lutheran Unity" as it was published in the January number of the *Lutheran Outlook*, the official organ of the American Lutheran Conference. In the same January number, and again in the April issue, the editors of the *Outlook* make some statements about, and raise some charges against the Wisconsin Synod to which we are going to take vigorous excep-

tion. In doing this we are going to assume that these editors subscribe to the high-minded sentiments of their "Overture" in all sincerity, and that their charges against us are based on misunderstanding and misinformation rather than on any deliberate intent to single out the Wisconsin Synod as the victim of a "smear" campaign. We hope that our remarks will be taken in the same good faith.

The charges referred to above are the outgrowth of the following series of events. Late last year our Synod opened a mission in Moline, Illinois, an old stronghold of the Augustana Synod. A preliminary canvass had been conducted by a number of Wisconsin Synod pastors and eventually letters were sent to a list of prospects inviting them to the opening of services. One of these invitations was unfortunately addressed to a faithful member of an Augustana Church. From this the *Outlook* in a lengthy editorial took occasion to charge our synod with unseemly competition and proselyting, as follows:

"It is difficult to understand what motivates a Lutheran church body to begin home mission activity in a community in which another Lutheran group has carried on intensive work for nearly a hundred years and where some of its most important synodical institutions are located, including its college and theological seminary.

"It is still more difficult to understand why such an invading synod, if it feels truly justified by a real spiritual need in the community to begin missionary activity there, should find it necessary to proselyte among the membership of the long established Lutheran churches in order to establish a new congregation. Is the motive behind such methods a holy zeal to promote the kingdom of God?"

The editorial concludes with the question, "When will the Wisconsin Synod learn to walk among the other Lutherans of America as among brethren?"

At the time this was published we said nothing. We were clearly at fault and felt that this should and would be said in due time by the proper persons. It was. In its April number the *Outlook* printed what its editor calls "a friendly letter from . . . , pastor of the Wisconsin Synod, in reply to our editorial of January." Clearly, a point had been reached where the entire issue could now have been discussed in a manner in keeping with the sentiments of the "Overture." But matters took a different turn when the editor added the following comment.

"We are happy not only to print Pastor . . . 's letter, but also to accept his explanation that the approach which was made to a member of the First Lutheran Church of Moline was due to an error and that it is not the policy of the Wisconsin Synod to proselyte among the membership of other Lutheran bodies.

The main issue involved in the organization of the new congregation remains untouched, however. In our January editorial we said:

'It is difficult to understand what motivates a Lutheran church body to begin home mission activity in a community in which another Lutheran group has carried on intensive work for nearly a hundred years and where some of its most important synodical institutions are located, including its college and theological seminary.'

Of course, it will be argued that, since the Wisconsin Synod has no relations of any kind with the Augustana Synod or any other member body of the American Lutheran Conference, it is under no obligations to observe ecclesiastical ethics in the establishment of new missions in a field already occupied by these bodies. More is the pity. It is a sad situation in the Church when one group of Lutherans not only refuses to have fellowship with other Lutherans but actually sets up opposition altars and pulpits. It is still more lamentable when such a group not only refuses to meet with other Lutherans for the purpose of trying to reach an understanding, but castigates and condemns a sister synod for making such endeavors."

It is this editorial which prompts the question at the head of this article. Is the cause of unity served when its sponsors, finding one of their charges to have been based on grounds insufficient for such sweeping statements, pass on to the next accusation without so much as a word of regret for their hasty conclusions, or for having fastened the stigma of proselyting upon an entire synod on the strength of only a single incident?

Is the cause of unity served when this other charge (of competition) which was criticised far less severely in the first editorial suddenly becomes the "main issue," and the motives and ethics of an entire synod are denounced before it is even clear that the policy of this synod is such as its critics imagine? We are not familiar with the situation in Moline. But we do know that it is not the policy of the Wisconsin Synod to open missions in new territory simply in order to set up opposition altars and pulpits. In this particular case our canvassers and their District Mission Board may have erred in their judgment. But even if that be the case, should this be made the occasion for maligning an entire synod? On the other hand, there is the possibility that the canvass may have revealed that there is a real field for work in that busy industrial area. If so, we shall stand by the action of the Board. For we do not subscribe to a code of "ecclesiastical ethics" which would dispose of the ministry of souls in the manner in which Big Business parcels out "territory" in perpetuity. The temptation is too great to use this for the freezing out of the small competitor.

Finally, is the cause of unity served when the editorial closes with the unsupported assertion that the Wisconsin Synod refuses to meet with other Lutherans for the purpose of trying to reach an understanding, but castigates and condemns a sister synod for making such endeavors? We grant the *Outlook* may have gathered this widespread but false impression from what it considers reliable sources. We shall devote a separate article to setting the record straight in this matter. But for the moment it is enough to point out what mischief is wrought when such misinformation is passed on without closer scrutiny. What good purpose is served? E. R.

Let the Record Speak — In the foregoing article we took the position that our Wisconsin Synod is being misrepresented when it is claimed that it refuses to meet with other Lutherans for the purpose of reaching an understanding, and that it castigates and condemns a sister synod for making such endeavors. If this were an isolated charge it could be shrugged off. But it is being said so often, even in circles that should be better informed and more kindly disposed toward us, that further patience ceases to be a virtue. So let the record speak.

During the last ten years the Wisconsin Synod has received one primary invitation from another Lutheran body to confer with the view of establishing closer relationships. (A number of secondary invitations will be discussed later.) This overture was from the United Lutheran Church of America, in 1935. It was declined by our Synod, not because it refuses to meet with other Lutherans, but because it was based upon the premise "that we already possess a firm basis on which to unite in our Lutheran Church in America and that there is no doctrinal reason why such a union should not come to pass" (Savannah Declaration, U. L. C. A., 1934). This would have meant a by-passing of the one thing which is essential to the building of true Lutheran unity and in which our Synod is vitally interested. At that time we said: "Any such (doctrinal) differences should be frankly recognized, freely discussed, and in charitable Christian spirit an earnest effort made to find the common ground of truth in the Word of God" (Wisconsin Synod Report, 1935, p. 39). Holding up the earlier Intersynodical Conferences which ended in 1928 as an illustration, we said: "It would certainly not be possible to enter upon any general plan of Lutheran union without first taking up these abandoned efforts at intersynodical agreement at the point at which they were dropped . . . *we should be ready for that at any time*" (ibid. p. 41; emphasis by Ed.)

From this policy the Wisconsin Synod has not swerved. It did not refuse to meet with the American Lutheran Church in 1935-38. The fact is that it was never invited. For years it seemed as though

this had been an unintentional oversight, or perhaps the result of a letter being lost in the mails, and we took it as such. A passing remark by Dr. Reu in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, October, 1941 (" ob denn unsere Kirche nicht gute Gründe gehabt hat, in den früheren Verhandlungen von einer Einladung an Missouri's Schwestersynoden *abzusehen*") makes it appear that this omission was not so innocent as we in our good nature had assumed. We have no quarrel with the A. L. C. on this score, even now. They were fully within their rights in limiting their invitations to the synods of their choice, just as the larger body of the American Lutheran Conference will be within its rights if it should refrain from sending the *Overture* of its Executive Committee to any specific synod. But then what of the *Outlook's* charges? You can't withhold your invitations and at the same time insinuate that they are being refused. Common honesty forbids.

But to get back to the record. The passage most commonly quoted as implying that Wisconsin refuses to meet other Lutherans is paragraph 2-b of the Watertown Resolutions of 1939, "that under existing conditions further negotiations for establishing church fellowship would involve a denial of the truth and would cause confusion in the Church and ought therefore to be suspended for the time being." We believe that this passage is also the one which underlies the claim that our Synod "castigates and condemns a sister synod for making such endeavors," viz., to reach an understanding with other Lutherans.

As to the first charge (refusing to meet), this actually proves the opposite. It speaks of suspending negotiations *for the time being* (even as the next paragraph of these resolutions describes a condition where these negotiations could be resumed). It is unclear thinking, to say the least, when our critics charge us with refusing to meet other Lutherans when the actual proposal, supported by carefully detailed reasons, is to mark time until "confidence will be restored to a point where negotiations can be resumed, first to remove these obstacles and then to establish true doctrinal unity."

The other point which should be noted is that this paragraph as well as the entire Watertown Resolutions carefully refrains from condemning our sister synod for its endeavors. It confines itself to evaluating the factual result of the St. Louis Agreement, especially in the light of the American Lutheran Church's own words and actions which made plain to us what subsequent developments have now clearly proved: that to the American Lutheran Church the Agreement of 1938 did not mean what many a conservative Missourian had assumed in 1938.

To this analysis our Synod did add the urgent warning quoted above. As this was disregarded, our words became even more emphatic, we admit (Saginaw, 1941). But mark well, it was never Missouri's original purpose which was criticised, but rather its failure

to heed the danger signals that were multiplying on every hand. We call that brotherly admonition rather than castigation and condemnation. But call it what you will, only do not imply what cannot be proved in fact. The record shows that Wisconsin does not oppose sincere efforts to remove doctrinal differences as long as these efforts do not begin to jeopardize the very truth in the name of which they are undertaken. Even our present warnings against the current inter-synodical conferences promoted by our sister synod should be understood in this light only. They are dangerous not because they are meetings of Lutherans for the purpose of discussing doctrinal differences, but because they blithely continue a movement which already is sorely in need of being reexamined and purged of the unsound factors which have attached themselves to it.

Are those Lutheran bodies which do not belong to the Synodical Conference aware of our general policy, of our readiness to meet when the purpose is really to remove the causes which separate us? We maintain that they are. They have been plainly informed. In declining an invitation (Columbus Conference, 1942), Pres. Brenner wrote:

“Our Synod will at all times be found ready to enter into a discussion of doctrine with any Lutheran body, providing that the existing differences are frankly recognized and that we have the assurance that the sole purpose of such conferences is to remove the differences and to establish true spiritual unity between that synod and ours.

“Our Synod is of the conviction that co-operation, even only in externals, should not as a means to an end precede the establishment of true unity between two bodies, but should follow as the result and expression of a Scriptural unity previously established.” (*Quartalschrift*, Juli 1942, p. 214f.)

No answer came to inform us that our misgivings were groundless and that the conference indeed wished to take up those vital matters which we deem so necessary.

In 1943 the Augustana Seminary of Rock Island invited the faculties of all Lutheran Seminaries to a joint conference in order to study the problem confronting the Lutheran Church of America in these times. The reply of our Thiensville faculty was to the effect that we consider the doctrinal difference to be the chief problem, and that if the purpose of this conference was to attempt to remove these differences, we would be glad to attend. Our letter was ignored, and the conference held without us. Our absence has been publicised; there has been no fair statement of our reasons for it.

To us it is clear that there is a sweeping trend toward ignoring doctrinal differences and proceeding on the assumption that union is within reach now. We gladly grant that the early negotiations be-

tween Missouri and the American Lutheran Church (1935-38) were not of this type. Even though we do not agree with all of the findings, yet the doctrinal issue was taken up. But note the trend in the present *Overture*. And when the plain implications of the later course of the American Lutheran Church are disregarded and the movement toward union continues on its way, we shall continue to speak in earnest warning, even at the risk of being further charged with "castigating and condemning," lest our sister be swept along with the tide.

E. R.

Shall We Have Laws On Religion? — We have had occasion in the past to speak of a trend which has been developing for some time, where various agencies of government undertake to exercise a certain measure of control in religious matters. We see it in policies by which the work of chaplains is governed. We see it in the increasing number of cases where men in the armed forces have been compelled to attend religious services not of their choosing. We see it in government housing projects where the use of a community building is offered to some, and denied to other denominations. Now comes a matter which gives us even graver concern since its sponsors seek to have their policy written into the laws of the land. We quote from the *Presbyterian Guardian* of May 25.

"Now pending in Congress are two bills which, if passed, will mark the complete suppression in principle and in practice of our freedom of speech, our freedom of the press, and our freedom of religion. House Resolution 2328 proposes to make mailing of "defamatory and false statements" about members of any race or religion a criminal offense. The bill is sponsored by Representative Walter A. Lynch of New York. A similar bill has been introduced by Representative Samuel Dickstein, also of New York, seeking to legislate against anything "designed or adopted or intended to cause racial or religious hatred or bigotry or intolerance." Both proposals call for penitentiary sentences up to five years or fines up to five thousand dollars, or both, upon conviction."

The *Guardian* adds a statement by the American Council of Christian Churches (the fundamentalist counterpart of the Federal Council of Churches) which is worthy of close study, both for its careful analysis of these bills and its vigorous protest against their passage.

"The American Council of Christian Churches," the statement declares, "while deploring religious or racial hatred and bigotry, regards H. R. 2328 as going far beyond the legitimate scope of government, as well as being particularly in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The essence of the doctrine of the freedom of speech is that such freedom shall be unqualified. That unqualified freedom of speech or expression is sometimes or

even often abused is no reason for abridging it. Abridgment of free speech is the first and often the irretrievable step down the road to tyranny. When it is taken away, the question is not, Can we still save our liberties in spite of this threat to them? but rather, How can we regain the liberty of which our freedom of speech is an essential ingredient?

“We oppose enactment of this legislation not only upon the broad principle just stated but upon the ground that abridging the freedom of speech and expression in religious matters is particularly pernicious. The advocates of almost any religion will consider that opposition to its tenets or denial of its exclusive truth is defamatory and false, although at the same time they view other religions as false and dangerous to the welfare of men. Historically the intolerance of most religions toward the doctrine of other religions is a condition of their own continued vitality and existence. While such a result may be far from the mind of the author of the proposed legislation, this act if enforced would virtually make it impossible for the advocates of any religion to say to men: ‘Here is the truth of God upon which your souls depend. If you follow any other way, you are deluded, you are eternally lost.’ While this state of affairs would doubtless please many, it would be fatal to the preaching of Christianity. For the preaching of Christianity in any of its great historic forms is inextricably bound up with its claim of being exclusively true.

“The conflict between the Church and the Roman Empire in the first three centuries of the present era could have been resolved at almost any time had the Church been willing to admit that Christianity was but one of a number of acceptable, good religions. This the Church could not do, and the persecution by the Empire was against the claim of the Christian message to be exclusively true. Exclusive claims in the world of action always issue in comparisons and contrasts. In the case mentioned the assertion of the exclusive truth of Christianity involved the denial of the divinity of the Emperor. Such denial being considered as treason, it was for that offense that Christians were persecuted. We hold that the same principles are at stake in the proposed legislation, that it would, in effect, make the assertion of the exclusive truth of Christianity together with practical applications of that doctrine to conditions in the external, contemporary world, an offense against the state. And as the lineal successors, no matter how unworthy, of the Christians of earlier periods, we solemnly assert that man’s duty to God as he sees and believes it is of supreme obligation with which the state interferes at its peril, and that when the state compels men to choose between its orders and those they believe are God’s, they have no alternative but to resist the state.

"But while we consider that such legislation would impinge upon our freedom to preach the Christian gospel as we understand it, we are against it as an equal infringement upon the rights of other religions. We believe that other religions than the Christian are essentially false, no matter how much incidental 'good' may be incorporated in them. But we emphatically do not believe that such a view should be incorporated in the law of the land. We believe that men must be free to choose their own faith and forms of worship without any compulsion whatsoever from any quarter. The fabric of freedom must be untorn if it is to be freedom at all, and a portion of our own liberty is lost if we, or anybody else, abridges the rights even of the meanest, most despised minority. And a part of that right is freedom to preach all the truth as one sees it, no matter how crude the expression or violent the condemnation of the religion of everybody else.

"From the record of the hearings before the subcommittee it is evident that most of the demand for the proposed legislation has come from members of one minority group. With the desire of that group to guard against being treated unjustly and cruelly we have only the warmest sympathy. But we believe profoundly that the contemplated means is much more likely to produce persecution and discrimination than to prevent it. The safeguard of any minority lies in the restraint which society imposes upon itself not to abridge liberties equally guaranteed to all. Without such restraints, minorities are at the momentary mercy of majorities or of groups which by the exercise of political powers can simulate the action of majorities. Enactment of this proposed legislation is a long step toward placing minorities at the mercy of majorities. Any minority ought to be able to see that whatever the inconveniences of free speech may be, they are infinitely preferable to the abridgment thereof. For such disabilities are always easier to fasten upon minorities, and particularly upon minorities which, having solicited such abridgment as to others, have no moral weapon left with which to defend themselves. To gain a temporary hoped-for immunity from what they deem to be defamation by others, they have paid a certain price. That price is simply the loss of their own freedom along with that of others. Through state censorship of religion and the guarantee of the state that no one is to be allowed to 'defame' them, they are in effect established by law. Quite irrespective of the constitutional prohibition upon religious establishments, the history of mankind evidences that the career of established minorities is neither happy nor long. Accumulated resentments finally culminate in which events are shaped that make the original troubles seem in retrospect to be the inconsequential irritations of a happier time.

"We hold that the remedy for falsity in speech is not the suppression of it by law or in any other manner. The remedy rather lies in the preservation of freedom of speech and expression, so that in unobstructed fullness truth may be stated and compared with it. How is any man ever to know what truth is if he does not have free opportunity to hear and decide between various views offered as truth? Further, how can he decide upon the merits of conflicting doctrines unless he is enabled freely to hear what can be said in favor of those doctrines by those who hold them? The cause of truth is never served by those who, for any reason or from any motive, move to make it impossible for any view, no matter how contemptible or scurrilous they deem it, to obtain a hearing upon its merits.

"It is better to have abuses of liberty than no liberty left to abuse. Yet we are not hopeless of a lessening of those abuses. They will lessen, we feel, when all realize that men may firmly hold to their own convictions as true, may regard the convictions of others as false, yet not allow these convictions to betray them into personal meanness and hatred toward any other. If we deem a man to be in error, instead of despising and hating him it is rather our part to feel true concern for him and to manifest that concern with true humanity. Especially we, as Christians, should never hate anyone for whom we believe Christ died. That Christians have done so is no reason for pride.

"We therefore respectfully oppose passage of the proposed legislation without impugning the motives of those who have conceived it. But good motives may give birth to pernicious legislation. If, unfortunate, this bill should pass the Congress and become law, it will set the clock of human liberty back for generations and give rise to evils and troubles incomparable to those it is designed to end. Its adoption would be automatic conversion of the concept of human society as a union of free men. Truly Christian churches will not tolerate such subversion or consider themselves bound by it. Wherever and whenever it is necessary to proclaim truth our churches will endeavor to do so in its wholeness. Wherever and whenever such preaching of the truth requires that falsity or evil be identified and opposed, our churches shall identify and oppose it. Let the state keep to its own side of the line that divides powers secular from powers spiritual, and there will be no conflict between Church and State. We respectfully ask the representatives of the people to remember that in any such conflict the Church will neither yield nor suffer defeat."

We are not in favor of the average "Write-your-Congressman" campaign. But these bills, if passed, will constitute a definite and

dangerous limitation of religious freedom. It is a matter of record that Nazism began its campaign against the churches with just such seemingly innocent measures. As we value our religious liberty, so it becomes our duty to speak out against these two bills, informing our lawmakers in unmistakable terms where we stand, before it is too late.

E. R.

Büchertijds

The Power of the Keys. — The original faith of the Lutheran Church. Presented in quotations from Luther and the Lutheran Confessions. By Uuras Saarnivaara. Finnish Lutheran Book Concern, Hancock, Michigan. Paper, 25 cents.

In this little booklet the author, Instructor of Systematic and Exegetic Theology at Suomi College and Theological Seminary, proceeds from the premise that "the Lutheran Church of our time has almost lost its consciousness of the power of the keys." Deploring the decline of private confession and arguing for a revival of this wholesome practice he does not content himself, however, with pointing out its usefulness and blessing as an aid to troubled souls, but seems to make forgiveness of sins contingent upon confession made to a minister or fellow Christian, going even to the length of claiming that a minister who is not a true believer at heart cannot preach the Gospel and forgive sins effectively.

The author has the conviction that "a return to the original faith of our Church is sorely needed." But he fails to observe that in the very sermon from which he draws several of his quotations ("Sermon on Confession and the Sacrament," Church Postil, Gospel for Palm Sunday) Luther is arguing *against* mandatory private confession; also that Article VIII of the Augustana declares: "Both the Sacrament and the Word are effectual by reason of the commandment of Christ, *notwithstanding they be administered by evil men.*"

We find ourselves in sympathy with the author's objectives, but cannot agree with his means for attaining them.

E. R.

A Compend of Luther's Theology. — Edited by Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Price \$1.50.

The editor of this Compend is also the editor of "A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion" by John Calvin. The purpose of the Compend is "to offer an introduction to the Theology of Martin Luther for those who find it difficult or impossible to make any prolonged or systematic study of the Reformer's many writings." The selection of subjects is one which covers the ground of Luther's theology quite adequately. Such subjects are for instance: The Bible,

God, Jesus Christ, the Christian Life, the Sacraments, Christian Ethics, etc., etc. The selections, comprising 249 pages, have been taken from translations of representative writings, which are listed in the Foreword and which can be consulted by the reader for further study and verification. A functional Index rounds out the Compend. However words like "Law" and "Religion" should not be missing in such an index.

The Foreword contains a comparison of Luther's and Calvin's theology and remarks on Luther's teachings concerning the separation of Church and State. The present day tendency to minimize the differences between the theology of Calvin and Luther and to question the correctness of Luther's views on the relation between the temporal and the spiritual order and power finds support in the argumentation of the author.

P. Peters.

The Primacy of Faith. — The Gifford Lectures by Richard Kroner, New York. The Macmillan Company, 1943. Price \$2.50.

The question may well be asked whether we as Lutheran theologians are always aware of the influence of philosophy on theology in the history of the Christian Church. It is true, Luther severed connections with Aristotle and the Scholastics because of their evil influence. But philosophy has always again experienced a comeback and it is a very interesting study to observe how it has influenced Protestant theology after the Reformation till to the present day. In our times the boundary line between philosophy and the Christian religion or that between Natural and Biblical Theology is again under discussion. Richard Kroner, Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion at Union Theological Seminary and formerly Professor of Philosophy at the University of Berlin, has written a kind of trilogy, as he himself calls it, that endeavors to draw the line between Philosophy and Religion. In it he deals with the problems of religious imagination, of religious knowledge and of faith. "The Primacy of Faith" is but one part of the trilogy, but nevertheless deals with all three problems, since these are so intimately combined in the spiritual field. The theological reader will be repaid in reading the arguments of the author, so clearly stated and defined, thereby gaining a factual knowledge of the problems under discussion as we find them in the philosophy of a Kant and a Plato, and in the theology of Kierkegaard and Barth. While we must disagree with the author on vital questions (comp. his interpretation of the Fall etc., pp. 216ff), we are nevertheless indebted to him for acquainting us with the intricacies of philosophical problems and their bearing on the theology of our times.

P. Peters.

* * *

Alle hier angegebenen Sachen können durch unser Northwestern Publishing House, 935-937 North Fourth Street, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin, bezogen werden.

Theologische Quartalschrift.

Herausgegeben von der Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Synode von
Wisconsin und anderen Staaten.

Jahrgang 41

October, 1944

Number 4

Opening Address

Delivered at the Lutheran Theological Seminary
in Thiensville, Wisconsin, June 20, 1944

“Therefore thus saith the Lord, If thou return, then will I bring thee again, and thou shalt stand before me: and if thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth: let them return unto thee; but return not thou unto them” (JEREMIAH 15, 19).

Dear Friends in Christ, Members of the Student Body:

We have every reason to be grateful to our God, when at the beginning of a new semester we can welcome a goodly number of students, who are about to enter in upon or to continue the study of theology at our Seminary. Your presence testifies to the fact that the Lord of the Church gives pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry (Eph. 4, 11. 12). It also testifies to your desire and willingness to follow the call of your Lord to preach the Gospel to all men. Every Christian has the call to show forth the praises of Him, who has called him out of darkness into His marvellous light, but as students of theology you are being prepared by the Church for a definite work in the vineyard of your Lord, for the work of preachers and teachers of the Word. Our text brings this out clearly, more so in Luther's translation, I judge, than in our English version: “Darum spricht der Herr also: Wo du dich zu mir hältst, so will ich mich zu dir halten, und du sollst mein Prediger bleiben. Und wo du die Frommen lehrest sich sondern von den bösen Leuten, so sollst du mein Lehrer sein. Und ehe du solltest zu ihnen fallen, so müssen sie eher zu dir fallen.” Luther's translation is a remarkable rendition of our text, which teaches us that God designates

The Requirements of a Preacher and a Teacher of the Word.

Let us consider first of all, how God teaches Jeremiah these requirements, and then, how God by means of this confession of the Prophet teaches you these requirements.

Jeremiah was called as a prophet in times very similar to ours. It was a time of great upheavals and disorder. The great nations surrounding Judah were engaged in a life and death struggle. A World War was on, Assyria and Egypt were resisting the attacks of the Medes and Babylonians. At the same time a people coming from the distant north invaded the land and devastated it threatening the Egyptian frontier. When therefore the Lord called Jeremiah, although he was but a young man of some 20 years, He said to him: "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant" (Jerm. 1, 10). After Jeremiah had been a prophet of the Lord for twenty years, things were coming to a climax in this great struggle of the nations, including Judah, but above all, things were coming to a head in Jeremiah's life and mission. During these twenty years of his office as prophet, Jeremiah had been preaching repentance to his people. And now, according to his own confession, he had to learn anew the need of repentance as to his own person.

Jeremiah uses one word for repentance again and again. It is the word *shub* meaning turn, return. We hear him use it for instance in the 18th verse of the 31st chapter, where Ephraim is bemoaning himself thus: "Turn thou me and I shall be turned. . . . Surely after that I was turned, I repented." The same word Jeremiah uses no less than four times in this his confession: "Therefore thus saith the Lord, If thou return, then will I bring thee again," the same word only in a different form, meaning, then will I restore thee, and finally: "Let them return unto thee; but return not thou unto them."

But why was Jeremiah to repent? Had he not served the Lord faithfully? Had he not spoken all those words, which the Lord had put into his mouth? He had. We know of no instance, when Jeremiah refused to speak the Word of God which the Lord had commanded him, even if it was the word pertaining to Jerusalem's destruction and the people's exile. Therefore

Jeremiah could assert: "As for me, I have not hastened from being a pastor to follow thee" (17, 16). Still the Lord told him to repent.

Jeremiah had been striving with his God. He had not only striven with his enemies, the princes, priests and prophets of the land. Truly, these his opponents had caused him great grief, had filled his heart with vexation and indignation, had inflicted a perpetual pain and an incurable wound on him. They had not hearkened unto him, but had hurled curses at him. He therefore calls upon the Lord to remember and to visit him, to avenge him of his persecutors. Yet Jeremiah's striving did not end here. Was it not the longsuffering of the Lord, which permitted his enemies to persecute him? Take me not away in Thy longsuffering, he tells the Lord, in that longsuffering of Yours by which my enemies prosper. This longsuffering of the Lord caused Jeremiah to plead, to strive, to take issue with the Lord, to bring, as it were, a charge against him. Jeremiah could not wait till God would bring judgment on his enemies, but wanted God to hasten on these judgments. "Let me talk to thee of thy judgments," he says to the Lord. "Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper, wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously? Thou hast planted them, yea, they have taken root, they grow, yea, they bring forth fruit: thou art near in their mouth, and far from their reins" (12, 1-2).

Here was a case, which in this hour of trial seemed to Jeremiah irreconcilable with God's righteousness. Was not wickedness the best policy after all? Why did God delay His judgments, those judgments which God had revealed to His prophet as forthcoming on a stiff-necked and impenitent people? Had God failed to keep His word? Wilt thou be altogether unto me as a liar, and as waters that fail? Jeremiah asks. Wilt thou really be to me like a treacherous brook, like waters that are not sure? Had not God dealt deceitfully with him like a watercourse, that deceives the thirsty traveler, filled with a turbulent torrent in the winter, but dry in the summer, in a time of the year, when men and beasts are in need of its waters to quench their thirst?

Thus with God's promises. Were they sure? Was God fulfilling them? Now Jeremiah knew full well that God is and remains righteous, even when His prophet pleads and strives with

Him. Yet Jeremiah was bold enough to say: Let me talk with thee of thy judgments. And having talked with God of His judgments, God answers him by saying: If thou return, then will I bring thee again, and thou shalt stand before me; and if thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth.

Jeremiah had asked God to remember him and to visit him and God had answered by calling Jeremiah into His presence, by calling him, as it were, for the second time. Not as if Jeremiah had ever ceased to be a prophet. But in this hour of trial and temptation the Lord had told him to return and to stand before Him. Indeed, that was the call of the prophet, to stand in the presence of the most high God, whose judgments are unsearchable, whose ways past finding out (Rom. 11, 33). Here in the presence of God Jeremiah learned anew, although he knew it all the time, that "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man that he should repent" (Numb. 23, 19). Here he learned that God cannot be tempted with evil, nor tempteth He any man. Yea, here he was to learn, even as he had learned it before, not to err, not to be drawn away of his own lust and enticed, but to know that with the giver of all good gifts, with the Father of lights there is no variableness neither shadow of turning (James 1, 13-17). In the presence of his Lord he learned to look upon the Lord's longsuffering, even over against his enemies, as salvation (2 Petr. 3, 15). Therefore he could speak before the glorious high throne, "Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed; save me, and I shall be saved: for thou art my praise" (17, 14). Here he was reminded of all the words of God, that had come to him, and in which he rejoiced: "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of my heart: for I am called by thy name, O Lord God of hosts" (15, 16).

Being healed from his perpetual pain and his incurable wound he was again sent out by his Lord as a preacher, to declare the judgments of God. He was to declare them as one who is the mouth, the mouthpiece of his God, who seeks the law at His mouth (Mal. 2, 7), who is a true teacher and instructor of the Word, one who is able to take forth the precious from the vile, who preaches the pure and unadulterated Word of God. Even

as the priests were commanded by Moses to distinguish between the sacred and the profane, between the clean and the unclean (Lev. 10, 10), with the end in view that they might teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord had spoken unto them, thus Jeremiah was told by the Lord to "put a difference" between the precious and the vile and to bring forth what is precious without anything base. Doing this he will ever answer the character of a true prophet, whose office it is to speak the Word faithfully that God put into his mouth, without adding thereto or diminishing from it (Dt. 4, 2). For what is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord (Jerm. 23, 28). As to his enemies, Jeremiah was not to be filled with vexation and indignation. They may return to you, the Lord says, yea, let them return to you, but do not you, as a preacher and teacher of my Word, return to them, do not you make any humiliating advances.

Now God wants to instruct you likewise. Ultimately and virtually Jeremiah's experience is also our experience, even if not in such an accentuated manner. The times in which you are preparing yourselves for the ministry are similar to the times of Jeremiah. The nations of the world are at war with each other. God is executing His judgments on nations and on individuals, He is sending the sword among them and the earth is sorrowing and trembling. In such times, to say the least, we cannot let ourselves be cut off from the tragedy of human suffering. We cannot read of the horrors described in our daily papers, without being driven back to the Word of God for light and comfort and guidance. Such guidance all Christians will seek, but you, as students of theology, no less. The whole prophecy from Genesis to Revelation reveals God to us as One "who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (Eph. 1, 11), in order to build His Church and to save His elect. In your study of Church History, ancient and modern, you will likewise want to behold God's counsels in shaping the course of events to the glory of His name. Therefore you will not only study the Scriptures, our Lutheran Confessions and all theological disciplines in a theoretical or scientific manner, but will want to do it in a very practical way by giving thought to God's judgments as revealed to us in His Word.

But this question concerning God's judgments is not only a

very practical, but also a very personal question. The enemies of our Lord are also our, also your enemies, who revile and persecute you. The rebuke which you suffered till now may be quite insignificant in your own eyes and in those of others compared with the suffering which the prophet Jeremiah had to endure. Who would want to compare himself with the prophet in this? Still we never know how early in our Christian lives we are called to suffer the rebukes and revilings of the enemies of the Gospel. In times like ours, in which the whole nation is bending every effort on the production of armaments, your very study of theology will be looked upon by the enemies of the Church as an object of much scorn and derision. Your profession as such, for which you are preparing yourselves, is one in which many a pain and wound will be inflicted on you in the longsuffering of your God. It is then that the very personal question arises: "Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper?" At present you mainly hear others ask it. But do not overlook who they are, that have always asked this question, the saints of God, to whom the whole matter was not merely a problem among scientific problems, but to whom it threatened to become a *scandalon*, a stumbling-block, an offence.

Luther called it that and thereby implied that our striving with men so readily develops into a striving with God. Why does God permit evil? Why does God permit such suffering and agony as men are experiencing in this war? Why does God permit His children to be persecuted? Why does the enemy prosper? Why does God take us away in His long-suffering? These and similar questions Christians and non-Christians ask. Behind all these questions there lurks this one question: Is God just? As students of theology you will cope with these questions. Sooner or later you will be called upon to answer those who ask these questions. The study of theology is not a mere theoretical acquisition of knowledge. In it we run up against difficulties, which can readily develop into stumbling-blocks for us, unless the Holy Spirit Himself leads and guides us in our studies.

Now God does lead and guide you by calling you to repentance. As Christians we repent daily, for we sin daily. It is Luther, who in the first of his 95 Theses told all Christians

that "Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, in saying 'Repent ye' intended that the whole life of the believers should be penitence." But repentance, daily repentance does not consist only in this, that we learn to discern our sinful deeds and to regret these sins. It is indeed a fruit of your repentance that you will have a watchful eye on your own shortcomings and transgressions of God's commandments in the pursuance of your new duties and in your relationships with your teachers and fellow-students. All of God's commandments, whether we think of the Fourth or the Fifth Commandment or of any one of the Ten Commandments, serve you as an instruction and direction of all your internal and external actions. But even when we realize that we sin daily, this is not yet repentance. Repentance consists in approaching the throne of grace in true faith and saying: "O Lord, thou knowest" (15, 15), and again: "Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed; save me and I shall be saved" (17, 14). We only speak and confess thus with the prophet when believing in the fulness and the riches of God's grace and mercy in Christ Jesus, our Lord, by whose Spirit Jeremiah spoke these words. Repenting daily you rejoice with the prophet: "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of my heart: for I am called by the name, O Lord God of hosts" (15, 16). If you thus return, then you will also be brought again, will be restored, quickened, strengthened for the task which lies ahead of you. Then you will stand before the Lord as "the individual before God", to answer His call and to preach His Word.

You will also want to gain that necessary knowledge of taking forth the precious from the vile and thus become God's mouth-piece. How can you however do justice to this great call without daily "seeking the law at his mouth" (Mal. 2, 7)? Do not be deceived! It is not such a self-evident matter to seek God's Word at His mouth, to listen to that, which God has to tell His servant. It was only when the Lord called Samuel the third time, that he learned to answer: "Speak, Lord: for thy servant heareth" (1 Sam. 3, 9). Jeremiah's confession is the result of God's great mercy in repeatedly addressing Himself to His prophet. But why is it not such a self-evident matter to seek God's Word at His mouth? Because we prefer to inject our own thoughts into the Bible. We do not always want to submit, whether consciously

or unconsciously, to that which God's Word is telling us. All false doctrine has its source, as far as man is concerned, in the evil will of man, in a desire to create his own religion. It belongs to your preparation to be fortified against false doctrine, against modern liberal theology, which does not differentiate any more between Law and Gospel, between philosophy and revelation, between natural and spiritual knowledge. The old dualism of our Lutheran dogmaticians who separated clearly between natural and revealed truth, has not been retained by modern liberal theology. Men, on the strength of their own reason claim to be able to determine, whether the spirit, which reveals itself in the Gospel, is really holy and divine. Nothing is made of God's Word as such, of repentance and of a spiritual discernment worked by the Holy Spirit. Beset on all sides by such false doctrine and by your own infirmities, you will want to learn to perceive the vast difference between the precious and the base, between the wheat and the chaff, in order to know how to bring forth the precious as faithful witnesses of your Lord Jesus Christ, instructed unto the kingdom of heaven like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old (Matt. 13, 25).

In doing so your Lord wants you to be uncompromising. So much is at stake, the retention of the pure, the unadulterated Word of God. God in all His longsuffering does not permit Jeremiah to compromise: Let them return unto thee, but return not thou unto them. We should return to our God, return to Him repeatedly, but we are not to return unto men. O indeed, we should preach the Gospel to all men, we should not wait till they come to us before preaching it. But in so doing, we are not to make any humiliating advances, are not to preach any other gospel, are not to mix the precious with the vile, the wheat with the chaff. In our preaching we are also to distinguish between the righteous and the wicked, neither making the hearts of the righteous sad, nor strengthening the hands of the wicked (Ezek. 13, 22). The Gospel, which you are taught to preach and which calls you to repentance, tells all men to repent, to return to their God, to become members of the Church of Christ by faith, to receive the Word from Christ's messengers as spoken by the Lord Himself. And you are to know, that even those who remain your

enemies, will not prevail against you. The whole Church of God has the promise from its Lord: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. 16, 18). Therefore fear not, and learn not to compromise in the preaching and the teaching of the Word of God.

God grant that this Confession of the prophet may ever be your confession. By means of it you will find the right approach to your study of theology and learn to stand before the Lord as preachers and teachers of His Word. P. PETERS.

Remarks on Eph. 4, 1-16

This essay was prepared by special request of the Mississippi Valley Pastoral Conference, and was also read before the Mixed Conference of Milwaukee and Vicinity. M.

Chapter Four opens the second part of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. In the first part the apostle painted a vivid picture of the glorious church of Christ's redeemed people. The church is Christ's body, the fulness of Him who fills all in all (ch. 1, 23). It is animated, sanctified by the new spirit of faith; it is the work of God's holy Spirit of wisdom and revelation (ch. 1, 17).

On the strength of these granted facts Paul in the second part directs an appeal to the Ephesians to practice sanctification appropriately, the particular aim of the section you assigned to me being to arouse them to a proper realization of, and a corresponding conduct with reference to the unity of the church. God expects them to cherish this unity.

The thoughts of this section flow in an unbroken stream from the first word of v. 1 till the climax is reached in the crowning word of v. 16, *en agapē*. For convenience we may divide the section into two major parts: 1) v. 1-10, a general encouragement to cherish the unity of the church; 2) v. 11-16, in particular the special purpose of God's gifts to the church with respect to its unity. I admit, this division may seem somewhat arbitrary. The first major part I would then subdivide into three smaller thought-units: a) v. 1-3; b) v. 4-6; c) v. 7-10. Also the second major part comprises three thought-units: a) v. 11-13; b) 14.15; c) v. 16.

1. General Encouragement Regarding Unity

a) Paul begins this part with a word which he uses very frequently, *parakalō*. The King James version, “beseech,” does not do justice to the term, and Luther’s *ermahne* has a connotation which the Greek word does not necessarily carry. *Parakalein* denotes an urgent request and encouragement, a sort of spiritual “pep-talk.”

Paul underscores his urging by calling attention to his imprisonment. He is in chains for no other reason than because he preached the Gospel of Christ, as he outlined it in chap. 1–3. He is satisfied to be in prison for the Gospel. He considers that as a trifling matter when compared with the overwhelming blessings he reaped from the Gospel. The words of such a witness, speaking from so deep an experience, should carry some weight.

The Ephesians have been “called,” *eklēthēte*, with a “call,” *klēsis*; and as a result belong to the *ekklēsia* of the Lord. Let them realize what this means, and let them arrange their conduct accordingly, *axiōs*, so that it will match the wonderful blessing they enjoy. What precisely Paul is driving at he tells his readers in v. 3, namely that they bend every effort to preserve the “unity” which they possess. He illustrates his *axiōs* and builds up to his exhortation by enumerating, in v. 2, several Christian virtues which every one must cultivate: “With all lowliness.” Look at the lowliness of our Savior, as Paul depicts it in Phil. 2, 5–8. Emphatically Paul adds *all*. Our lowliness here on earth is never pure, it is so easily marred by pretense. Christ built the church by His lowliness. Nothing is deadlier to the church than lack of lowliness in its members. Always cultivate lowliness, *all*, genuine, lowliness. And let it be coupled with “meekness.” “Behold, thy King cometh unto thee meek” (Mt. 21, 5). The members of the church which He built must follow in His footsteps. For there is nothing that will disrupt the unity of the church more easily than harshness and haughtiness.

Equally destructive is the lack of patience. Paul urges his readers to practice “longsuffering.” He explains what he means by adding a participial phrase *anechomenoi allēlōn*, “forbearing one another.” No Christian will attain to perfection in this life. Weaknesses of character — think of fits of temper, addiction to drink, the use of profanity — trouble many a Christian and cause

him to fall again and again into the sin against which he is fighting. Think also of the disciples themselves, how difficult it was for them to rid themselves of faulty notions. Christ receives weak brethren, He bears with them and helps them, sustains them. Let us cultivate such forbearance. — Of course, weaknesses of the flesh persisted in without repentance, and errors retained in spite of a manifest Word of God call for a different treatment on the part of the church (cf. Mt. 7, 15; Rom. 16, 17; Tit. 3, 10). When dealing with error that arrogantly demands tolerance as its right, then forbearance ceases to be a virtue.

Paul sums up all he has urged so far by using the comprehensive term *en agapē*. This is the love which takes the condition of its object into proper consideration, and adjusts its actions accordingly. Where this is done by every one concerned, the unity of the church is comparatively safe.

We bear in mind that the oneness of the church is a spiritual thing, a *henotēs tou pneumatos*. It consists in this that the Spirit of God has created in all believers the same spiritual life of faith, which unites them with their Savior and among one another. While we are here on earth, this spirit is nourished by the means of grace, which God has instituted for that very purpose, and by the mutual contact of the Christians, *per mutuuum colloquium et consolationem fratrum*, as the Smalcald Articles say (*Trgl.*, p. 490, Art. IV). The oneness of the spirit is threatened when the Word of God is adulterated with errors, may they seem ever so insignificant, and when external things are allowed to interfere with the mutual contact of brethren. Compare the incipient factionalism in Corinth (I, 1, 11). Think also of a Christian who would isolate himself from a local church; or of a congregation that would isolate itself from larger church bodies. The *henotēs tou pneumatos* would suffer from such isolation — though in itself but an outward thing.

The bond that unites the hearts, and that must ever be strengthened, is the "bond of peace." Christ is our peace. He came to us from heaven to establish peace on earth, peace with God, peace among the hearts of men, even in such apparently hopeless cases as between Jew and Gentile. Yes, He actually did make one of the two and abolished the enmity in His flesh (ch. 2, 15). The bond of peace has been prepared by our Savior — a

peace which the world cannot give, a peace which passes all understanding. It has been applied to us and we have been united through it in the one church by the work of the Holy Spirit. This bond of peace is complete in itself and cannot be improved. But we must strive ever to become more conscious of it. It must ever become a more potent factor in our lives so that our words and conduct always reflect it. Let us, as Paul urges, bend every effort, *spoudazontes*, to achieve this purpose. Watching! Praying! Searching the Scriptures!

b) In brief, but powerful, words Paul has warmed our hearts to heed his urging. In the second sub-part he does so still more by holding before our eyes, flashlike, a vivid picture of the glorious unity with which we have been blessed.

The facts which Paul presents in v. 4-6 concerning the unity which has been provided for us in the church, he assembles in three groups of three each, but his enumeration thereby does not become monotonous — anything but that. In presenting the nine points of unity he uses the numeral *one* seven times, and in other ways varies his expression so as to present each point in its proper relation without thereby destroying the symmetry of the three times three items.

The first trio consists of "body," "spirit," and "hope." The church is "one body and one Spirit," and this is the case because all of its members have been "called in one hope of their calling." What a hopeless lot was theirs before they received this call, Paul had told them in chap. 2. They were "dead in trespasses and sins" (v. 1); they were under the control of "the prince of the power of the air" (v. 2), that is, the devil and his angels (who to the present day in Greece are called *aerika*). They lived according to "the lusts of their flesh" and thereby became the "children of wrath" (v. 3). A hopeless lot! But into this darkness of despair a ray of hope has fallen, yes, all the brightness of hope blazed on them when the Gospel call of God's saving love in Christ reached their hearts. Their gloom was dispelled, the call of hope with which they were called — the same hope in every case — effectively welded them together into one body, animated them with one spirit. — We need not spend much time on the question whether Spirit should here be capitalized, as in our English Bible, or a lower case initial should be used. There is a singular oneness of

spirit in the church, which in every case is produced by the operation of the one Holy Spirit. — The more vivid the hope in the hearts of Christians, the firmer the unity of the church. Whatever tends to strengthen this hope, at the same time reinforces the unity; and whatever weakens this hope in the least, to the same extent undermines the unity.

The second trio is a simple, yet just because of this simpleness a super-dynamic enumeration: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." In the Greek this simple enumeration is made even more impressive by the use of the three genders of the numeral *one*: *heis, mia, hen*.

There is just one Lord, one Savior, who is our only Priest, Prophet, and King. "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (Jh. 6, 68). — The call which announced this one Lord to us, created in all hearts the identical faith towards this one Lord. That is the "one true faith" of the Third Article. — The call was sealed to us by one Baptism, which in every case was a baptism in the Triune God, administered in the name of our Lord Jesus, as a "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. 3, 5).

Paul's presentation of the third trio is altogether different in structure. The numeral *one* occurs but once in it, but this particular unity is shown in a threefold relation: "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all." One Father *over* all members of the church, over each and every one of them alike: "Our Father, who art in heaven." He is *through* all, doing His saving work through all the members of the church, great and small, whom He has appointed to be priests and kings, a "royal priesthood . . . that they should show forth the praises of him who called them out of darkness into his marvellous light" (1 Pet. 2, 9). He is *in* all. He has come to them to "make his abode with them" (Jh. 14, 23). He "takes pleasure in his people" (Ps. 149, 4), and delights to dwell in their hearts as in His glorious temple (1 Cor. 3, 16). *Unio mystica!*

c) Unity — but by no means monotonous uniformity, rather a perfect blending of an endless variety into pleasing symmetry, perfect harmony in a vast polyphony. That is the truth to which Paul now proceeds, and which he briefly mentions and firmly establishes in the following verses.

In these remarks we have already indicated that the connective

de is not to be taken in the adversative sense, as does Dr. Reu in his pamphlet on Lutheran Unity, but rather as being transitional. By saying that to each member of the church a certain grace has been given, Paul does not intend to meet an apparent objection to the unity of the church. By repeating the word *all* in v. 6 he had already indicated that the unity he is speaking of is a composite thing, made up of a great number of component parts. He now advances a step by showing that each individual member of the church is to contribute his share that the wonderful harmonious pattern may be realized, and has received his special grace for that very purpose.

For the present he merely announces the fact, the development in detail will follow in verses 11ff. But it must be established, briefly perhaps, yet securely. Paul does so by a reference to the redemptive work of Christ.

The special grace which each member of the church enjoys is a gift from Christ, "according to the measure of the gift of Christ." It seem most natural to accept the genitive "of Christ" as subjective, naming Christ as the dispenser of the gifts, not, as some suggest, as objective, making Christ the recipient. It is true, even at the moment of His ascension into heaven Christ said: "All power is *given* unto me in heaven and in earth." But is it a legitimate conclusion to assume that Paul here must be thinking of the exaltation in the sense of a gift conferred on Him? Throughout, so far, he has been speaking of Christ as the foundation of the unity of the church. It would seem most natural to retain that thought also here.

To fortify his statement, Paul introduces a quotation from the 68th Psalm (Ps. 67 in the LXX), a quotation which has caused the commentators much worry. Not only does Paul quote quite freely, substituting, *e. g.*, the third person for the second, but he also changes the verb from "receive" to "give." We assume that Paul, when he made these changes, had solid ground to stand on. He was writing under the guidance of the same Holy Spirit who had indited the Psalm in the Old Testament; moreover he knew that his letters were always read very carefully, they were also searched for flaws by his opponents who would have been only too happy could they have detected one that might be made to appear as a falsification. Paul did not alter the sense of the Psalm passage.

The Psalm sings of God as the great champion of His people, who in mighty battle rescues them from their enemies. Paul quotes: "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." Ascending "on high" in the language of the Psalm means going to heaven in triumph, in majesty and power. And when prison itself is made a prisoner, that means that the original prisoners regain their freedom. To this the psalmist adds that He received gifts, which Paul interprets to mean that He gave those gifts to men. Correctly so, in perfect agreement with the sense of the Psalm. For our Savior did not receive any gifts for His own person; whatever gifts He received He received for those whom He came to save.

Now Paul proceeds to explain what the ascending on high really implies. How can He who is Lord of heaven be said to ascend into heaven? He must first have descended from heaven. "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" This can hardly refer to the descent of Christ into hell. As the ascent into heaven is a crowning event in the exaltation of Christ, so the descent "into the lower parts of the earth" most likely refers to the exinanition. Out of the terrific battle He comes forth victorious and in triumph ascends to heaven where He was before. More. "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." The ascent into heaven, as Paul conceives it, does not remove Christ from the earth; it rather expresses His omnipresence — on earth, in heaven, everywhere — also according to His human nature.

Here we see our Christ as what He really is. He is not a new lawgiver, issuing orders for the life and conduct of His followers, or instituting new offices which the Christians are duty-bound to establish, or commanding new organizations which they must join. No, He is one who descended into the lower parts of the earth, who thoroughly "humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" (Phil. 2, 8); who in our stead and for our benefit took up the fierce struggle against our enemies, and having come out victorious, now is the dispenser of gifts. That, and that alone, He wants to be, a *dispenser of gifts*. Whoever presents Him in any other light robs Him of His honor, so highly cherished by Him that He was ready to die for it. He

is not, and does not want to be, the author of any form of institutionalism, but ever the giver of gifts. This is the vivid picture which Paul paints of Him in verses 7-10.

Christ with His redemption and with the gifts which He secured for His followers is the foundation on which the unity of the church rests.

2. *The Gifts of Christ and Unity*

a) What some of these gifts are, and what benefits the church is to derive from them as far as the unity is concerned, Paul sketches briefly in the second part under consideration. When we read our German or English translation, we do not get to feel the stress which Paul lays on the subject of the statement: "And he gave some, apostles" etc. In the Greek original the subject is expressed with the emphatic *autos*. Yes, *He*, the very one just presented in the preceding verses, taking everything into consideration that was there mentioned about Him, *He*, and no one else, *He*, directly, not through an institution that He established: He gave. His gift is a fact which is bound up indissolubly with His person and work. He, in His capacity as descender and ascender, in His capacity as capturer of captivity, *He* — bear this in mind — He is the Giver.

Paul does not enumerate all gifts that the exalted Christ bestows on His church. In Rom. 12 and 1 Cor. 12 he mentions many more. Here, where he is speaking about the unity of the church, about the proper cultivation of this unity, he limits his list to such gifts as have a direct bearing on this unity. The gift of tongues, for instance, mentioned in 1 Cor. 12, and the gifts of healing were wonderful gifts indeed; but their relation to the *unity* of the church was rather remote.

The gifts which Paul here enumerates are the following: "some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." These men with all their qualifications and with all their efforts and with all their achievements are gifts which our Savior procured for us in His bitter suffering and death, and which He, being now exalted to the right hand of God, dispenses according to His good pleasure.

The apostleship was not an institution. The apostles were men with certain qualifications, whom Jesus called personally. What the required qualifications were we can see from the appoint-

ment of Matthias to fill the vacancy caused by the defection of Judas, Acts 1, 21. 22. They must be eye- and earwitnesses of the public ministry of Jesus from the baptism of John until the ascension. The same story also shows that the choice of an apostle is entirely for Jesus to make, the assembly after fervent prayer casting lots. These apostles, moreover, had the gift of inspiration.

Prophets seem to have been quite numerous in the early church. This is evident from the many warnings against false prophets, and from a special gift which the exalted Christ bestowed on His church, the gift namely of discerning spirits. Jesus warns against false prophets (Mt. 7, 15). He foretells their feverish activity toward the end of the world (Mt. 24, 11). St. John in his first epistle repeats the warning and instructs his readers how to "try the spirits" (ch. 4, 1). In 1 Cor. 12, 10, Paul in the same breath speaks of the gift of prophecy and of discerning spirits. — Some prophets are mentioned by name. We meet Agabus in Acts 11, 28, predicting a "great dearth," and in Acts 21, 11, foretelling the impending imprisonment of Paul. Silas, the companion of Paul on his second mission journey, is called a prophet, also a certain Judas (Acts 15, 32). In the church at Corinth there were a number of prophets, so that several of them could still serve as "judges" while two or three addressed the assembly (1 Cor. 14, 29-33). Whether they all received revelations regarding the future we do not know, but the manner of their regular work may be inferred from the effect it had on unbelievers. Under their influence an unbeliever felt his heart subjected to a most scrutinizing cross-examination and became inwardly convicted to glorify God (1 Cor. 14, 24. 25).

Among the evangelists Philip is an outstanding example. He was chosen as almoner in Jerusalem; then after the martyrdom of Stephen and the ensuing persecution he did mission work in Samaria, baptized the Eunuch of Ethiopia, preached the Gospel in the cities along the coast of the Mediterranean from Azotus to Caesarea, where he made his headquarters with his four prophesying daughters. The work of the evangelists in many respects resembled that of the apostles; it was pioneer work in spreading the Gospel, mission work.

To "teachers" Paul assigned the third place in 1 Cor. 12, 28.

Here he groups them together with "pastors" and lists them fourth. This is not an inconsistency on the part of Paul, but rather a clear indication of the absolute absence of rank among the workers which the exalted Christ graciously grants to His church. The work of shepherding is assigned by Paul to the bishops or elders of a church (Acts 20, 28). The work of a teacher was not so much to impart knowledge as to strengthen the believers and to train them in the art of Christian living. We take this from the expression used by Jesus: *didaskontes autous terein* (Mt. 28, 20).

The work of all these men was varied, indeed, but in one respect they were perfectly alike: they were gifts from Christ, gifts which He had given to the church in order to enrich its life, gifts which the church should gratefully receive and diligently use for its own edification and growth in unity.

What grand purpose these gifts serve Paul indicates in the following verses. Verse 12: "For the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry for the edifying of the body of Christ." Much labor has been spent on the three "for" phrases: are they coordinate or subordinate? The Greek preposition is not the same in all three instances, the first being *pros*, the other two *eis* (incorrectly listed in Reu's essay). The first expresses direction and aim: *toward*; the second and third, relation: *with respect to*. In this manner each succeeding phrase modifies the foregoing. The gifts of our exalted Savior aim toward the perfecting of the saints; the perfecting is to take place with respect to the work of the ministry; and the ministry pertains to the edifying of the body of Christ.

The "saints" are all Christians, each one having received complete forgiveness of all his sins. Each one of the saints is now to grow and to become ever more perfect in the "work of the ministry" (*ergon diakonias*). Note the absence of the definite article in the Greek, the two nouns thus stressing a quality rather than any definite form. The two terms really express but one compound concept, that of *service work*. — The ministry for which each saint is to be thoroughly equipped here naturally does not refer to the pastoral office as such, but denotes spiritual service which one saint renders to the other. The addition of the word *work* stresses the actual performance of such service. — The sphere to which such service work pertains, hence the purpose which it is to achieve,

is "the edifying of the body of Christ." Since Paul himself tells us in the next verse what he means by the "edifying," the building up, we need not waste any time or effort in guessing.

The building up of the body of Christ consists in this, and thus must ever be pressed vigorously "till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." — The building of the body of Christ, which is the church, is achieved only by the advancement of the individual members. As grows the individual in faith, in knowledge, in understanding, in sanctification: so grows the church. Only so. The goal we wish to reach in the building of the church is the "unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." The genitive "of the Son of God" is objective. The Son of God is the object of both our faith — we believe in Him — and of our knowledge — we taste His blessings in the Word. The oneness in these two basic factors of church life is the goal toward which we are working. There will always be novices in the church — just think of our children — who need tender and most careful coaching. It is the business of every saint, assigned to him, and gladly accepted by him, in the very act that created him a saint, for the carrying out of which business he is being thoroughly equipped by the several gifts of the exalted Christ.

Paul defines this "unity" a little more closely by two appositional phrases. The first is "a perfect man"; *teleios* means complete. Paul is thinking of a full-grown, fully developed, mature man, the opposite of what he in v. 14 calls *nēpioi*, immature children, *Unmündige* (according to the etymology). The second appositional phrase is "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." The three *of's* make the English phrase rather cumbersome; the Greek with its three genitives is much smoother. Besides, we have in the English the antiquated use of "stature." In addition, the first two words in the Greek, being anarthrous, form a compound term, the "age-measure." The "fulness of Christ" is everything that the descending and ascending Christ procured for us. To grasp to some extent what the age-measure of Christ's fulness may mean, read Gal. 4, 1-7.

b) There is a very practical purpose in attaining the goal of mature manhood as envisioned on the basis of the rich achievements of Christ. It is that we outgrow the infirmities of child-

hood. Children may drift hither and thither like the waves of the sea, they may be tossed to and fro as with the wind. From these metaphorical expressions Paul goes directly over into literal speech. He means doctrine, *didaskalia*. Note the importance of doctrine. We speak of fundamental doctrines and non-fundamental doctrines. We consider some doctrines as more important, others as less important; we may even be tempted to treat some as negligible. Not so Paul: he is concerned about "every wind of doctrine." And God laboriously made provision (v. 7-13) that we may be able to stand up properly under "every wind of doctrine." Because this is so important in God's eyes, those saints who are still in the *nēpioi* stage should tenderly be coached so that they become *andres teleioi*; but those who refuse to be thus trained must be sternly rebuked. Paul denounces them in the following words as toying with the most sacred things. He speaks of the "sleight (*kybeia*, *i. e.*, dice game) of men." Where there is such toying with doctrine, there certainly is not to be found a heart which trembles at the Word of God; there will be a strong urge and a strenuous effort to uphold a doctrine once espoused, be it by fair means or foul. Paul speaks of *panourgia*, cunning craftiness, a readiness to try anything, *pros tēn methodēian tēs planēs*, toward the intrigue, the tricky expertness, of error. This danger is inherent in every erroneous doctrine. We have good reason to heed the warning.

V. 15. While the foregoing verse stressed the negative side, that we endeavor to strip off childish helplessness over against the enticing dangers of error, v. 15 presents the positive also. Grammatically the verb of this verse is dependent on the same *hina* that introduces v. 14. We should be mature men so that "speaking the truth," meditating, absorbing, proclaiming it, we may once and for all "grow up" (Aorist) in every respect in relation to Him who is the Head, namely Christ.

The truth, God's truth, *i. e.*, the truth of the Gospel, is the only thing that can achieve the blessed end mentioned in this verse. It is a power of God, the only power that we have, unto salvation. Paul would have us handle the truth of the Gospel "in love." Using the truth in a self-assertive, loveless way is throwing it away as far as we ourselves are concerned. By a loveless, conceited use we on our part change the truth into a lie. The very

first fruit of the spirit, as Paul tells us in Gal. 5, 22, is love, coupled with such virtues as joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, meakness, temperance. This is a love without dissimulation, a two-sided love, which according to Rom. 12, 9, abhors that which is evil as well as it cleaves to that which is good.

Our growth is to be *eis auton*. This can hardly mean, as our English Bible translates, "into him." A body does not grow into its head, especially not "in every respect," *ta panta*, as Paul here adds. Paul speaks of Christ as the Head, and of the church as the body. It seems most natural that *eis* refers to this relation. By using the truth in love we shall grow so that in every respect the body corresponds to its Head.

c) Christ is the Head of the church. But He means vastly more to the church than ordinarily a head means for its body. Christ is also the source of all life that pulsates in this spiritual body, and He causes its growth. With this thought Paul concludes the first section of the parenetic part of his epistle. "From whom," he begins v. 16. Now what from Him? The sentence is very compact, and difficult to reproduce in English. We divide it into parts.

The principal clause is: the whole body produces for itself the growth of the body. *Pan to sōma*, as Paul pictured in the foregoing verses. *Poieitai*; note the middle voice: by and for itself the body works, again as outlined in the foregoing verses. What the body thus produces is *tēn auxēsīn tou sōmatos*. Paul might have said *heautou*, but since the subject is removed rather far he prefers to repeat *tou sōmatos* for clarity.

The subject, *to sōma*, Paul describes, by adding two present participles, as in the process of "being framed together and being knit together." This process has its source in the Head, but is carried out "by way of the supply of every joint." The preposition *dia* governs the genitive *tēs epichorēgias*, which is modified by the preceding genitive *pasēs haphēs*: by means of the supply of every joint. This is explained by a prepositional phrase introduced by *kata*: "according to the proportionate (*en metrō*) working of every individual part." Each part of the body, according to the gift bestowed on it by the Head, contributes its particular share — great or small, yet essential — to the growth of the body.

What is the fruit of this growing process within the church

among the members of the church, having its source in the Head? It is the "building of itself" — a growth from within. The church is a wonderful living organism! And the life stream, coming from its Head, pulsating through its veins, is *love*, intelligent, purposeful love.

Let the great thought receive due attention that all of this is from Him who is the Head of the church, Christ. It is He by whose descent and ascent the church was founded. It is He who provides the church with the Word of truth. It is He who gave the church many special gifts. Any error, be it ever so slight, will adversely affect the health of the church. Any idea of institutionalism will put a strait-jacket on this thriving organism. Any claim of personal merit will stunt its growth. We cultivate the unity of the church by nourishing faith in our Savior.

What Is the Gift of the Holy Ghost According to Acts?*)

Our topic is stated in the form of a question. No doubt it was assigned for the purpose of attempting to establish the nature of the religious phenomenon or Christian experience which Luke had in mind when he related that certain people received the gift of the Holy Ghost. Was this manifestation a miraculous, supernatural gift restricted to the apostolic period of the church? Or was it essentially the same gift by which the Lord continues to bless His Church to the end of days, that gift which Luther depicts in his explanation of the Third Article in the Creed?

It is of course the Greek phrase "dorea tou hagiou pneumatos" which at once comes to mind when one hears or reads the topic for this essay. According to the concordances and dictionaries at our disposal, this phrase occurs exactly twice in the twenty-eight chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Let us examine these passages in the order in which they occur.

The phrase appears for the first time in chapter 2, verse 28. This chapter relates the wellknown story of the Pentecostal

* Essay delivered before the Milwaukee City Conference in January, 1944.

miracle and Peter's first sermon. When at the close of this sermon the people were pricked in their hearts and said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do," Peter answered, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive *the gift of the Holy Ghost.*"

Before we investigate the content of the phrase, a point of grammar should be cleared up. What sort of a genitive is *tou hagiou pneumatos*? Is Luke speaking of a gift coming from the Holy Ghost? If so, then *tou hagiou pneumatos* is a subjective genitive and we should then be compelled to ascertain the nature of this gift which the Holy Ghost imparted or promised to impart to Peter's hearers. The definite article before the word *dorea* would further require that we discover *one single* specific outstanding gift endowed by the Holy Ghost. Our further studies will show that no gift of this sort is described anywhere in the Acts.

Thus the only other explanation which can be given and which is applicable is this that *tou hagiou pneumatos* must be an objective genitive. In other words, Luke wishes to tell us that this gift of which Peter speaks is the Holy Ghost Himself, and Peter might have stated the same promise in other words by saying, "Repent and be baptized . . . and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost as a gift."

Let us consider this last interpretation of the genitive accepted and continue with the study of the entire phrase: *the gift of the Holy Ghost*. What else does Peter wish to imply with the promise, "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit?" Does he here refer to that specific manifestation of God's Spirit which we are wont to call a charism? Was he promising the great multitude before him that they would, upon accepting Christ in baptism, experience the miraculous power of speaking with tongues just as did the apostles? Our answer must be an emphatic "no." For search as we will in the closing words of our chapter, we do not find the least evidence that such a charismatic gift was imparted. If the converted members of Peter's audience had actually been endowed with such a gift, Luke would, in all probability, have recorded this fact. However, he merely states that about 3,000 souls received the Word gladly and were baptized, adding that "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers."

Did they, then, fail to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost? Most assuredly not. The Spirit of God worked in their hearts and accomplished that gracious miracle within their hearts by which *they were brought to repentance and to faith in the Lord Jesus Christ*, and by which He established them in their faith through the blessed sacrament of baptism and by Peter's preaching of the Word. He came into their hearts and became a permanent sanctifying comforting possession unto them. What they experienced on Pentecost Day was precisely that which we experience today when the Holy Ghost calls us by the Gospel, enlightens us with His gifts, and sanctifies and keeps us in the one true faith. This was *the gift of the Holy Ghost* received by some 3,000 souls on the day of Pentecost.

We turn now to the only other passage in Acts where the phrase embodied in our topic appears verbatim. It is found in chapter ten, verse 45. Here we shall make an interesting discovery. The chapter records the experience of Peter in the home of the Roman centurion at Caesarea. The story is well known, and we can proceed at once to that section in which we find what we are seeking. Peter was preaching to the members of this Gentile household and while he was speaking, "the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out *the gift of the Holy Ghost.*" Again we ask, What was the gift of the Holy Ghost? Was it identical with the gift received by the multitude on the day of Pentecost? Offhand one would be very strongly attempted to think so. Luke uses the very same phrase. Why would he not have the same gift in mind? But the context assures us beyond doubt that this was an entirely different occurrence. St. Luke goes on to explain why Peter's Jewish companions were astonished at this gift by saying, "For they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God." Thereupon Peter exclaimed, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost *as well as we?*" Note these last words. Clearly Peter is referring to his experience of the charismatic gift received on Pentecost Day and points out to his Jewish companions that these Gentiles now were also receiving this charisma. Thereby he establishes the characteristics of the "gift of the Holy Ghost" re-

ferred to in this passage beyond any doubt. Let us not overlook, moreover, that Luke makes very much of this miraculous happening at Caesarea and yet only a small number of people received this gift of speaking with tongues. May we not justly argue in reverse, that Luke would most certainly have reported such a gift on Pentecost if a vast audience of 3,000 souls had suddenly been endowed with it?

So we have here an entirely different use of the phrase, since it describes the charismatic gift of the Holy Spirit, coming in miraculous manner and imparting miraculous powers to the members of Cornelius' household, *before* they had been baptized. This was an extraordinary operation of the Holy Spirit, the effects of which were manifest, capable of being perceived by the senses. Men saw with their eyes and heard with their ears the singular gift imparted by this unique operation of God's Spirit. We might add at this point that such manifestations as this one were in evidence only for an extremely brief period in the church. God employed them in accordance with a specific purpose. When they had accomplished their purpose, God terminated them abruptly and completely. Their purpose does not lie within the realm of unrevealed mysteries of the Godhead. We shall later find it revealed in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians and shall spend some time with it even though it is beyond the confines of our topic.

But lest someone may still be disturbed about it that St. Luke applies our phrase in one specific sense in the first passage and in an entirely different sense in the only other passage employing this phrase, permit us to offer a very simple explanation for this seemingly irregular usage of a phrase in literature. The fact of the matter is that while this phrase is used only twice in this exact form, the *essential thought* conveyed in the words "gift of the Holy Ghost" is actually employed by Luke in a number of instances throughout the book of Acts. What is equally important, moreover, is that, when Luke speaks of the manifestation of the Spirit in a different terminology, he again refers sometimes to charism, sometimes to what we might call the regular activities of the Holy Ghost as they occur to the present day. But in every instance *the context makes it perfectly plain* which activity is meant.

Therefore it is necessary for us to go beyond what seem to

be the limits of our topics. We cannot well stop at this point if we wish to obtain a complete picture of everything vital pertaining to the thought content in our phrase. Let us retrace our steps and, beginning with Acts 2, 4, examine in their proper order all passages in the book which have reference to our topic.

For the first reference we briefly turn again to chapter two, where it is said of the apostles in verse 4, "they were all *filled with the Holy Ghost* and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." The reader will at once notice that the word "gift" is here omitted and that we have correctly interpreted the phrase "gift of the Holy Ghost" as far as the genitive "of the Holy Ghost" is concerned. Moreover, this sentence and the following ones make it clear beyond any doubt that this being filled with the Holy Ghost designates that specific bestowal of the Holy Ghost as it occurred in the early church only. We call it a charismatic gift. The words in verse 4 are a divine prelude to the magnificent creation of the first congregation of believers in the New Testament.

The next reference occurs in chapter four, verse 31. The rulers of the Jews had seized Peter and John and attempted to intimidate them in order to quell the preaching of the Gospel. In the end they were compelled to set them free and the apostles returned to their companions to relate their experiences. Then, we are told, the whole assembly joined in a prayer of thanksgiving to the Lord for His protection. "And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all *filled with the Holy Ghost*, and they spake the word of God with boldness."

Offhand, a reader of the Bible, recognizing the identical wording of the phrase "filled with the Holy Ghost" in this and the foregoing passage might be led to the hasty conclusion that the meaning in each case is the same. One cannot but perceive certain points of similarity between this manifestation and that of Pentecost. The shaking of the dwelling was no doubt brought about by the same divine agency which at Pentecost filled the place of assembly with the sound of a mighty rushing wind. But this fact alone must not decide upon the interpretation. It is interesting to note what an important role the wider context plays in the exposition of each passage pertaining to our topic in the book of

the Acts. In this passage there is after all not a hint of charismatic gifts. The Holy Spirit revealed his presence in the hearts of these men by increasing their courage to preach in the face of ever increasing hostility to the Gospel. This differs in no way from the activities of the Spirit in our own times. We have every reason to believe that we shall in like manner be "filled with the Holy Spirit" under similar circumstances of stress in answer to our prayers. Stephen, the first martyr, was granted this same support in the hour of his death for we are told that "he, being *full of the Holy Ghost*, looked steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God," and in the strength of the Spirit he triumphantly continued his testimony to the last. In our passage, then, the phrase "filled with the Holy Ghost," describes no other than the usual activities of the Spirit as we experience them today.

Next we note briefly an indirect reference to the gift of the Holy Ghost in the story of Ananias and Sapphira, chapter five. Peter reveals a supernatural knowledge and the power to read the heart in his cross-examination of husband and wife. Moreover, he clearly hints at the source of this charismatic gift by accusing Ananias of having lied *to the Holy Ghost* and by charging the woman of having agreed with her husband to tempt *the Spirit of the Lord*. He clearly wishes to point out to these two malefactors that the Holy Spirit accepted their challenge and fouled their plot by revealing this secret agreement to Peter in a miraculous manner. Although this is a very indirect reference to our phrase, it cannot well be omitted in a complete listing of the Spirit's manifestations.

The next passage on the other hand will require more careful study. It is found in chapter five. Philip had been preaching Christ in the city of Samaria and the Lord had supported his work with many miracles. As a result, the people believed in the name of Jesus Christ and were baptized. Though the fact is not mentioned, we may be certain that these conversions came about through the working of the Holy Spirit and that the people received the gift of the Holy Spirit in the same measure as did the three thousand on Pentecost Day.

Now when the apostles at Jerusalem heard of these conversions, they sent unto them Peter and John, who prayed for them "that they might *receive the Holy Ghost*." Note the new phrase. Thereupon Luke adds the remarkable words, "For as yet he was

fallen upon none of them; only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." How are we to understand these words? Would Luke be saying that in being baptized these people had not received the Holy Spirit? That is quite impossible because then the Scriptures would contradict themselves. We point again to such passages as Tit. 3, 5; Acts 2, 38; 1 Cor. 12, 13. The Bible knows of no baptism in which the Holy Spirit is not an active participant and in fact the vital regenerating power. Luke himself say so. He would not contradict on one page what he had declared on another.

The answer lies in part at least in the verb *epipeptokos*. Luke does not say, "they had received," but "he had fallen upon." What Peter and John prayed for was a visible manifestation of the Holy Spirit such as they had experienced at Pentecost, with visible wondrous signs, with charismatic gifts. Why these manifestations were asked for and what purpose God had in mind by granting them, are questions we shall attempt to answer later. The prayers of the apostles were promptly fulfilled. As they laid their hands upon the men, the latter received the Holy Spirit. Luke does not tell us how this gift became apparent, but from what follows we may be certain that it was an extraordinary manifestation witnessed by all present. For the sorcerer Simon, who had come to faith and had been baptized, was a witness to it. He *saw* (*idon*) that through the laying on of hands the Spirit was given. In fact, this made such an impression upon him that the evil habits of his former profession again took possession of his heart. He offered the apostles money in order that they might teach him this power of bestowing the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands. Whereupon Peter answered, "Thy silver be with thee unto perdition, because thou didst think to acquire *the gift of God* by means of money." The "gift of God" here plainly refers to the charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit.

The next three references will be touched on briefly. First we have the one in chapter nine, verse 17. When Ananias called upon the blinded Saul in Damascus, he announced this as the purpose of his coming, "that thou mightest receive thy sight and *be filled with the Holy Ghost*." Saul did receive his sight and was baptized. But nothing whatever is recorded about any charismatic gift of manifestation; hence we conclude that this being filled with

the Holy Ghost was identical with the gracious impartation of God's Spirit to all human beings in the hour of their conversion.

Next we have a brief remark concerning a man named Agabus in chapter eleven, verse 28. We are told that he stood up "and signified *by the Spirit* that there should be a great dearth throughout all the world." Here we find an instance of the charismatic gift of prophetic vision and Luke adds that this prophecy was fulfilled. The power to do this came *by the Spirit*.

Paul himself experienced the power of a charismatic gift. This is related in chapter 13, verses 9-11, where we find Paul at the beginning of his first missionary journey on the island of Paphos. He was preaching the Word to Sergius Paulus, the chief official of the island, when an unholy acquaintance of the latter, a sorcerer named Bar Jesus, attempted to interfere. Thereupon Paul, "*filled with the Holy Ghost*, set his eye upon him and said, Behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness."

When Paul and Barnabas had been ousted from Antioch in Pisidia by fanatical Jews after Paul had preached there, we are told that the disciples were filled with joy and *with the Holy Ghost*, 13, 52. Note that this phrase is identical with the foregoing, and yet its meaning is evidently different, for there is no reason to believe that in this case we have a reference to any charismatic gifts. These men received the Holy Spirit through the preaching of the Word in like manner as do all those in whom the Holy Ghost works faith in the Gospel.

We come now to the last passage in the Acts which mentions something concerning the gift of the Holy Ghost. We have in mind the incident at Ephesus where Paul engaged in a remarkable conversation with some disciples he met there. He asked them, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" and received the surprising answer, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when

Paul had laid his hands upon them, *the Holy Ghost came on them*; and they spake with tongues and prophesied" (19, 1-7).

Here again we need not be uncertain in the least as to what the phrase "the Holy Ghost came on them" implied. Everything is clearly stated. These twelve men quite suddenly received the Holy Ghost with a twofold extraordinary result: they spoke with tongues and prophesied. Two charismatic gifts were imparted to these disciples. Moreover, the Lord graciously permitted this to be brought about by the laying on of hands, exactly as in 8, 17.

This passage does, however, contain certain statements which are rather perplexing at first sight and have received various interpretations. Since the questions involved have a bearing on our topic, we cannot very well ignore them.

Just what does Paul mean when he asks, *ei (ob ihr wohl) pneuma hagian elabete pisteusantes* (Did you receive the Holy Spirit when coming to believe?)? Does he wish to have these men understand that one might come to faith in Christ without any aid from the Holy Spirit and without His entering into one's heart? Certainly not, unless we assume that Paul was in error when he assured the Corinthians "that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost," 1 Cor. 12, 3, or that he here employs the word *pisteusantes* in an unusual sense which has no reference to the Savior.

It seems quite apparent that our passage is only a very abbreviated report of what occurred. Luke reports the highlights of the conversation and we agree with Zahn when he says, "Die Belehrungen des Paulus waren schwerlich auf einen Tag beschränkt." Paul has ascertained in the course of the conversation that those people were actually disciples just as it had been reported to him, that they sincerely believed in Jesus, their Savior. As a result of the information he had obtained in this respect he asks the question whether they had received the Holy Ghost when they had come to believe in Christ. Now Paul knew full well that they had come to faith through the Holy Spirit, but at this moment he is interested in hearing if they had also received unusual *charismata* at that time. No other interpretation of *pisteusantes* is possible. With Paul that word has only one connotation, that of faith in Christ. It is therefore a biased and unreliable interpretation when Zahn and others quote the word "disciples" in verse 1 in quotation marks and add

that Paul later re-baptized these men because he realized that he had been mistaken in his original judgment when he had supposed them to be true believers. We stick to the clearly reported facts. These men were believers and Paul's theology forbids us to assume that he could think of a man coming to faith without the gracious working of the Holy Spirit. So his question can have only one meaning. He is inquiring of these Christian disciples whether they had experienced any *extraordinary* manifestation of the Holy Spirit at the time of their conversion.

Was this an odd question under the circumstances? Is it so irrelevant to the entire situation that we are compelled to reject it? Quite to the contrary. To begin with, such manifestations at the time of conversion had occurred rather frequently in that brief period since Pentecost. Peter had recorded his experience with Cornelius to the conference at Jerusalem where Paul was present. It is hardly probable that Peter and John failed to tell Paul of an occurrence like this in Samaria. Moreover, in view of Paul's lengthy discussion of charismatic gifts in 1 Cor. 12 we have every reason to believe that he knew of numerous instances not recorded in Scripture when such gifts were received; for in listing these gifts he describes various types of charismatic manifestations which are not reported in the Acts or in the epistles.

Let us also bear in mind that these manifestations were certainly astounding. Whenever people witnessed such speaking in tongues and such prophesying, they were amazed beyond measure. These gifts of the Spirit must therefore have been an outstanding topic of conversation in Christian gatherings. At each new report of such an occurrence not only the rank and file of Christians but also the apostles themselves were filled with new wonderment and reverential awe over this glorious testimony of the exalted Lord by which He revealed His divine support to the newly founded church which was joyfully proclaiming His name in the face of bitter antagonism.

This is the proper background against which one should proceed to construct the meaning of Paul's words in these verses. Then we can readily understand how Paul in the course of a lengthy conversation with these people regarding the chief issues of Christian faith and life would at some point also inquire whether they, upon coming to faith, had enjoyed this unique experience of

receiving charismatic gifts. Luke's readers of that day would quickly understand and appreciate the drift of this question. No doubt it was a question asked of converts newly won over to the faith by many men and women. In fact, both this and the following fragments of conversation were merely recorded by Luke in the skeletal form as we have it in order that he might properly introduce the great manifestation of two charismatic gifts recorded in verse 6. It is well to bear this in mind also in regard to the other statements in verses 2-5 which have called forth so much debate among commentators. Nothing was farther from Luke's mind than to pose doctrinal enigmas in his historical portrayal of early church life.

Someone might ask why Paul should exhibit such a marked interest in the occurrence of the charismatic gift. The questioner might harbor the thought that a man of such lofty spiritual ideals as those exhibited by Paul would not ask such a question merely for curiosity's sake. To allay these misgivings, we would answer that there was indeed another reason why Paul asked these men whether they had received charismatic gifts. He recognized in these gifts an important factor in that critical period when the tender infant church had just come into being. This is a matter closely related to our topic, for we shall want to know why these miraculous gifts of the Spirit put into appearance during the apostolic age and why they were restricted entirely to this period.

This appended investigation involves the study of 1 Corinthians 12. The entire chapter constitutes an evaluation of charismatic gifts. The first thing Paul emphasizes is that the Corinthians are to recognize the importance of the Holy Spirit. All these gifts come from Him. Not only does He bring to human hearts the blessed knowledge that Jesus is the Savior (v. 3), but it is He also who lavishly poured upon the church a wealth of miraculous powers. Notice the repetition of the phrase, "by the same Spirit," and the words in verse 11, "But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit." Hence it becomes evident that one important purpose of these charismatic gifts was *to stress the third person in the Godhead* and His indispensable powers in the life of the church. Beginning with Pentecost, God continued to impress upon His people that His holy child Jesus was now bringing about the founding of His church through the divine Spirit

Himself, even as Christ had so often promised. Every speaking in tongues, every voice of prophecy, every miracle of healing was like a voice from heaven assuring both the believers and their fanatical persecutors that this was not the work of men, but of God, yea, that this was the fulfilment of the promise given to Israel of old, "It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men dream dreams, and on my servant, and on my handmaidens I will pour out, in those days, of my Spirit." Little wonder therefore that the apostles laid on their hands and prayed for repeated manifestations of these gifts; yes, little wonder that Paul should ask those men at Ephesus whether they had received the Spirit. These charismatic gifts were the heaven-sent signs of the times that the Spirit of God had come unto men in power and glory, to found and raise up for the blessed Son of God a believing throng which was to be known as the very body of Christ.

But there is one other clear reason given in this chapter for the manifestation of these charismatic gifts at this particular time. Paul carries out a magnificent comparison between the members of Christ's body in the new church and the members of a human body. He points out how in each case the body is one, though composed of many members with many diverse functions, and that in each case their individual gifts received by the members must serve the body as a whole. "There should be no schism in the body," Paul says (v. 25), "but the members should have the same care one for another."

It was vitally *important for the growth of the young church* that there be a peaceful, uninterrupted amalgamation of the heterogeneous groups and individuals who were so suddenly now brought together into close fellowship by the divine stimulus of the Gospel call. Perhaps we have never given much thought to the difficulties and the adverse criticism which the church faced in the dawn of its history because of this motley influx swiftly converging upon it from all sides. What God at that time proposed to do and did carry out would have seemed an insuperable task to any man, endowed though he might have been with rarest administrative and executive skill. For the Lord proposed to establish a new religious communion, a powerful religious body,

with a membership composed of utterly dissimilar racial elements in the very heart of a nation which had because of its century-old training vigorously and fanatically refused entrance to any religion which appeared to be foreign to the teachings of Moses and the prophets, a nation which looked down with haughty scorn upon every other race and tribe on God's earth. And let us not forget in addition that God planned to effect this creation through a message which on the face of it could not help but appear as utter foolishness to both Jews and Gentiles. Nevertheless the Lord undertook to found a new church in the very heart of this segregated nation, to found the church upon the name of the most despised, most hated, and most brutally persecuted Jewish citizen of all times. Moreover, what must have seemed equally insulting and challenging to this extremely clannish nation, God from the start called into the membership of this church founded in the Holy City an astonishing mixture of purest Jewish elements and of every sort of Gentile peoples. The very inception of this body within a body at Pentecost must have rocked the foundation of the totally unprepared Jerusalem society. Within an hour or two the Holy Spirit had fused into a compact body 3,000 men and women, citizens of Jerusalem, Parthians, Medes, folks from Mesopotamia, from Judaea, from Asia Minor, from the shores of Africa, from Mediterranean islands and from the vast expanse of the Arabian desert. And that was merely a beginning. After all, these people were all Jews or Jewish proselytes. But within a short time there were incorporated in this body hundreds, yea thousands of Gentiles, the hated and despised Samaritans, the household of a Roman centurion, and that ever increasing throng of Greeks won over to the new faith by Paul throughout Asia Minor and Greece, together with the contingent of Gentiles in Rome, the capitol of the world. Verily, this New Testament church of Christ in its early decades presents to the student of history a miracle wrought by the hand of God, a miracle of such magnitude that human mind is utterly incompetent to fathom it.

How was it possible for such an organization to function harmoniously and effectively? How could Jews and Gentiles, brought together without any previous psychological propaganda, *suddenly* become as one, rejoice together in the oneness of spirit,

and remain inseparable under the pressure of persecution and martyrdom? True, we witness the same unity in the church throughout the centuries and do still experience it this very day. Ever since that initial formative period this unity has been successfully maintained *through the preaching of the Word*. Yes, the communion of saints will continue to be maintained thus to the end of time.

But in this twelfth chapter Paul points out that the Lord provided *a further temporary yet extremely miraculous means* of fusing the heterogeneous elements into so firm a foundation, that all the powers of evil unleashed against it were unable to destroy it. These means were the charismatic gifts of the Holy Ghost. Whenever and wherever they appeared, Christians of every race and nation were assured thereby that they were indeed being guided and governed and comforted and kept safely in the faith by the *perceptible* presence of God's Holy Spirit. Paul stresses the fact that Christ's people are *one* body. That was the vital issue next to the salvation of the individual. All those that call on the name of the Lord must be one; nothing dare disturb this spiritual unity, for on it depended the continued existence, the entire future, of the church. Let them think of this and be reminded of it whenever the Spirit graciously revealed His presence by means of charismatic gifts.

The apostle sums all of this up in v. 11-13: "But all these (gifts) worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by *one* Spirit are we all baptized into *one* body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into *one* Spirit" (Goodspeed: "and we have all been saturated with one Spirit"). In other words, Paul wants to say the church is enjoying a pouring out of many miraculous gifts. Let the Christians beware of misusing and misunderstanding the purpose of these gifts. They are to be the visible signs that the church is filled with the Spirit of God and that all are to remain one body through this selfsame Spirit.

In view of all this it should therefore be quite clear to anyone, first why these gifts were so necessary in the apostolic church,

secondly why the need for them disappeared entirely as the church grew and became established, and thirdly why the apostle had excellent reason to ask the twelve disciples at Ephesus whether they had received charismatic gifts of the Spirit when they came to faith. Finally also we can readily understand now that Luke reports what he does about the further remarks of Paul in chapter 19 of Acts in order to lead up to that part of the story which to him was the climax, — that when Paul laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied.

In conclusion it might not be out of place to summarize briefly what we have discovered in the Acts concerning the gift of the Holy Ghost. First we noted that this phrase actually occurs only twice in the book. Its meaning in the Pentecost story is that bestowal of the Holy Spirit by which every child of God has been blest from the beginning of time to this day and hour, whereas its meaning in the story of Peter and Cornelius is far, far different, since Luke there clearly uses the phrase to describe miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit, so-called charismatic gifts, restricted entirely to the apostolic period.

Thereupon we systematically examined every passage in the book (with the exception of some brief references to our topic in chapter twenty-one) which speak of the various gracious and beneficent manifestations of the Holy Ghost and found again that these referred either to the activities of the Spirit which Luther lists in the third Article or to charismatic gifts limited to the first Christian church. We list this latter group:

- 2, 4: "They were filled with the Holy Ghost" — a charism.
- 4, 31: "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost" — not a charism.
- 8, 17: "They received the Holy Ghost," v. 20: "the gift of God" — a charism.
- 9, 17: "That thou mightest be filled with the Holy Ghost" — no charism.
- 13, 9: "Saul, filled with the Holy Ghost" — a charism.
- 13, 52: "The disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost" — no charism.
- 19, 6: "The Holy Ghost came on them" — a charism.

In connection with the study of chapter nineteen we made an

excursion into 1 Cor. 12 in order to determine the purpose and the importance of charismatic gifts.

A. SCHALLER.

The Natural Knowledge of God in the Light of the Law and the Gospel

Essay Delivered at the 72nd Convention of the Michigan District of
the Ev. Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States in
Wayne, Michigan, June 12 to 16, 1944.

P. PETERS.

In times of great upheavals and disorders, when the foundations of society are crumbling and when individuals and nations have lost sense of security, men seek to establish a new world order. The old has lost its values, the new, to which are attached the fondest hopes for the future, is to be replete with new values. In such times of transition from the old to the new men do not only grope for new values, but endeavor to bring all the moral forces into play, which they may call their own. Knowledge of God, piety, morality are the pillars which are to support this new world order. "Our crisis is essentially moral and spiritual in nature," we are told, "and can therefore be overcome only by the development of non-economic values" (*The Union Review*, May 1944, p. 21). Therefore a more mature morality, a more god-fearing piety, a better knowledge of God is the goal which men have set themselves. Religion and morality are not to be put aside or reduced to mere segments of life anymore. On the contrary, religion and morality are being pointed out by the political and religious leaders of our times as the very essentials of human society. "Only a society which is striving after ethical ends," we read in "What is a Mature Morality," "can realize the blessings of material progress and eliminate the dangers which are likely to accompany such changes . . . If men can be found who revolt against the spirit of thoughtlessness, and who are personalities sound enough to let the ideals of ethical progress radiate from them as a force, there will start an activity of the spirit which will be strong enough to evoke a new mental and spiritual disposition to mankind" (p. 17).

The Christian Church cannot remain indifferent to this turn of events, if for no other reason than that we want to be fully

conscious of it in our preaching of the Law and the Gospel. We of course do well to realize that since the Fall the world has never been set aright by man. Throughout the various periods of world history, which have outlived an old order of things and have ushered in a new one, a final solution to all the difficulties which beset human society has never been found. Impressive are the pleas for an enduring peace, as we find them made by men in the various periods of history. In a Canaanite epic of the 14th century B. C., to cite one of many, we find the following heart-rending appeal to the deity: "Remove war from the earth. Do away with passion! Pour out peace over the earth, loving consideration over the fields!" Certainly this plea of old is also the plea of modern times both as to its contents and as to its fervor. And there have always been great leaders, "Heroen," as Luther and Melanchthon liked to call them, who sought to redress the ills of their times and to hold up the hope of a better future. Thus the old Babylonian king Hammurabi, who was very self-conscious of his having been called by the deity and who professed to honor the gods, designates as the purpose of his great code of laws: "To bring justice to prevail in the land, to destroy the wicked and the evil, that the strong may not injure the weak . . . to enlighten the land and to further the welfare of men" (Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 399). And now follows a whole series of laws whereby Hammurabi claims to have provided a dwelling place of peace and righteousness for the people of the land. Looking to the future he says: "In the days that are to come, forever and ever, the king who is in the land shall attend unto the words of righteousness which I have written upon my monument. The law of the land which I have given, the decisions which I have pronounced, he shall not alter nor efface my image. If that man have wisdom, if he wish to keep his land in order, he shall take heed to the words, which I have written upon my monument" (*ibid.* 460/1).

Yet people living under Hammurabi's rule and that of other great rulers had to learn that peace is not of an enduring nature and that it is followed in quick succession by wars and chaos. Nevertheless we know from Scriptures that God is preserving this world so that the Gospel of Jesus Christ can be preached unto all nations until to the end of days. We also know that God

after the Flood has given mankind through Noah definite laws for the preservation of this world till to the day of judgment. Therefore the Church of God must ever be conscious of the means that God applies to preserve His creation despite the ravages of sin. That the natural knowledge of God which man still possesses, even if only in a limited manner, plays an essential part in the order of things, no one will deny. In order to gain an always better understanding of that which natural man can call his own on the strength of his natural knowledge of God and an always sounder judgment of that which man is able to do and not to do in times of disorder, we'll do well to place the natural knowledge of God into the light of both the Law and the Gospel as revealed to us in the Scriptures.

The Natural Knowledge of God in the Light of the Law and the Gospel. In the first part of this paper we intend to show the nature of the natural knowledge of God and the use which natural man does not make of this his knowledge because of his corrupt state. In the second part we hope to show the use to which natural man puts his natural knowledge of God and conclude the whole by describing the nature of the spiritual knowledge of the Gospel in order to differentiate between both the natural and the spiritual, *i. e.*, the saving knowledge of God.

I

Has natural man any knowledge of God at all? Must we not from the very outset speak of him as being without knowledge of God? Does not the Psalmist say of the heathen that they "have not known God and that they have not called upon his name" (Ps. 79. 6), that "the nations have not known his judgments" (147, 20)? As to the New Testament — does not the Apostle Paul refer to the "Gentiles in the flesh" as having no hope, and as being without God in the world (Eph. 2, 12)? Certainly the Gentiles had many gods, many idols, but we hasten to add with the Apostle, "we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one" (1 Cor. 8, 4). Why then speak at all of the natural knowledge of God on the part of natural man? Because the Bible on the other hand testifies to the fact that natural man is not without a knowledge of God.

Romans 1 and 2 and Acts 14 and 17 are the passages of Scriptures which deal especially with the natural knowledge of

God. Romans 1, 18–21 we read: “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imagination, and their foolish heart was darkened.” This passage teaches three distinct facts concerning the natural knowledge of God: 1. that natural man has a knowledge of God, 2. that there are certain means whereby he gains this knowledge, and 3. that the knowledge, which man gains by such means, embodies definite facts concerning God and His Law.

Romans 1, 18ff teaches us first of all that natural man actually has a knowledge of God. Verse 19 tells us of that “which may be known of God” or that “which is known of God” on the part of every man. Verse 20 speaks to us of the invisible things, namely God’s power and Godhead being “clearly seen” and being “understood,” *i. e.*, perceived by every man. Finally verse 21 assures us with so many words that men “knew God,” literally “men having known God.” These three sentences in Romans 1 teach us clearly that man is not without a knowledge of God, that he *has* such a knowledge. The Apostle speaks of this knowledge of God as something which man has, which he will continue to have till to the end of time. He does not want to inform us of that which man had before the Fall, but of that which he had and which he has since the Fall and of that which he will retain and always have till to the end of days despite his ungodliness and corruption. But how is it possible that corrupt and sinful man can have a knowledge, if only a limited knowledge, of God? What are the means whereby he gains this knowledge?

According to Roman 1 God is constantly revealing Himself to man by means of “the things that are made,” *i. e.*, by His creative works. First of all it is God who is revealing or showing to man “that which may be known of God.” The knowledge, which natural man gains of God proceeds from God Himself, is manifested by God to man and as a result is manifest in man (V. 19).

When speaking of the natural knowledge of God we are not to think of a knowledge which man gains without a revelation or manifestation of God, but of a knowledge which he obtains by means issuing from God as Creator of Heaven and Earth. In other words it is a God-given knowledge which natural man has and as such a revealed knowledge.

The Apostle in speaking of creation as the means whereby God manifests and reveals Himself is not referring to the Creation of God before the Fall of man, but to the Creation after the Fall and after the Flood. But can the creation after the Fall under the curse of God and the ravages of sin, still be a means of revelation? It can because God did not and does not cease to create and thereby to preserve His Creation. Creation after the Flood can be designated as the New World Order with its Noachian commandments. According to the Covenant of Forbearance, which God made with Noah for the benefit of all His creatures, the World is to be preserved from destruction by means of very definite institutions and ordinances, defined in German as "Schöpfungsordnungen," still better as "Erhaltungsordnungen." The Old Testament speaks of these ordinances in a few instances. Referring to the whole earth Isaiah says in chapter 24 verse 5: "The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws (*i. e.*, both the law written in their hearts and the law of positive commands), changed the ordinance (*i. e.*, violated the Divine ordinances), broken the everlasting covenant (undoubtedly an allusion to the covenant made with Noah)." Jeremiah is still more specific in speaking of the ordinances of the Noachian covenant by referring to the "covenant of the day" and the "covenant of the night" and "the ordinances of heaven and earth," which God has appointed (Jerm. 33, 20, 25). The ordinances of heaven are for instance the courses and the marvellous motions of the stars, the ordinances of earth the seasons, while ordinances which God has established for the preservation of mankind are the ordinances of matrimony, the family, the ordinance of national existence, the nations, and the ordinance of government, the state, based on the decree of God: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man" (Gen. 9, 6), and pointed out by the Apostle as an ordinance of God: "The powers that

be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13, 1). In other words God's creation is not a disorderly sum total of creative works, but is a "cosmos," which ever reveals to man that "God is not the author of confusion" (1 Cor. 14, 33), but that He has appointed ordinances and has laid down the principles of a perfect world-order, whereby all of His creatures, animate and inanimate, rational and irrational are to be guided. As such these ordinances are a constant reminder to man concerning the will of God. Men placed into this order of things and having their respective stations in them cannot lay claim to an autonomous independence, but must become and remain conscious of their dependence on God and on His world-order. For all the blessings that God bestows upon individuals and nations are received in and through these ordinances. In other words that which we call history is the course and order of events in the life of nations under the guidance and direction of Him, who is the ruler of all men. Behind all history stand the creative words of the Creator: "Let there be." God, who creates continuously "separated the sons of Adam" (Dt. 32, 8) and "made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation" (Acts 17, 26). God therefore not only brought Israel out of Egypt, but He also brought the Philistines from Caphtor, the Syrians from Kir (Amos 9, 7). All these events in the life of nations have a purpose. For the corner-stone of history is the doctrine of the covenant relationship of man, which God made with Noah and of which Isaiah speaks in his twenty-fourth chapter. Thus the Bible teaches us that it is God who exalteth a nation, and it is God who visits the nations with His judgments. Men have a faint knowledge of these facts, which the Bible reveals so clearly, and therefore make themselves guilty by transgressing this everlasting covenant. "Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht."

Finally we can say that man, created according to the image of God, is a world in miniature, a microcosm. Therefore Greek poets, whom the Apostle cites, have said: "For we are also his offspring" (Acts 17, 28). Although the Fall of man brought with it the loss of the divine image, and the entire corruption of the whole human nature, still some fragments and vestiges of the divine image remain, so that heathen philosophers can speak of

man as on offspring or of his form as divine or of his soul as one of the main sources of our knowledge of God. Therefore the Apostle wants to tell the Athenians with words of their own philosophers that man "is an eminent specimen of the power, goodness, and wisdom of God, and contains in him wonders enough to occupy the attention of our minds, if we were not indisposed to such a study" (Calvin, *Institutes*, p. 65).

The visible world in the form of the Noachian world-order is however not the only means whereby God reveals Himself to man. His law is no less a manifestation of His Divinity. Note well, the Bible does not speak of the law of nature. It, however, tells us of the law of God. We read Romans 2, 14-15: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." God indeed has manifested Himself "in the most effectual manner conceivable, when in the very act of creation He inscribed His law in the heart of man" (*Concordia Cyclopaedia*, p. 412). Here indeed is a writing and script more deeply engraved than any writing on stone- and clay-tablets and on parchment. Although the writing of this law has been partially obliterated in the heart of man, it can nevertheless still be read by man, so that men know the judgment of God (Rom. 1, 32). This law can well be designated as a "Jus Gentium," a universal law, which places men under standards of right and wrong which all men know to be right and just. Certain Greek philosophers were wrong in claiming that traditional morality was merely "conventional," while others were right in appealing to a higher law that still holds good when human conventions break down. This higher law is none other but the law of God which the Apostle Paul as a sacred and inspired writer sets forth so forcibly.

Of course man's mind has to be able to perceive and to understand that which God reveals of His power and Godhead and of His law, if these should be of any service to him. But man's mind is able to do just that. Man has both sense perception as well as mental perception to perceive the manifestations of God. And it is the senses, the reason and the conscience of man to which the

manifestations of God address themselves and not without results. Man's mind is able to perceive and to understand that which God as Creator and Lawgiver reveals. His senses have been compared with so many loopholes of the mind, by which it looks out upon truth and sees what is revealed. Thus the mind surveys the domain of truth and gains materials of knowledge. Having seen and perceived the things of God the mind of man is also capable of reflecting on the made things and of giving sober and serious thought on these things. The philosophical and religious literature of all nations testify to this. Yet the act of reflecting on the seen things is not only an intellectual, not only a moral act on the part of man, but is above all of a religious nature. Man's conscience is and remains conscious of God as of that God who reveals Himself by the inward law written into the heart of man. Before the tribunal of man's conscience, of which God is the judge, conscience is a thousand witnesses testifying to the law as a divine norm, a norm of right and wrong, and with its thousand voices, the reasonings of the heart, it either accuses or defends our actions. Therefore man cannot perceive and reflect on the works of God in the creation of the world nor on the works of the law as they are written in his heart without a response of his conscience ever making him conscious of God and His law.

Having shown the means whereby man gains a knowledge of God we can now speak of the nature of the knowledge itself, wherein it consists. In Romans 1 the Apostle simply states that natural man has an understanding of God's "power and God-head," *i. e.*, Divinity (V. 20). The Apostle does not say with so many words that man believes in the existence of God, let alone that the Apostle tries to prove the existence of God. The Bible nowhere endeavors to prove the existence of God. The Bible proclaims the existence of God. Even concerning one who has a dead faith James says: "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; the devils also believe and tremble" (2, 19). In other words: Thou believest that One is God! How can you do otherwise? "For any human being in existence to think," says Cicero, "that there is nothing in the whole world superior to himself would be an insane piece of arrogance . . . therefore God does exist . . . Hence the main issue is agreed among all men of all nations, inasmuch as all have engraved in their minds an

innate belief that the gods exist" (*De Natura Deorum*, p. 135).* "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God" (Ps. 14, 1). The Apostle Paul therefore loses no time in endeavoring to prove the existence of God, not even to emphasize the existence of God, but leaps at once, in his convictions and his argument, from the creation to an eternal power and Godhead. But let us not overlook that the eternal power implies eternal existence, *i. e.*, uncreated, absolute existence.

Man, however, has not only a knowledge of God's existence, *i. e.*, of His theotēs, but also a knowledge of the theiotēs of God, *i. e.*, of the Divinity of God. God's Divinity is a summary term for the divine nature of God and all the attributes of God which constitute divinity. Man knows that God is more than human, that He is divine. And being divine he also knows that God is not like unto gold, or silver, or stone or like unto any device of man's art and imagination, but that God in His infinite majesty and glory transcends all human power of conception. Although the Athenians had erected golden and silver images in their temples, nevertheless the Apostle reproves them for doing this very thing, since they had every reason to know that God because of His Divinity cannot be compared with created things, let alone with the devices of man. Man knows this, although man does not live up to this his knowledge of God. Testimonies to this knowledge of God can readily be found in the religious literature of the past. Cicero tells us that man's intelligence must lead us to infer the existence of a mind in the universe, and that a mind of surpassing ability, and in fact divine" (*ibid.*, p. 141). And a most forceful illustration of man's knowledge of the incomparableness of God in comparison with the created things we find in the Mexican story cited by the *Theological Quarterly* (1906, 85) concerning the relationship of the Sun and of God to one another as the created thing and the Creator ending up in this conviction. "There must be some God, invisible and unknown, who is the universal Creator." Into His hands the Germanic lawgiver, Thorkel, commended his soul, when he was carried in his dying hour into the sunshine declaring that he did

* All quotations from Cicero in this essay, unless otherwise designated, are taken from his *De Natura Deorum* in the Loeb Classical Library edition.

not want to have any other faith than that of his father, Thorstein, who had believed in Him, who had created the sun and who rules over all things (Walter Baetke, *Die Religion der Germanen in Quellenzeugnissen*, Seite 52).

Men having a knowledge of the Divinity of God also have a knowledge of the attributes of God. The Apostle in Romans 1 mentions the power of God. In the second chapter of his Epistle to the Romans he lists goodness and forbearance and longsuffering (V. 4). In speaking of the wrath of God in verse 18 of chapter one he reminds us of the punitive justice of God and tells us that it is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men as it is realized in God's righteous judgments on nations and individuals and as it is a reality today in this great world-conflict. Men of today are becoming aware of the wrath of God despite all denials of it. Even those men, Paul says, whom God has given over to a reprobate mind, to do things not fitting, know the judgment of God that they who do such things are worthy of death (Rom. 1, 32). Because of this knowledge of the punitive justice of God man cannot strengthen himself in the iniquity of his life (Ezek. 7, 13). All his days are passed away in God's wrath and he is consumed and troubled by his anger (Ps. 90, 7. 9). If man knows anything, he knows of the wrath of God, living in constant fear of death (Hebr. 2, 15). Certain Greek philosophers wanted it understood that anger and favor alike are excluded from the nature of a being at once blessed and immortal, *i. e.*, from the nature of God, and that all fear of the divine power or divine anger should be banished. In their endeavor to eliminate from the minds of men their inherited fear of the gods and their dread of death, they made it quite evident that a man is beset by just such fear, and that this fear is a part of the traditional religious notions of all peoples. The Babylonian worshipper in his lament was nearer to the truth presented to us in Romans 1 than the Greek philosophers: "Sickness, headache, ruin and destruction are come upon me. Miseries, turning away of countenance, and fulness of anger are my lot. Indignation, wrath, anger of gods and men . . . Days of affliction. months of sorrow, years of misfortune . . . judgment of disorder and violence, death and misery make an end of me . . . over my house, my gate, and my fields is affliction poured forth. As

for my god, his face is turned elsewhere" (Rogers, C. P. O. T., 158).

But why does man look upon affliction and sorrow, disorder and violence, death and misery as tokens of the wrath and retribution of God? Why does he not define all these things as part of a gradual development in the realm of nature, things which may be overcome in time and be mastered with the help of science and an increased knowledge of the laws of nature? Simply because of the conscience of man, let us add the guilty conscience of man. This conscience calling forth thoughts that accuse and excuse one another gives man no way of escape from the wrath of God, "es macht ihm die Welt zu enge," truly, "das böse Gewissen macht ihm wohl tausend Welten zu enge" says Luther (St. L. III, 18; *Quartalschrift* 18, 173f.). We need not think that man will ever be without a knowledge of the wrath of God or that he will in time be able to meet the judgments of God with equanimity. Even when not exposed to trying visitations, men are not without fear. They are in fear, where there is no cause for fear (Ps 53, 5) — because of their bad conscience. "O conscience! into what abyss of fears and horrors hast thou driven me; out of which I find no way, from deep to deeper plunged!" Man's knowledge of God is a knowledge of the wrath of God.

But man's knowledge of God is also a knowledge of the "riches of his goodness" (Rom. 2, 4), consisting of the manifold gifts with God bestows upon mankind. Men are daily witnesses of the fact that God is not leaving himself without a witness constantly "working good," giving us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts 14, 17). Men are not only the recipients day in and day out of the gifts of God but are experiencing daily God's divine presence. The Apostle tells the Athenians that "God is not far from every one of us" (*ibid.* 17, 27). Daily "he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things" (*ibid.* 25). Consequently men must confess, as some of the poets among the Greeks did confess, that "in him we live, and move, and have our being" (*ibid.* 28). And a Roman philosopher said: "God's near you, with you, in you. Within us holy spirit has its seat, our watch and guardian in evil and in good" (Seneca, "*The God in Us*"). Romans and Greeks alike confessed God as the fountain and source of all good things, whereby our natural

life is being upheld and preserved. Therefore they knew how to laud divine beneficence and divine benevolence. They designated it as "the most essential element of supreme goodness and excellence." "Make out god to be devoid of either," says Cicero, "and you make him devoid of all love, affection or esteem for any other being, human or divine" (p. 117). Indeed how can man despise the riches of God's goodness and forbearance and longsuffering? Does he not know that the goodness of God leadeth to repentance (Rom. 2, 4)?

Man however has not only a knowledge of creation as such, but also of the law of God and of the works of the law written in his heart (Rom. 2, 15). It is the conscience of man which keeps him posted on the will of God. Conscience is a special function of the soul reacting continuously to the inward law and as such a sense-organ for the precepts of this law. (Comp. Reu-Buehring, *Christian Ethics*, pp. 72ff.). While we must speak of a bad, a sluggish, an erring conscience of man after the Fall, nevertheless conscience remains conscious of God as of that God who reveals Himself in His inward law and who demands a life of holiness on the part of man. Our conscience testifies both to the fact that God is holy and that God demands holiness of us. Consequently man has a knowledge of God's holiness and of the things of the law. Not only that he has a knowledge of "the things" and "the works" of the law, not only that he has a conscience towards God and men (Acts 24, 16), man by nature performs things of the law. There is still a moral response left in the heart of man. He is still able to do works of civic righteousness, which outwardly are in conformity with God's holy law. We read in our Confessions: "Nor indeed, do we deny liberty to the human will. The human will has liberty on the choice of works and of things which reason comprehends by itself. It can to a certain extent render civil righteousness or the righteousness of works; it can speak of God, offer to God a certain service by an outward work, obey magistrates, parents; in the choice of an outward work it can restrain the hands from murder, from adultery, from theft. Since there is left in human nature reason and judgment concerning objects subjected to the senses, choice between these things, and the liberty and power to render civil righteousness, are also left. For Scripture calls this the right-

eousness of the flesh which the carnal nature, *i. e.*, reason, renders by itself, without the Holy Ghost" (Trigl. 355).

Heathen philosophers are well aware of the laws which God has impressed upon the hearts of men. The Greek poet Sophocles well says of them: "Laws that walk on high, begot and bred in upper air, whose only sire is Heaven; Nor did the race of mortals give them birth, Nor will oblivion ever cause them sleep" (*Pulpit Commentary*, Isaiah, p. 384). Plato repeats an old tradition in regard to God that "Justice always follows Him, and is the punisher of those who fall short of the divine law" (*Works of Plato*, Jowett, p. 420). Cicero says concerning the conscience that one could "lend authority to sin . . . were not an innocent or guilty conscience so powerful a force in itself, without the assumption of any divine design" (p. 371). And when he tells us that virtue may be realized in man (p. 159), we may well remind ourselves of the fact that conscience does not only make accusations according to Romans 2, 15, but at times it also makes defense and considers certain acts of man right and declares them right no matter what others may say to the contrary. All this conscience does, however, in connection with a day when God will judge the secrets of men. Whether man's conscience accuses or defends, it does it "in inner and vital connection with a day to come . . . when nothing can be hid." The pagan knows of a higher court than the one which has been established in his heart. He knows of "the higher court of God with its judgment on a day to come." In this last judgment "the heart," as the Egyptians pictured it, "was put in one scale of the balance and a feather, the symbol of truth, in the other. If his heart was lighter than the feather the truth was not in him" (*Procession of the Gods*, Atkins, p. 60).

Whatever might be added to that which natural man knows of God and His law, it would serve no definite purpose if we were not able to evaluate the knowledge of God, which natural man has. We can evaluate it however by holding it up in the light of the revealed Law. Doing this, how are we to evaluate the natural knowledge of God? Does it belong under the category of that which is true or of that which is false? Offhand we are inclined to define the knowledge which natural man has of god and of the Unseen as false, as something contrary to truth. Was not the

heathen judge, Pilate, justified in saying: What is truth? Heathen walking in darkness certainly know not the truth. They despair of knowing the truth. Yet here we have Romans 1 telling us directly that the natural knowledge of God, which men have, is "the truth" (1, 18). Professor Stöckhardt in his Commentary interprets Romans 1, 18 thus: "Die Menschen besitzen die Wahrheit. Die Wahrheit enthält auch die Norm für das richtige Verhalten der Menschen. Und die Wahrheit dringt in sie ein, drängt und nötigt sie zu einem Gott gemässen Verhalten" (p. 51). We also find the word "the truth" used by the Apostle in Verse 25 of our chapter. Again he speaks of it as something with which natural man has certain dealings, using it for no good, yea for a very ungodly purpose, but thereby proving that he has it and that he contacts it continually. Added to this "the truth" is not only mentioned in contrast to unrighteousness, but to lie, *i. e.*, to an idol. Therefore Professor Stöckhardt is again justified in designating "the truth of God" in verse 25 as "God Himself, the true God," as "die Wahrheit, die Gott selber ist, der wahre Gott" (p. 61), of whom 1 Thessalonians 1 and Acts 17 speak as the living and true God over against the idols, whom the heathen worship.

In other words, Pontius Pilate is lying when simply denying *all* knowledge of truth. And we are not justified in speaking of natural man as being without any knowledge of "the truth." That he is without the knowledge of the Triune God, without the knowledge of the saving truth of the Gospel, the Bible teaches so clearly that only a gainsayer of the Scripture truth can deny it. But the fact that natural man is without this saving knowledge of God does not permit us to conclude that he is without any knowledge of God and His law at all. He is not without this knowledge because of God's revelation and because of his own conscience. What man's attitude toward this his knowledge is, what he does with it, that is an altogether different question, which we must answer later. In this connection we only want to seek an answer to the question: What is it that natural man does not know concerning the law of God?

He does not know that the law is spiritual and that he is carnal, sold under sin. Man does not know that the law belongs to the divine sphere of things and that it is expressive of the divine

order. Both the moral law in the bosom of man and the revelation of this law in the Decalogue is, as Augustine has expressed it, a revelation of the higher order of things founded in the being of God. To have a knowledge of this law we must have a knowledge of the Divine nature of God Himself. God is a Spirit and the law, as coming from God's Spirit, is spiritual. And in addressing itself to man, it requires of man to be spiritual and thereby also tells us that it can only be fulfilled by one, who is spiritual. Yet man is carnal, fleshy, and therefore, not only unable to fulfill the law, but also unable to have a final knowledge of the law.

In this connection we undoubtedly will recall that the Apostle in Romans 1, 20 teaches that God's power and Divinity are clearly seen and understood by the things that are made, so that man is without excuse. God's Godhead or Divinity, however, is God's nature. Are we not contradicting Scriptures by asserting that natural man has no knowledge of God's nature and also not of the nature of God's law? And if we are not contradicting the Scriptures, what then does it mean that natural man does not know of the spirituality of the law.

Let us note that the Scriptures themselves on the one hand tell us that man has a knowledge of God, *i. e.*, of the true God, and then again they tell us that the Gentiles know not God (1 Thess. 4, 5; Gal. 4, 3). Again the Scriptures tell us that the Gentiles "do by nature the things contained in the law" and then again they clearly state that "the carnal mind . . . is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be" (Rom. 8, 7). How are we to understand these passages that apparently contradict each other? What does it mean that the Gentiles know not God, that there is none that seeketh after God, none that doeth good, no, not one (Rom. 3, 11.12)? Let us not evade the issue by simply stating that the Gentiles know not the God of the Gospel and that they are without the regeneration and the sanctification of the Gospel. This is only too true and represents the final analysis, but should not yet be used here. We would be ignoring and evading a difficulty which we have when studying the above cited Scripture passages. The difficulty under which we are laboring is that the Scriptures affirm and deny a knowledge of the true God as regards one and the same group of persons and they affirm and deny the doing of the law again as regards one and the same group of persons. How is this possible?

Although God reveals Himself to all men in His works and in His law and although men actually have an organ of perception, their reason, their conscience, corresponding to God and His law, yet men do not like to retain God in their knowledge, they glorify Him not as God, neither are thankful (Rom. 1, 28. 21). Although God is objectively knowable to men, yet men never allow this knowledge to get at them, it never comes to an internal comprehension of God and His law. Men being carnally minded will not permit this knowledge to give its inner assent to the self-revelation of God. Men do not approve of God, they refuse to have Him in realization. Their mind throws out God. They reprobate Him (Lenski, Romans, p. 120). In other words, we cannot speak of a knowledge that man has without speaking of the will of man. Only if man wills to do God's will as revealed in the law, shall we know that it is of God and that it is spiritual. But natural man does not want to do God's will. Man is the *homo incurvatus*, *der in sich gekrümmte Mensch*, the selfwilled individual, slidden back by a perpetual backsliding, turned to his course, knowing not the judgment of God (Jer. 8, 5ff.). The fact that every imagination of the thoughts of men's heart is evil continually explains to us why man, knowing God, still does not know God, why the world by wisdom, *i. e.*, by its knowledge of God, knew not God (1 Cor. 1, 21).

Because man does not want to know God and His law, he has no knowledge of the only good and spiritual works of the law. Those works of the law, of which he has a knowledge and which he performs, are merely outward, legal actions of civic righteousness, are the external precepts of the second table of the Law, while the internal precepts of the first table, fear, love and trust in God above all things, are unknown to natural man. Consequently man is without a true and spiritual knowledge of the law.

Man not knowing the internal precepts of the law also does not know the true nature of sin. Now natural man is not without a knowledge of sin. His conscience only too often reproves him of a misdeed. Therefore Cicero could confess: "There is no conceivable evil that does not beset me, yet all are lighter than the pains of sin, for that, besides being the highest, is eternal" (*The Preacher's Homilet. Commentary, Romans, p. 222*). While he is thus able to speak of the pain of sin, and of this pain as the

highest, yea as the eternal evil, still he is without a true knowledge of sin. For his sluggish conscience can only tell him that his actions are evil, but it cannot tell him that his person is bad. The Greeks — and they are representative of mankind — admitted a deficiency of knowledge, but never a deficiency of good will. They would not admit that “the individual will, as such, is corrupted and depraved. The person is not bad, the actions are bad” and as such are only an error of judgment (Kroner, *The Primacy of Faith*, p. 83).

In other words natural knowledge of God does not include a knowledge of original sin. The wise and the prudent, the scribe and the disputer of this world throughout the ages have claimed that man by nature has a “right reason and a good will.” Not only heathen philosophers have made this claim, but also philosophers and theologians within the pale of the Christian Church have become champions of a “right reason and a good will” in natural man. Over against the claim of the Scholastics that Moses had not taught that man’s nature is corrupt, but only inclined to do evil, Luther asserted: “Moses does not speak of adultery and other sins as being evil, but does speak of the imagination of man’s heart as being evil . . . This is called original or capital sin . . . This hereditary sin is so deep a corruption of nature, that no reason can understand it, but it must be believed from the revelation of Scriptures, Ps. 51, 5; Rom. 5, 12sq.; Ex. 33, 3; Gen. 3, 7sq.” (*A Compend of Luther’s Theology*, edited by Hugh Thomson Kerr, p. 84).

Man, who is without a spiritual knowledge of God’s Law, is also without an inner comprehension of the riches of God’s goodness and forbearance and longsuffering. Therefore man does not know that the goodness of God is trying to lead him to repentance (Rom. 2, 4), *i. e.*, to a spiritual change. The goodness of God, of which the Apostle speaks in Romans 2, 4 is not to be regarded as a means of grace, able to produce real saving repentance” (Lenski, Romans 141). The Apostle is not speaking here of the gracious influence of the Gospel, but of the moral tendencies of providential dispensation (Hodge, Romans), of the forbearance of God with which he delays His punishment of sin. Yet this very patience of God gives men ground to hope for exceptions. Still they remain without the knowledge and understanding of the

true nature and design of this goodness of God and even abuse it because of their hardness and impenitent heart by presuming upon all the abundant goodness, forbearance and patience of God without repenting. Repentance is unknown to natural man and consequently he does not glorify God neither is he thankful.

All knowledge finally has a spiritual background, not only the knowledge of the Gospel, not only that of the Law, but also that of Creation. Yet man, although he has a knowledge of Creation, does not possess that knowledge of it which Hebrews reveals to us in chapter 11, verse 3: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Man is wanting a spiritual knowledge of God's Creation, even as he is wanting a spiritual knowledge of God Himself. Such a knowledge of God and His Creation can only be gained by faith, God being "an object of knowledge only insofar as He is an object of devotion at the same time." Only when we love God above all things, do we know God and do we worship God. Natural man is without this love and this worship of God. He cannot say of God, as Melanchthon liked to point out: "My God" "My Lord and my God" (John 20, 28) is a confession which only the disciple of Christ can make, not a heathen philosopher. The latter can speak of honoring the gods, but he does not know how to say with the prophet Isaiah: "O Lord, thou art my God" (22, 1).

Natural man does not glorify God as God nor does he give thanks to Him (Rom. 1, 21) — although he knows God. Therefore men must hear the final verdict of the Law "that they are without excuse" (1, 20). This verdict stands when we but consider the use that man does not make of his knowledge which he has of God. It stands and continues to stand also in view of the use, both the moral and religious use, to which man puts his natural knowledge of God.

(To be continued)

Kirchengeschichtliche Notizen

Missouri's Saginaw Convention on Union. — No decisive action on union with the A. L. C. was taken by the Missouri Synod at its convention of last June because, in the words of its Committee No. 3, "the entire picture has been changed due to the fact that our Committee on Lutheran Unity has succeeded in taking the first steps in preparing the document which was ordered by the resolution of the Synod of Fort Wayne, page 302, No. 8, b, c, d. This document or doctrinal affirmation as agreed upon by our committee and a sub-committee of the A. L. C. Commission has already been submitted in a preliminary way to the entire group of the A. L. C. commissioners, and we have the promise that the document will be presented to the convention of the American Lutheran Church in the fall of this year." — In view of this new development the Synod unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"We recommend that our Committee on Doctrinal Unity be instructed, as soon as the document is in shape to be presented, to make it accessible to all members of our Synod, not only to pastors and teachers, but also to congregations, in order that all members of our Synod everywhere may have an opportunity to study the document carefully and be ready for a final vote in the convention of 1947. This document will, therefore, after acceptance by the respective bodies, clearly supersede all previous doctrinal documents and resolutions as accepted by Synod in 1938 and 1941."

A proposal to apply for membership in the National Lutheran Council seems to have provoked much more discussion before it was declined. The resolution as finally adopted reads as follows:

"WHEREAS, according to the best information available, membership in the National Lutheran Council as at present constituted and in accordance with the proposed constitution would apparently involve our Synod in unonistic principles and endeavors beyond a mere cooperation in externals and thus violate Scriptural principles which we are bound to observe; therefore be it

Resolved, that we decline the request contained in Memorial No. 617 and others of the same intent and therefore do not direct our officers to make application to the membership in the National Lutheran Council; and be it further

Resolved, that we request the President and the Vice-Presidents of Synod, together with our Committee on Doctrinal Unity, to study the proposed constitution of the National Lutheran Council and to gather further information as to the scope of the cooperative endeavors contemplated, with a view of collaborating with the National Lutheran Council in such matters as involve no violation of conscience and no denial of the truth."

The convention also took formal notice of a Memorial of the Wisconsin Synod. For the information of our readers we present both Memorial and Reply without comment, under a separate heading.

E. R.

Question and Answer:

A Memorial

from the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States,
to the Honorable Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States,
in convention assembled at Saginaw, Michigan, in the year 1944.
Attention of President John Behnken, D. D.

Dear Brethren in Christ:

Our most recent information on the status of negotiations between the American Lutheran Church and your honorable body is derived from the report of the Missouri Committee for Doctrinal Unity published in the *Lutheran Witness* of May 11, 1943.

We are in full agreement with the thought that the continued affiliation of the American Lutheran Church with the other synods of the American Lutheran Conference constitutes a very real obstacle to the proposed union. But since the report does not commit itself on a number of points that to us seem most important, we ask the following specific questions:

1. According to the report of the chairman of the American Lutheran Church Commission no more was achieved in their meetings with the Executive Committee of the American Lutheran Conference in the way of doctrinal discussion than to register the request "that this subject be kept on the agenda of the American Lutheran Conference committee," — and this after they had been "told . . . that such discussion would be altogether useless." Are you ready to agree to such an indefinite postponement of the American Lutheran Church's pledge?

We ask this because a promise of early action was implied by the resolutions of the Detroit Convention ("We entertain the confident hope that our sister synods in the American Lutheran Conference will occupy the same ground in these matters now occupied by us"), following similar statements by the American Lutheran Church Commissioners in the conclusion of their Declaration ("We recognize it as our duty to do what we can to bring about the acceptance of these doctrinal statements by the bodies with which we are now in church fellowship"). The fulfillment of this condition, which surely is a *sine qua non* to the Missouri Synod, now seems very remote.

2. Are you ready to accept the implication that the objections raised by the representatives of the American Lutheran Conference ("that the anti-Missouri feeling was at too high a pitch") are something that you could in good conscience "help to remove?"

We ask this because to the best of our knowledge the "unfavorable attitude" toward your body in American Lutheran Conference circles is due to your insistence on purity of

doctrine, *e. g.*, in such important articles as the Inspiration of Scriptures, etc.

3. Shall we conclude that the discussions of doctrinal differences between you and the American Lutheran Church are a closed chapter, and that you are definitely committed to the Resolutions of 1938 as a settlement of the doctrinal controversies between the two synods?

We ask this because of the disturbing reference in the report of May 11 to the question of unionism as "precisely . . . *the* obstacle" that keeps the synods apart, because of the equally disturbing silence on doctrinal obstacles, and because of the reiterated reference to "our (Missouri and A. L. C.) *common* doctrinal position."

We would much prefer to assume:

- a) that when the Fort Wayne Convention resolved to continue "negotiations . . . in an effort to *establish* doctrinal unity"; and when "in addition to any controversial doctrines that may need further study and clarification" it specifically enumerated four points as requiring further "careful study" — it indicated that the chapter was not yet closed and that the doctrinal controversies were not yet considered as settled; and
 - b) that when the convention instructed its representatives to make every effort to prepare one document of agreement in place of the three included in the St. Louis Resolutions of 1938, it did so with the thought in mind that such a procedure would reveal whether the Brief Statement and the Declaration are in fact reconcilable with each other, and would therefore provide a test of the doctrinal soundness of the latter document.
4. In view of the unionistic attitude of the American Lutheran Church, which has become increasingly evident, will you not agree that further negotiations for establishing church fellowship could only undermine the testimony that has previously been given, and should therefore be discontinued for the time being?

Such an action would not be inconsistent with the course followed by your Synod in an earlier stage of these intersynodical negotiations when in reviewing the Chicago Theses of 1928 the convention of 1929 accepted the following recommendation of its committee:

"It now seems to your committee a matter of wisdom to *desist* from intersynodical conferences. By entering into a closer relationship with the adherents of the Norwegian Opgjøer, the opponents have given evidence that they do not hold our position in the doctrine of conversion and election. In view of this action further conference would be useless

and would only be creating the impression that we are endeavoring to come to an understanding which is not the case." (Report of 1929, page 133, as quoted by Dr. Poppen, A. L. Conference Convention of 1942.) — Does the same conclusion not apply today?

May we express the hope that your consideration of, and answers to, these frank questions may help to dispel the confusion that is besetting the Church, and strengthen the ties of common faith that unite us.

In behalf of

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN JOINT SYNOD
OF WISCONSIN AND OTHER STATES,

JOHN BRENNER, *President*.

August 11, 1943.

* * * *

The Reply

President JOHN BRENNER,
816 West Vliet Street,
Milwaukee 5, Wisconsin.

Dear President Brenner:

President Behnken calls my attention to the fact that you should be officially notified of the action taken by the Missouri Synod regarding your letter addressed to our Synod. This letter was printed as Memorial 608, p. 354ff, in our Book of Reports and Memorials and was given careful consideration by Committee No. 3, which then reported as follows:

"With regard to the overtures concerning the objections raised by our brethren in the Norwegian and the Wisconsin Synod *we recommend* that Synod respectfully call the attention of our brethren to the proceedings of the Ft. Wayne Convention, where the request of the brethren was fully respected, page 303, #9: 'That, after favorable action has been taken by our Synod and the American Lutheran Church in reference to the one doctrinal agreement prepared, our Synod take no further action with the American Lutheran Church until our Synod has submitted the entire matter to our sister Synod in the Synodical Conference and the American Lutheran Church has submitted the entire matter to its sister Synods in the American Lutheran Conference, and all this has resulted in favorable action.'"

This report of Committee No. 3 with its recommendations was adopted by our Synod. That means, of course, that we fully recognize our obligation toward our brethren in the Synodical Conference and that no union agreement will be entered into on our part with any other Lutheran Church body until the matter has been submitted to our sister synods, and they have acted favorably, even as we expect the American Lutheran Church to come to an agreement with its constituent synods in the American Lutheran Conference before any final action can be taken.

With cordial greetings,

Yours fraternally,

M. F. KRETZMANN, *Secretary*.

Re-Thinking the Chaplaincy. — Concerning the chaplaincy question the *Christian Century* already a year ago issued the warning that the proverbial camel was poking his nose under the tent. The warning should be heeded before developments carry us too far. There is grave danger in delay. We were glad to notice in recent weeks that the former apparently universal complacency is gradually giving place, at least in some quarters, to what the *Presbyterian Guardian* calls "re-thinking the chaplaincy." The method employed may at first resemble a groping in the dark and may not at once lead to a thorough clarification; yet we welcome the fact that a re-thinking has set in at all. The *Presbyterian Guardian* for July 10 carried an article of more than three columns on the question: "Why should we hesitate? Should not every presbytery endorse all applicants for the chaplaincy?" We cannot reprint the entire article, but we will present some of the thoughts contained in it.

Immediately following the above question the *Guardian* continues: "But look again at those shoulder-bars. Does it begin to appear that a price tag is attached to them? It may be small and inconspicuous, but there it is: *Paternalism*. . . . The Great White Father is concerned that the soldiers be religious. Cradle-to-grave security must never ignore religion. . . . *Paternalism inevitably breeds control* (Emphasis always ours. M.). . . . Control is coming and is partially here." The article then speaks of the navy's "permanent V-12 program for the training of officers. This program includes the supervision of the training of chaplains. Seminary students will wear uniforms and be paid by the government. Seminary courses must be shortened from three years to two; and the cooperating seminaries must offer three terms a year, with no summer vacation for practice preaching. This 'aid' is in an area which up to now has been the church's own business — the education of its clergy." — The article then adduces cases in support of its claim that "already there are hints of deeper control than mere 'aid.'"

The following paragraph deserves the most careful attention of every one who contemplates to offer his services as a chaplain. "The strange sight of a Roman Catholic chaplain conducting Protestant services, a Protestant chaplain conducting Jewish services, or a Jewish chaplain conducting both Romish and Protestant services, is not only *provided for in the rules*, but is frequently seen. . . . *A chaplain must be willing to conduct such a 'general service,'* reading from a book to fill the air with neutral though perhaps Biblical words. It cannot be called worship." Here apply some words contained in the same *Guardian* on the President's D-Day prayer. It "fell far short of being a Christian prayer. There was indeed an employment of some Biblical language. . . . But, for all that, *the prayer was essentially unchristian*. It made no recognition of Jesus Christ as the one through whom men have access to God and as the one who is the only Savior of men. . . . Prayer and religion have become meaningless when they are reduced to vague generalities."

From the remainder of the *Guardian* article on the chaplaincy — nearly

one half — we here take up only one thought. There is a fine testimony to the general priesthood of believers, as it manifests itself in army life. "Now it is always right and proper for a soldier to witness to another soldier of the saving grace of the Lord Jesus. *This is done constantly*, and men are being saved." This statement is used merely to introduce the following: "*It is also perfectly in order for a civilian minister to preach to the fighting men*, and go along with them if the army will let him. The difficulty with a civilian chaplaincy which is outside the control of the army is that no civilian has access . . . An officer's uniform unlocks doors and gates which a civilian could never enter. If there is to be a ministry in Army and Navy circles, it must be done in uniform. *There is something basically wrong with such a situation*. Sphere-sovereignty of church and state has somehow broken. — A state-supported ministry, with state-supported colleges and state-supported seminaries, seems to be here to stay."

Really? It will be our own fault if we meekly cooperate, and meanwhile withhold or subdue our testimony. Our ingratitude may, indeed, move God to take away from us the religious liberty we so far enjoyed, and we may be doomed to become "witnesses to a breakdown of the foundations of our civilization." But we dare not stop testifying.

On the same general topic of the chaplaincy the *Lutheran Standard* in its column "The Church Views the News" had an item. It referred to an article in the *Christian Century* containing the following statement: "The rest (all denominations other than Roman Catholic) must work together as a unit. *Such a thing as closed communion, for example, is impossible*. Chaplains who feel that they cannot administer communion to all Christians alike are properly dropped from the chaplaincy during the training period." The *Standard* also quotes a chaplain as reporting: "I served communion to men of 22 different denominations, and there was no question of creed or sect. It beats any church council you ever heard of. Let us take down the fences between ourselves and others." The fact that the program in the chaplain's service "cuts across denominational lines," and that the "Roman Catholic denomination is the only one permitted to maintain its own distinctive practices and services" moves the *Standard* to ask: "Has the Lutheran Church less right to be respected for her doctrinal position than the Roman Catholic?" This misses the main issue. True Christians are often subjected to injustice. That does not injure the conscience. But can a Christian, a Lutheran, with a clear conscience apply for a position as chaplain under such conditions? And if for some reason or other he does, what effect will it have on his conscience? The *Standard* asks: "Will our chaplains come home, Lutherans or interdenominationalists?" The same chaplain quoted above asserted that "it is not true that the Navy chaplains are asked to do things inconsistent with their beliefs." Naturally not if their "belief" permits things such as he boastfully admitted.

Dr. Dau Called Home. — Few people, when the news of the death of Dr. William Herman Theodore Dau was flashed abroad, were so deeply affected by it as his former colleagues and co-workers who at the present time are responsible for the reading material offered in the *Concordia Theological Monthly*.....No one can think of the antecedents of our present journal without recalling the work of the now sainted father and brother. Every issue of the *Concordia Theological Monthly* carries the information that this journal continues *Lehre und Wehre, Magazin für ev.-luth. Homiletik*, and *Theological Quarterly* — *Theological Monthly*. In 1905, when Prof. Dau became a member of the faculty of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, he was made managing editor of the *Theological Quarterly* and continued to serve in that role till 1920, when the *Theological Quarterly* was changed into *Theological Monthly*. The latter journal he piloted till 1926, when he resigned from the faculty of Concordia Seminary to become president of Valparaiso University. Besides the work he did for the *Theological Quarterly* and the *Theological Monthly* he edited for a number of years the English section of the *Magazin für ev.-luth. Homiletik* (*Homiletical Magazine*). Hence prior to 1926 he sustained the most intimate relations to several of the theological journals now united in the *Concordia Theological Monthly*, and we sincerely regret that the only wreath we can lay on his tomb are a few words of humble gratitude and appreciation.

Born in Lauenburg, Pomerania, February 8, 1864, the deceased came to this country in 1881. In 1886 he was graduated from Concordia Seminary, a member of the last class which was dismissed into the ministry by the sainted Dr. C. F. W. Walther. From 1886 to 1892 he served as pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, Memphis, Tennessee. The next seven years saw him in the presidency of Concordia College, Conover, North Carolina. In 1899 he went to Hammond, Indiana, as pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church of that city. From 1905 to 1926 he filled a professorship at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, teaching chiefly dogmatics and comparative symbolics. The presidency of Valparaiso University he held from 1926 till 1930. In the latter year he retired from active regular church work and moved to Berkeley, California. He continued, however, to write and lecture when special invitations reached him. Dr. Dau led an extraordinarily busy and useful life. In addition to the tasks and labors mentioned above, he edited for a time the *Lutheran Witness*, wrote a number of books and pamphlets, and tirelessly served as preacher and essayist at conferences and conventions. Among his books the best known are *At the Tribunal of Caesar*, *The Great Renunciation*, *The Leipzig Debate*, *Law and Gospel* (a translation of Walther's great work), and *He Loved Me*. Important was the aid he gave Dr. Bente in the preparation of the *Concordia Triglotta* and his contribution to the book edited by Dr. Engelder *Walther and the Church*. Many a time he served his Church on special missions. When, for instance, after the First World War our Synod desired to send an able ambassador to Europe in order to strengthen the brethren that were laboring there under difficult conditions and to

obtain first-hand information on affairs, he was chosen for that post, and wherever he went, he made a deep and lasting impression.

The departed was a person of the rarest gifts and accomplishments. His learning had a marvelously wide range and was marked by dependable accuracy in details. Especially was he versed in the history of the Reformation, and his monographs in that field are justly considered as classics. What delighted his hearers and readers was the originality, warmth, and artistic elegance of his style, which made listening to a sermon or essay of his not only a spiritual, but an intellectual treat. Readers of the old *Theological Quarterly* will recall the thrill with which they perused the article on "Grace," which, if we mistake not, was the first production he published as editor of that journal. His discourses were freighted with rich and precious thought, and if at times his language became more Johnsonian than he himself desired, that was compensated for by the solidity of the material he presented. On account of his excellence as a writer and speaker in the English language, he must have been during the first two decades of the present century one of the two or three representatives of the Missouri Synod best known in the circles outside our own church body.

His chief distinction, of course, lay in something else — in the humble, sincere acceptance of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in the Lutheran Confessions and their faithful reproduction in the pulpit and classroom, on the lecture platform, and the printed page. He was a Lutheran theologian that clung to the *sola Scriptura, sola gratia, and sola fide*.

Now he has been taken into the home above. We praise God, who was glorified through the gifts of this servant, and in gratitude we say that his memory shall remain fresh and green in the hearts of us who knew him well and loved him. His death occurred April 21. He was buried in Hammond, Indiana, on April 28.

"Lord, Thou hast been our Dwelling Place in all generations," Ps. 90, 1.
 "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and today and forever," Heb. 13, 8.
 A., in *Concordia Theological Monthly*.

Acceleration In Theological Education.*) — In keeping with the requirements of the Selective Service System and the plans of many other seminaries, Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, inaugurated this year a summer semester of fourteen weeks involving

*) It is to early to pass finally on the merits and demerits of an accelerated seminary course, after a trial of only one summer. We in Thiensville were favored by unusually cool weather, broken only by one or two hot spells for a few days' duration. In general, our experience parallels that described by Dr. E. E. Flack, Dean of Hamma Divinity School, whose report we herewith submit because of its thought provoking suggestions. In our case it proved fortunate that we did not "stagger" the faculty members but provided for recuperation periods in a different way. — We call our readers' attention particularly to what Dean Flack has to say on the desirability of "clerical experience" for seminary students.

two terms of seven weeks each, May 15 to June 30 and July 3 to August 18. Three of the six members of the faculty taught the first term; the other three, the second. This plan enabled the professors to devote part of the summer to private study and recuperation. This seems to be a better plan than that of having all members of the faculty teaching the entire summer.

Under the strain of continuous study the students appear somewhat fatigued. This is observable in the tendency toward tardiness in arising in the morning to meet 7:30 classes and in the quality of work done. Grades for the first term were in general lower than usual. Nevertheless the majority of the students are accepting the situation in fine spirit, feeling that they are promoting the nation's cause by pursuing an accelerated course of study. Many of them rejoice in the prospect of an early admission to graduation. Some, however, feel a sense of immaturity and a desire to prolong their period of study or internship before undertaking the work of the pastorate.

It is of course too early to determine the plan of theological education for the future. Undoubtedly the accelerated program will continue to operate until the postwar period. Any other plan would seem to be out of harmony with Selective Service regulations. In spite of the fact that students now fail to acquire the maturity and clinical experience desired before leaving school, the accelerated plan in general increases the flow of men into service and thus meets the public demand.

Long experience in training men for the ministry has taught us the value of the customary summer vacation period. Faculty members must have time for study and research. The man who lectures regularly day by day through the school year ordinarily devotes himself so unreservedly to the task that he finds himself too exhausted both mentally and physically to undertake creative intellectual pursuits while school is in session. To keep abreast of developments in his field he needs all the extra time which the summer months afford. The sabbatical year, devoted exclusively to personal development, is widely recognized as sound educational policy. Many leading theologians confess that they cannot do any literary work while school is in session. Any permanent program of acceleration, therefore, must involve adequate provision for vacation periods for faculty members. Schools which are requiring all members of their faculties to teach throughout the entire year are by the very nature of the case lowering their standards. Some method of "staggering" the faculty members, as Hamma has done this summer, relieves the situation considerably.

Students also need the benefits which the summer months normally afford. The average theological student is required to engage in some remunerative employment on the side. Most churches, recognizing this situation, make some provision for ministerial aid, but rarely is that adequate to provide for all the financial needs of the student. He must either secure part-time employment after school hours or devote a large part of the summer to that interest. The introduction of a summer semester precludes the possibility of regular employment for the period either in a

pastorate or some other remunerative service. It thus compels needy students either to increase the amount of time devoted to outside employment or to seek greater aid. Naturally, the student who exhausts himself in outside work does so at the expense of scholarship. One way to meet this situation is for church bodies to increase the amount of ministerial aid. This has been done in many instances. But the method is not altogether satisfactory. The student who is able to work during the summer months and thus to accumulate considerable reserve for the following school year acquires a wholesome independence, confidence, and experience.

Furthermore, theological education is for the most part theoretical. The time allotted is too brief to add full clinical experience. Ordinarily, students pursue their theoretical discipline during the academic year, then spend their summers in clinical experience as supply pastors, assistants, or home or inner mission workers. Thus the average student has many opportunities to preach, to teach in church or daily vacation Bible schools, to engage in pastoral calling, and to test out in many other practical ways the principles presented in the classroom. The tendency in theological education in recent years has been to place increasing emphasis upon clinical training. Many seminaries have gone so far as to introduce a full clinical year to enable their students to acquire adequate practical training during their seminary course. The accelerated program seems to militate against all this. It reduces the amount of time a student can devote to practical pursuits and sends him forth far too immature in both age and experience.

Three full academic years with their intervening summer vacation periods are in reality insufficient for all the demands of modern theological education. To reduce this to a period of two calendar years, as is now the program of many schools, is to adopt a wartime emergency measure which involves sacrifices on the part of both faculty and students. In our judgment, it will not prove satisfactory as a permanent program. The Church is becoming increasingly aware of the fact that it takes time to make strong, mature ministers of the Gospel.

Büchertisch

A Dictionary of Bible Topics. By Theodore Graebner. D. D. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. Price \$2.00.

This Dictionary of Bible Topics is not only a "book of ready reference on matters historical and archaeological," it is a reader's digest of Biblical and archaeological material, to which the Bible student will always again have recourse, whether he is seeking information on some specific Bible topic or on the Bible and its contents in general. The three main parts of this Dictionary will give our readers an idea of what it has to offer:

I. Studies In Biblical Interpretation, II. Bible Land Rambles, III. Biblical Archaeology and History.

The importance of archaeological discoveries has been concisely stated by the author: "Without them the Bible histories would be regarded by skeptical historians as little more than mythical and fabulous. As soon as the historical data of God's Word are identified by discovery, the controversy concerning trustworthiness ceases" (p. 202).

We recommend this Dictionary with its 278 pages of Bible topics to the theologian and the non-professional student alike. P. Peters.

From Science to Souls. By Peter W. Stoner. M. S. Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago 10, Illinois. Price \$1.00.

The author, not only professor of mathematics and astronomy and member of the American Scientific Affiliation, but also a teacher of Sunday School classes, is well aware of the dangers by which our young people are beset when entering a college and there encountering teachings which contradict their early training. Professor Stoner, however, does not only place the blame at the doors of the colleges and their professors, but also realizes that "too many times the fault lies with the Church," it having "taught its young people theories about the Bible which are neither scientific nor scriptural." The reader will therefore be interested to hear what the author as professor of mathematics and astronomy has to tell him concerning scientific theories and hypotheses of the past and present and their connections with Genesis 1 (Comp. Chapter One, pp. 17-61). The reader of this book will also be interested in the interpretations, which the author as teacher of religion and as a Bible student gives to Genesis 1 and to the prophecies of the Old Testament, dealing with their interpretation from "the angle of probability" and by means of "numerical evidence." (Comp. Chapters Two and Three, pp. 62-101). We must leave the weighing of this evidence to the reader. Our only question is whether the author has not evaluated "scientific evidence" at the expense of the testimony of the Bible, which is the best evidence for the trustworthiness of the Scriptures. Professor Stoner points to this evidence and tells us that "the question of creation cannot be scientifically considered or settled without first hearing God's own testimony and claim" (p. 20). Yet we must always keep in mind that the testimony of the Bible is not only one piece of evidence, that it cannot be replaced by scientific evidence (comp. Preface to Chapter One, p. 15), but is skyhigh above all scientific evidence. Therefore, we would not like to see the following conclusion listed among the "Conclusions" of Chapter Four (pp. 102-116): "Since the Bible is true, as we have proven it to be, the Christian must take the Bible seriously" (p. 104). Let the conclusion rather read: Since the Bible is true, as it testifies to be, the Christian must take his Bible seriously. A true evaluation of scientific evidence in favor of the Bible will develop only in the light of this its own testimony. P. Peters.

Beginners' Hebrew Grammar. By Rev. Harold L. Creager, B. D., with the collaboration of Rev. Herbert C. Alleman, D. D. D. C. Heath and Company, New York, Chicago. Price \$3.00.

There is a great need in our country for beginners' Hebrew grammars, grammars which will prepare the beginners for the study of the standard works by Gesenius, Davidson and Harper. The *Beginners' Hebrew Grammar* by Creager and Alleman meets this need. One of its many good features is listed by the authors in the Preface with the following words: "The constant effort to give reasons for seeming peculiarities, and to explain principles thoroughly." In conformity with this feature the nouns are classified and the primitive forms of the verbs are listed, so that the student can trace the changes which give rise to the present regular forms. These principles should be adhered to throughout in teaching the student a correct approach to both noun and verb. Why advise the beginner to learn inflection and vowel changes by deducing all forms of the noun from the present Sing. Absolute, only to add: "It is more strictly accurate, however, to derive each form independently from its own primitive"? It is not only more strictly accurate, but also more practical. Why, to mention another instance, burden the beginner with the statement that there are "ten classes of irregular verbs" over against the one strong or regular class? The word "irregular" is a very relative one. The so-called irregular verbs have made themselves guilty of no other irregularity than to have their own characteristic consonants and vowel changes, which can only create an added interest in the study of the Hebrew on the part of the beginner, if these characteristics are held up to him to see and study. This the authors do not fail to do despite the above mentioned inconsistencies, and we therefore can assure all beginners in Hebrew that with the help of this grammar they will acquire a basic knowledge of the grammatical forms and syntactic principles to enable them not only to develop a facility in general reading, but to continue their study of the Hebrew with the help of the standard works of Gesenius, Davidson, and Harper.

P. Peters.

The Loves and Wars of Baal and Anat and Other Poems from Ugarit.

Translated from the Ugaritic and edited with an Introduction by Cyrus H. Gordon. Princeton University Press, Princeton. Price \$1.50.

The Ugaritic or Râs esh-Shamrah discoveries have been proclaimed as "extraordinary" and "brilliant," yielding "most remarkable" and "epoch-making" results, because a portion of the ancient literature of the Canaanites, which was felt by competent scholars to be irretrievably lost, has been found in the mound of the ancient port of Râs esh-Shamrah on the coast of northern Syria. "Syria bids fair," we are told, "to rival Babylonia and Egypt in the importance of its ruined cities for the reconstruction of ancient history."

Among the most important finds which Ugarit yielded the temple library containing clay tablets in a new cuneiform alphabetic script is

undoubtedly the most valuable. These tablets are not only inscribed in the native Semitic language, the Ugaritic, but also in the Assyro-Babylonian, the Sumerian, the Hurrian, and Egyptian confronting the scholars with an internationalism, which could hardly have been surpassed by any other city of ancient times. The contents of these inscriptions are still more extraordinary and remarkable. They do not only include mere names of kings and gods, but "the bulk of the documents consists of mythological poems, about Canaanite gods and heroes." That such texts will have a considerable bearing on the Bible, can be taken for granted, since they represent the religious records of a people, with whom the Israelites, the worshippers of Jehovah, had to carry on a life and death struggle. References in the Bible to the Canaanite gods and worship can now be studied anew with the help of these documents. Numerous "striking points of contact" have been found. These have been pointed out by the translator, Cyrus H. Gordon, to whom all Bible students are indebted for this insight into the most important portion of the Canaanite literature. The first poem in this publication, "The Birth of Dawn and Dusk," tells us of the birth of the two sons of El, the supreme god of the Ugaritic pantheon. The second poem is entitled, "The Loves and Wars of Baal and Anat," Baal being to the Canaanites the god of life and fertility. The third poem is "The Saga of Aqhat, Son of Daniel," the virtuous hero of old. Introductory remarks to the different parts of these poems make it possible for the reader to retain the line of thought running through each poem. Dr. Gordon, who has also published a Ugaritic Grammar, is well acquainted with the language and with the mythology of these old poems composed between 1700 and 1500 B. C. and can therefore be considered a trustworthy translator and interpreter of this North-Canaanite epic. P. Peters.

The Chapel Hymnal. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Paper bound. Price 25 cents.

The idea of a small and inexpensive collection of hymns to serve on the many occasions when the larger *Hymnal* is not at hand is surely a happy one. It should also serve well in the early stages of the work in a mission field, in the care of the sick, and in many other ways. Therefore it is most disappointing to find that this collection falls far short of representing Lutheran hymnology in general, or the *Lutheran Hymnal* in particular, which would seem to be the source from which this miniature edition was derived. For not only is this small selection topheavy with hymns of non-Lutheran ancestry, but it is more than strange that in this small number of hymns (103) there should be at least eight which for one reason or another have not been received into the larger *Hymnal*. Those culled by this reviewer are the following: Lead, Kindly Light; I Think When I Read That Sweet Story; Softly and Tenderly Jesus Is Calling; I Love to Tell the Story; I Need Thee Every Hour; My Church, My Church, My Dear Old Church; Sweet Hour of Prayer; There Is a Green Hill Far Away. The taste which accounts for these selections seems to be developing in the wrong direction.

E. R.

The Graduals for the Church Year. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Paper bound. Price \$1.25.

Edited by the Rev. Erwin Kurth and Prof. Walter E. Buszin, these *Graduals* constitute a fitting companion to the *Introits* of a year or more ago (cf. *Quartalschrift*, April, 1943, p. 157). In addition to providing choir-settings for the Graduals of the Church Year, including many special occasions, the editors have added music for Seasonal Sentences as well as a number of traditional Sequence Hymns. Since many of these settings are in the more familiar barred chant in which much of our liturgical singing is done, choirs will probably find them less difficult than the Gregorian Tone of the *Introits* referred to above. A carefully written introduction not only offers an interesting history of these forms, but also presents some simple rules which should prove very helpful to choirmasters who wish to familiarize themselves with this type of liturgical music.

E. R.

Our Church. — A Guide to the Study of the Organization and Activities of the Local Congregation. By J. M. Weidenschilling. Concordia Publishing House. Paper, 35 cents.

In simple terms this booklet brings a wealth of information on the meaning of church membership, of the Liturgy, including the Communion Service and the Special Services, of the Church Year, and the like. It will serve well for use with Young People's groups and also be very helpful to the adult convert who is trying to get his bearings in new and strange surroundings.

E. R.

Eighty Eventful Years, Reminiscences of Ludwig Ernest Fuerbringer. — X and 267 pages; handsomely bound. Price \$2.00. — Concordia Publishing House.

This is not an autobiography in the ordinary sense; it presents, as the subtitle announces, reminiscences. The author speaks of events that occurred, and of persons connected with those events, on most of which he reports as an eye and ear witness. The value of the book lies particularly in this that it furnishes to the reader many close-up views of men and happenings that are important for properly evaluating the major trends of the particular period of time, but which are not always recorded in formal histories. — The book is divided into 27 chapters, preceded by an Introduction and followed by several pages of Notes. The many pictures, scattered throughout the book, of eminent individuals and of groups add greatly to its value.

M.

* * *

Alle hier angegebenen Sachen können durch unser Northwestern Publishing House, 935-937 North Fourth Street, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin, bezogen werden.